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Russian anthropology takes its roots in folklore studies, on the one hand, and various applied ethnographic cum geographic research motivated to a substantial degree by colonial expansion and military effort, on the other. However, though this heritage is still strongly felt, it has been supplemented by other components in subsequent periods of the discipline’s development.

At all periods of its existence, from the early 18th c. to the present Russian anthropologists made extensive theoretical borrowings from other national traditions and disciplines, adapting them according to the prevalent ideological and political demands.

In terms of language the early stages of the discipline seem to be more multilingual than the later ones, with publications of research results in German, Latin, French and Russian predominating. Today (as well as during the late Soviet period) the bulk of domestic ethnographic is published in Russian, although the number of publications in English is continuously growing; French and German language publications became marginal. The fragmentation of the discipline into many specialized research fields, regional specializations, subdisciplines, etc., contributed to the present situation when many Russian ethnologists/anthropologists publish for a narrow audience of their immediate colleagues with the same specialization (often only a few people) and are not aware of the developments in the neighbouring areas or other national traditions. The library crisis that has started in early 1990s due to the inadequate funding (even the leading academic institutions and libraries do not get most of the leading anthropological journals published abroad and could not pay for online access to academic articles collections) contributes to the growing gap between the present concerns of Russian anthropology and developments in leading anthropological
traditions, though trips abroad Internet access and joint projects alleviate and somewhat ameliorate the problem.

The history of the national tradition of anthropological research is practically as long and eventful as those of the main European (British, Dutch, French and German) and American traditions, although admittedly much less known\(^1\). It is of considerable interest to ask why its impact on other national traditions and its contribution to theoretical and methodological heritage of anthropology has been so unimportant. A straightforward and simple answer would be the existence of a language barrier and the ideological isolation during much of the XX\(^{th}\) c. But this answer is not quite acceptable, because Russian literature as well as the best literary criticism (i.e., works by Mikhail Bakhtin or Yuri Lotman) had somehow got over the language barrier and made its way through the iron curtain. Would this mean that mimesis of literature and criticism had been more readily accepted in the West than comparatively more prone to ideological constraints mimetic descriptions of social reality produced by Soviet social sciences? Or was it the geography of Russian anthropological research, reflecting the Russian geography of colonialism (as well as the weakness of moral reflection impeded by Leninist dogmas), that created insurmountable barriers for the anthropological community in the West? I am not sufficiently qualified to answer these questions, for I could only make guesses why the vast ethnographic literature of the Soviet and now more than a decade of post-Soviet times is left largely unclaimed by wider anthropological community. To answer this question one should know the other side of the story: the opinions of our colleagues from other countries. My own guess is that most of the time Russian ethnografia (a Soviet name that very roughly corresponded to socio-cultural anthropology in the West) during most of the periods in its history looked for inspiration to the West, a gaze that could not but produce somewhat secondary and thus less appealing nature of the Soviet anthropological theory and knowledge. And although some European and American scholars tried to engage Russian anthropologist in a dialogue, notably, Ernest Gellner (1980, 1988) in Britain, and Stephen P. and Ethel Dunn (1974) in the USA, the results were not impressive.

Fifteen years ago one of the leading figures of the emerging post-Soviet Russian anthropology Valery Tishkov, who had at the time got the position of the director of the major anthropological institution within the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (IEA RAS), published an essay with a suggestive title “The Crisis in Soviet Ethnography”. He suggested that the crises of this discipline had to do “not so much with the social conditions under which [it] operates as with the discipline itself, including its central authoritative body, the IEA RAS” (1992: 371). Looking

---

back at the developments that happened within this broad field of research during the last 15-20 years I am inclined to modify this statement by stressing the role of the social conditions. Indeed, as I have stated elsewhere (Sokolovskiy 1993), the recent changes that altered the anthropological research in Russia were induced by the major political and social shifts in the country, not due to internal controversies and debates within academic community. The history of Russian anthropology, as probably some other histories of social sciences within those national traditions of social research that were surviving in the adverse conditions of centralized state control, demonstrates a recurrent pattern of change induced ‘from the outside’, sometimes brought on by violent measures by authorities, followed by slow recovery with its varying strategies of adaptation, from close cooperation with the state bureaucracy to scholastic escapism. I will not follow the well trodden path of the history of interactions and operation of power on and within academy. Instead I will try to look for changes induced by these external pressures (or their suspension) that altered the research terrain in terms of disciplinary boundaries and alliances.

It had become a widely shared opinion that early anthropology of the mid-XIXth c. was inspired and molded by the example of natural sciences. One of the ‘ancestors’ of Russian anthropology Dmitry Anuchin, who was trained in zoology, physical anthropology, archaeology and geography, and became known as an ardent proponent of the so-called ‘anthropological triad’ (physical anthropology, ethnology and archaeology) in his own attempts at reconstruction of the “physical and psychological development of mankind from the most ancient periods of its existence…” (Anuchin 1880: 59) called for the integration of the data from anatomy, physiology, embryology, geology, paleontology, archaeology, zoology, history, linguistics, ethnography, geography, psychology and statistics. This total descriptive approach was derived from the mode of naturalists’ field observation of plants and animals, where everything from soil to physical appearance and from sounds to behavior mattered. This stance had not been specific to Anglo-American tradition (Stocking 1992: 22), but was typical for German and Russian naturalists as well, notably for Karl Baer, the founder of Russian physical anthropology and archaeology.

This embracive naturalist gaze had survived in Russia till the end of the XXth c. and influenced the work of Vladimir Vemadsky, Nikolaï Vavilov, and my own teacher Valery Alexeyev, a physical anthropologist, who left after his premature death over 600 scholarly publications in such diverse fields as paleoanthropology, anthropogenetic and ethnogenetic studies, craniology, osteology, human paleoecology, prehistory, medical geography, to name but a few. He left unfinished his magnum opus “Anthropogeosphere”, a compendium in which he planned to cover such issues as the genesis of anthroposphere with its periods of equilibrium and disequilibrium, including local ecological crises in different periods of human history due to over-hunting and over-grazing, climatic changes, depletion of mineral resources, human loss due to local and global wars, economic crises etc. As his teachers, Vladimir Vemadsky and Nikolaï

---

2 See, inter alia, a two-volume set on repressions in Soviet anthropology, compiled by Daniil Tumarkin (1999, 2003), and the article on early Soviet ethnography crisis by Yuri Slezkine (1991) as well as the recent book by Frédéric Bertrand (2002) on the early period of Soviet etnografia.
Vavilov, he thought in terms of civilizations, of the evolution of technosphere into what he called ‘a psychotronic civilization’ which should bring among other major changes demilitarization and political and social harmonization (Alexeyeva 2004: 651). This synthetic gaze of a true Renaissance dimensions is at once reminiscent of the gaze of a XIXth c. naturalist, but unlike it, is integrated due to the interrelated intellectual tasks of problem-solving. Although within problem-oriented research specialist from social, biological, medical, and ‘hard’ sciences often co-operated, the problems themselves were classified by disciplines, so problems that were considered as ‘central’ for the discipline usually implied more focused co-operation of specialists from neighbouring disciplines or subfields.

In the case of Russian etnografia the ‘legitimate set’ of such disciplines or fields for several generations of researchers had been the triad of physical anthropology, ethnology and archaeology. Even the first specialized Soviet academic institution founded in 1933 as the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography had been within a year renamed into the Institute of Anthropology, Ethnography and Archaeology. The word ‘ethnography’ in the title was a specifically Soviet terminological invention made during their early struggle with ‘bourgeois science’ in the 1920s. It happened at the conference of Moscow and Leningrad ethnographers in April 1929, which proclaimed non-Marxist ethnology “a bourgeois surrogate for social sciences”. It signaled the end of the intellectual map of Russian anthropology formed by predominantly German and other European influences and initiated new preoccupation with class-struggle and class stratification in various ethnic groups (Soveshchanie 1929: 115-16). After another major attack from the Marxist reformers at the All-Russian conference on Archaeology and Ethnography in May 1932 the focus of ethnographic research for several subsequent years moved from the study of pre-literate non-industrial and pre-modern groups to scholastic exegesis of the theory of ‘primitive communist formation’, the genesis of classes and the family, and the role of ‘survivals’ (Slezkine 1991: 481). The ‘survivals’ were identified not so much for the purposes of reconstruction of certain social institutes of the past, but more as impediments to progress to be abolished in the construction of socialist society.

Dogmatic interpretations of Marxist approach to the study of social phenomena produced problematic which demanded new configuration of methods and different interdisciplinary alliances. “Primitive peoples history” in view of the discipline’s reformers should be focused on the issues raised by Marxist classics, namely on the study of the origins of the family, classes, religions, arts and other ‘superstructures’, ethnogenesis and geographical distribution of ethnic groups, and to such practical issues as the transformation of pre-capitalist societies into socialist and the construction of socialist culture (Rezoliutsia 1932: 12-14). From that period on (the end of 1920s), the Russian anthropology got more and more isolated from productive dialogue with other national research traditions beyond the political borders of the country. The divorce with classic anthropological heritage was selective and uneven in various subfields which composed the discipline, but the split initiated by Bolshevik Cultural Revolution had so thoroughly reconfigured and redrawn the disciplinary alliances and borders that its consequences have not been overcome till this day. “Iron curtain” policy and witch-hunting for dissidents aggravated the intellectual isolation and contributed to
idiosyncratic institutionalization of Soviet social sciences, quite different from their western analogues. The resultant semi-isolation from developments abroad and ideological censure inside the country produced a unique conceptual vocabulary, which posed a considerable challenge for rendering into the vocabularies of other research traditions.

Most of the main commentaries on the specifics of etnografia as a discipline, written by Soviet anthropologists in pre-war period, stressed the proximity of anthropology to history. At major universities (both in Leningrad and in Moscow), etnografia had been relocated from the department of geography to that of history. In 1945, Sergei Tolstov (the director of the Institute of Ethnography from 1942 till 1966) wrote:

“Etnografia is a branch of history, which researches the cultural and customary distinctiveness of various peoples of the world in their historical development, which studies the problems of origin and cultural-historical relations between these peoples, and which uncovers the history of their settlements and movements.” (Tolstov 1946).

The definition of the director of the central ethnological body of Soviet science had been equivalent to directive, and Soviet ethnographers were busy studying the historical development of ethnic groups and cultures throughout the territory of the country, often ignoring contemporary cultural phenomena. As a result, while Soviet ethnographers produced quite rich ethno-historical accounts, the works on contemporary socio-cultural processes till 1951 were practically rare. Tamara Dragadze said once that “a Soviet anthropologist is a historian, not a sociologist” (1987:155). The pervasive historicism of the Russian etnografia contributed to its peripheral status as a subsidiary discipline of history and had been a factor to its marginalization in the system of university education.

The centralized character of Russian academic research and small number of ethnographic institutions played an important part in the occurrence of regular and synchronized shifts in focus and subject of the discipline (or what they were called from the internal perspective – ‘crises’), when a party attack or a mere change of the head at the central institute initiated a set of reformist moves, which thoroughly transformed the problematic of the discipline each 20-25 years of its existence from the early Soviet years right to perestroika of the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The next major shift in research focus of Russian anthropology after the crisis of 1929 happened after the publication of Stalin’s work “Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics” in June 1950, when he put to scathing critique the so called ‘new teaching on language’ of Nikolai Marr, a philologist and archeologist, specializing in Georgian and Armenian linguistics and archeology. Marr had become a full member of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1912 at the age of 47, and was the holder of several leading posts in academic institutions until his death in 1934 (see for details and bibliography Alpatov 2004; Slezkine 1996). His exercises in ‘iaphetology’ produced a unique fusion of comparative semantic analysis with archeological, folklore and
historical data. We need not go into the details of his teaching or the polemics it provoked both at the time of its first publication in the 1920s and during the summer months of 1950 (May 9 - July 4), when a public discussion of his ‘new teaching on language’ took place on the pages of the national newspaper Izvestia. His position and the vehement attack of his followers on ethnologists back in 1929 contributed to the demise of the comparativist research programs and separate institutionalization of ethnographic and linguistic studies. In October 1951, after long preparation, an academic conference of scholars from leading anthropological, linguistic and archeological institutes was convened for bringing the tasks of the disciplines in accord with the party guidelines. Methods of ethnogenetic studies were substantially revised. The All-Russian conference of ethnographers which took place the same year put a special stress on the study of family and contemporary culture of peasants and workers. Within the next five years a score of the so-called ‘collective farm monographs’ had been published and more than 20 dissertations written (Tolstov 1956).

The next phase of Russian ethnografia and substantive change in research problematic came with Yulian Bromley, the director of the Institute of Ethnography within the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (now IEA RAS) from 1966 to 1989, who insisted on the definition of ethnografia as the study of etnos. This led him to the following strategy of boundary delimitation with history, sociology and social anthropology and several other social sciences he perceived as neighbouring. By positioning etnos or ethnic communities (groups, categories, peoples as ethnic communities) and not cultures, societies, or individuals and their various groups as the main object of ethnographic research, Bromley underlined those functions of such objects that served as demarcation features of the discipline. He designated these functions as intra-ethnic integration and inter-ethnic differentiation and grouped them under generic heading of ‘ethnic functions’ (Bromley 1981: 84-5). He used ‘ethnic functions’ as differential markers for delineating research focus of ethnografia from that of cultural studies (kulturologia), linguistics, history and psychology. Any component (trait or feature) of a given etnos according to his methodology should be assessed through the lens of ‘ethnic functions’ (does it serve for integration or differentiation purposes, is it characteristic of every constitutive part of a given etnos and is it distinctively unique for that etnos etc.). If this component is unique for the etnos under consideration and quite common across its constitutive groups and communities, than it could be viewed as belonging to the core area of ethnographic research, for it was considered as serving
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3 In fact, this was a reiteration of a deeply entrenched view among Russian anthropologists derived from Herder and Humboldt. Nikolai Kharuzin in one of his works defined “lifeways of tribes and peoples” as the subject of ethnography (1901:37); Sergei Shirokogoroff introduced etnos as the main object of ethnographical research as early as 1922. Soviet anthropology, or as it was named after the conference of 1929 ‘etnografia’, had been consistent in delineation of its subject and identification of the main objects of research. Since its institutionalization as a separate field of research its main object had been ‘peoples’, designated later as ‘etnoses’. From N. Kharuzin (1901), N. Mogiliansky (1908), and S. Shirokogoroff (1922, 1923) right up to L. Gumilev (1967), Yu. Bromley (1969) and V. Tishkov (2002) it had been focused on ethnic phenomena, and any other ‘object of research had been viewed as ‘deviant’ and treated with suspicion as ‘not quite ethnographic’.
‘ethnic functions’. Hence, Bromley’s insistence that the core area for ethnographic research of culture was the so-called ‘traditional everyday culture’ (traditionnaia bytovaia kultura); in linguistic sphere it was the ordinary and commonplace language (obikhodnyi yazyk), and in psychology it was the routine and commonsense notions (obydennoe soznanie) (Bromley 1981: 84). By opposing traditional culture to its other domains, Bromley drew the boundary between etnografia and kulturologia; and by focusing on habitual experience and thinking he contrasted ‘ethnographic problematic’ of ethnopsychology to mainstream psychology, which studied psychological phenomena as universal generalized and features of individuals; whereas his differentiation between commonplace language and its literary form set the boundaries between ethnographic studies of ritual behavior and folklore with mainstream academic linguistics and cultural critique endorsed both by kulturologists and literary critics.

I should perhaps remind my colleagues from the West that up to the mid-1970s the main task of Soviet social sciences as understood both by authorities and scholars was ideological support and legitimacy confirmation of the regime and the critique of ‘bourgeois ideology’. As repression by direct coercion and violence after Stalin became unpopular, the regime dysfunctions were to be remedied by other means, such as better information on social and political processes, optimization of governing by monitoring popular opinion, and other means of feedback from population for more effective control. All these needs required professional empirical research and better education for social research. However, the dialogue across political borders was severely limited due to ideological constraints: only technical methods of information collection and processing could be borrowed from the West; theory and conceptual apparatus were not allowed. This policy had substantially weakened the new research opportunities and channeled research into politically safe but futile directions. One of those directions had been the already mentioned Bromley’s theory of etnos, which put the potentially dangerous studies of ‘nations’ and ‘nationalism’ on the track of more secure and abstract typological exercises on the forms of etnos in different historical epochs and economic formations and classification of ethnic processes of integration and differentiation (see Graph 1).

Whereas in the case of American anthropological tradition there was a marked increase in the number of “adjectival anthropologies”, in Soviet etnografia of the 1970s-1990s there was a similar increase of ‘ethno- prefixed’ disciplines (such as ethnodemography, ethnoecology, ethnopsychology, ethnoconflictology etc.), where the prefix ‘ethno-’ was not the same as in ethnobotany, but implicated a reference to etnos or basic ethnic unit, as the proclaimed subject of Soviet etnografia was the etnos, understood as “a social organism which had formed, over certain territory out of a group of people with similarities of language, common traits of culture and everyday life, some common social values and traditions and a considerable blending of different social components achieved in the course of the development of economic and social cultural relations. The basic features of an ethnic community were ethnic self-identity and self-name, language, territory, specific features of psychic make-up, culture and every-day life as well as some specific forms of socio-territorial organization or a drive to create one” (Kozlov 1967:111).
The changes of focus and theoretical orientations that happened in Soviet/Russian ethnografia could be summarized in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>The main object of research</th>
<th>The main theoretical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to late 1920s</td>
<td>Traditional culture of tribal groups and Russian peasants</td>
<td>The history of ‘pre-historical’ or ‘a-historical social and ethnic groups’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 - 1950</td>
<td>Class and class differentiation within various communities; ethnogenesis</td>
<td>The study of ‘survivals’ within the framework of social evolution and economic formations change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950- mid 1960s</td>
<td>Contemporary culture of peasant and ‘non-Russian’ groups</td>
<td>Culture change and ‘socialist progress’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1988</td>
<td>Ethnos and ethnic culture</td>
<td>The classification and study of ‘ethnic processes’; ethnogenetic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 - present</td>
<td>Conflict and change, gender, religion</td>
<td>Contemporary cultural, social and political processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the recently published survey of 45 Russian anthropologists, conducted by the editorial staff of the Russian anthropological periodical “Anthropologicheskii Forum”\(^4\) several participants of the survey mentioned mass borrowing of ideas and methodology from the West. In the words of one Ekaterina Melnikova, “The opening of floodgates between Western and Russian scholarship has led, as often happens in such cases, to the borrowing of terminology and sometimes ideas on a mass scale.” (Melnikova 2005: 459). Another participant of the same survey Evgeny Golovko, commenting on the research objects and topics that were ‘not considered a proper object of study’ during Soviet times, made a similar observation that although such topics are currently the subject of much interesting work, “one has to acknowledge that it consists of attempts (often very successful, indeed brilliant) to catch up with what was being done abroad much earlier.” (Golovko 2005: 456).

In my opinion, the problem with current borrowing from the West is not that it is happening at an unprecedented rate and scale, but that it happens in the most haphazard, uncritical, and disorderly fashion. Peter Skalník, an uncompromising critic of Soviet ethnography, posed once a question whether “Russian and other post-communist ethnographers ... want to become anthropologists and thereby achieve an intellectual revolution or continue hiding behind changed labels of ethnologists”. He went on to suggest that if “the former is their goal, then they will have to translate, study, and digest the vast anthropological literature, which in turn will enable them to carry out a thorough and frank revaluation of the fairly large body of their own writing

up till now” (Skalník 1998: 10). Unlike Soviet translations that were carefully chosen and few, present-day translations into Russian, though much more numerous, are often flawed and ill chosen. The digestion also suffers under ill-coordinated teaching and commenting. The lack of trained faculty at most of peripheral universities chairs and conservative reaction to innovations at the central universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg is one reason for this indigestion. Lack of funding for the purchase of foreign books for university libraries is another.

The interdisciplinary boundaries of Soviet ethnography. Soviet scholars at different periods in the history of their discipline many times redefined its main objects and subject area, establishing various alliances with ‘neighbouring fields’ and underlying differences with similar research programs of other social sciences and humanities. Focus or the necessity for the synthesis of archaeological, linguistic, bio-anthropological and ethnological data had been dictated by the research agenda or by the nature of the main problems that the general anthropology was struggling with at the time, mainly, the reconstruction of the history of mankind and particular histories of its constitutive ‘races’ and ‘peoples’. With the breakup of the evolutionary grand narrative and subsequent change of research focus the synthesizing effort lost its main objective and the unity of the discipline was threatened. Our current preoccupation with the unity or diversity of anthropological disciplines from this perspective might be a corollary of interrelationship of data from its various subfields needed for reflection on certain problems. The question is, whether we still have such problems on our agenda that demand joint efforts of all the constitutive ‘sub-fields’, or we have become so specialized in our research that no such problems are in view.

I have no space and time to follow most of these changes and will concentrate on the period of the 1960s–1980s, immediately preceding the contemporary state of ethnography /ethnology /anthropology in Russia. Somewhere in the middle of this period Ernest Gellner in his preface to the publication of papers resulting from the conference of Soviet and Western anthropologists cautioned western readers on the conceptual and terminological non-equivalences, reminding them that etnografia in the Soviet parlance is “the science as a whole, including its theoretical parts” … and “that ‘anthropology’, without qualification, means physical anthropology in Soviet parlance (1980: x). He warns as well that “when a Soviet author prefixes the term ‘ethno’ to another word as in ‘ethnogenesis’ this generally means … that ethnos is an object of inquiry” (1980: xi). As elsewhere in Europe, physical anthropologists in their studies were more often associated with ancient and medieval history, than with etnografia. Sergei Tolstov, who was a follower of Marr since his student years, devoted much time to archeology and founded the Khorezm expedition at the Institute of Ethnography, which survived in reduced form the subsequent directorship of Yulian Bromley and exists as a small team of researchers at the IEA RAS even now.

Bio-anthropological data from were readily used in ethnogetic studies and in compendiums on ethnohistory of particular ethnic groups. With decline of academic studies of ethnogenesis, which took place during the 1970s and 1980s (now such studies are maintained mostly by archeologists themselves, at the Institute of Archeology, RAS
in Moscow, and at its St. Petersburg twin Institute for the Study of Material Culture), archaeology became marginalized. A conservative group of ethnologists at the Omsk University chair of Ethnography and Museology have made ethnogenetic studies and 'ethno-historical regions' their primary object of research, and regularly publish works on 'ethnic archeology', with descriptions of the so-called 'ethno-archeological complexes', but this is viewed by most of the rest as particularly 'peripheral' and outdated preoccupation. An analogy might be drawn between relationship of ethnology with history, on the one side, and ethnology and physical anthropology, on the other, except that institutionally the links with anthropology are stronger (there is a number of physical anthropologists on the staff of both Moscow and St. Petersburg academic ethnographical institutions (IAE RAS and MAE). A special physical anthropologists panel is organized at every all-Russian congress of ethnologists.

Both 'ethnology plus archeology' and 'ethnology plus physical anthropology', quite prominent alliances in the past, fell into disfavor in liberal Russian scholarship. The virtual disappearance of these previously central synthetic fields was caused by ideological shift. The first union produced prolific pop-science publications in local ethnonationalism, as it helped to link territory to ethnic group and enabled ethnic leaders to wage war against other 'less autochtonous' claimants. The second union of ethnology and physical anthropology is implicated if not in outright racism, than in racialism, since on the basis of this synthesis Russian anthropologists have created what they call 'ethnic anthropology' and published quite a number of works with bio-anthropological profiles of every ethnic group of the country.

There is another peculiar marriage of what has been traditionally viewed as part of physical anthropology with some research issues from the agenda of sociocultural anthropology. I am speaking here of a small research group (both at the IEA RAS and at the Center for anthropological study and research of the Russian State University for Humanities), who is specializing in what might be designated as sociobiology or evolutionary behavior studies. A primatologist, who head this group (Marina Butovskaia) ingeniously use her training in behavior study of the current urban subcultures of begging, gender-specific behavior, human sexual behavior, hunter-gatherers studies etc.

The rapprochement of linguistics with ethnology produced Russian ethnolinguistics of a very special kind, which problematics looks more like the search for Volksgeist, than as contemporary cognitive anthropology.

Two other interdisciplinary fields of burgeoning activity are 'the contact areas' between anthropology and political sciences and anthropology and sociology. The first contact area started as applied field during perestroika years, as various ethnic mobilization movements and conflicts draw the attention of scholars from both fields. A report series on applied and ethnic anthropology, now containing almost 200 issues, has been initiated in early 1990s. The study of power and conflict, banned during Soviet period, returned to become a central concern for early post-Soviet ethnology/anthropology.
Ethnic sociology started ten-fifteen years earlier, during the disciplinary scope expansion initiated by Yu. Bromley, when groups of ethnic ecology, ethnic demography, ethnic psychology and ethnic sociology were formed. The interdisciplinary boundaries in this case remain blurred and the division of labour unarticulated.

Sociologists equipped with qualitative methods (including ethnography) were the first to embrace the problematic of newly born social anthropology and set the standards for PhD programs and teaching requirements for the new university courses. As they were not well-read in classical anthropology at the time, both the standards and the programs suffered. The institutionalization of social anthropology by sociologists and cultural anthropology by kulturologists effectively isolated and divided these two imaginably different disciplines from each other and from the mainstream ethnology.

So, now, in some regions of the country we have three different disciplines with very different research focus and agenda, whereas in others the dividing lines are blurred or ignored as mere bureaucratic inventions. The Soviet ethnografia normativity, that crystallized and emerged around 1960s, came to an abrupt end by the turn of the century. Now the departments and chairs that cling to Soviet style 'traditional' ethnographic agenda are seen as hopelessly retrograde, whereas the new social anthropology chairs with rare exception, as absurdly eclectic.

The culture wars that are fought in the current Russian social sciences and humanities resemble more trench warfare than offensive operations. The decade-long debate over the status of ethnicity (constructionist vs. primordialists) getting stale, Russian anthropologist are starting to look apprehensively for other directions, specially those that are viewed as new for traditional mainstream Russian ethnografia. The community of Russian ethnologists, painfully and slowly moves in the direction of much wider concerns of sociocultural anthropology. As an illustration I would mention only a few topics that were unthinkable as subjects of ethnographic concern only ten years ago. In "Ethnographic Review", the anthropological journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences, which has been founded in 1889 by Dmitry Anuchin, and then resumed in 1926 by Soviet ethnographers as “Etnografia” (the, from 1930 to 1990 as “Sovetskaia ethnografia”; since 1991 “Etnograficheskoe obozrenie” or “Ethnographic Review” again), during the last couple of years special issues were devoted to the anthropology of advertising, tourism, dreaming, everyday conversations, militant Islam, Muslim headscarfs etc. Except for the last topic, which would have been considered as a legitimate object in the ethnographic study of costume (all political implications would have been dropped!), all other topics were not considered as belonging to the field of ethnology.

The alignment with academic linguistics during all periods of the history of Soviet and post-Soviet anthropology has been optional and tentative. Although in 1920s and 1930s the stress on knowledge of native languages has been quite high, the lack of funds for long field research and frequent switches of anthropologists from one linguistic group to another (aggravated by the unusual richness of linguistic composition of the country' population divided into more than 150 different linguistic communities, even if we ignore dialects which are often incomprehensible for other dialect speakers of the
same language) had contributed to the early disappearance of linguistics from ethnographer’s curricula. The usual way of specialization was language training ‘on the side’ at linguistics department of the same university, or privately (I do not mean here the foreign languages training which has often been a factor in area specialization of a student). It had been a usual case for an anthropologist back in the 1930s to learn the language of the group in the field, to work out an alphabet for the unwritten language, to describe its grammar and to write a textbook for local aboriginal school. But already at the end of this period field linguists took over this job from ethnographers, leaving them with ‘extra-linguistic’ or ‘meta-linguistic’ problematic, such as sociolinguistics of ethnic groups, some linguistic issues within the study of folklore, linguistic aspects of local classifications and terminologies (i.e. semantic and semiotic aspects of kinship terms, etc.). The Ph.D. requirement for linguists and ethnographers were always quite different and post-graduate programs of the latter rarely included topics from the domain of linguistics, except classification of languages and linguistic composition of regions.

This is not to say that ethnographers/anthropologists have not worked quite productively together in joint teams, such as folklore expeditions or ethnographic research within dialect borders. The Institute of Ethnography series “Peoples of the World” of the 1950s, for example, required the preparation of detailed ethnic maps of various regions and thorough knowledge of linguistic geography. Semiotics of culture propagated and studied by Yuri Lotman and his pupils at Tartu University inspired some Leningrad ethnographers and folklorists to use semiotic methods in their research of various aspects of material culture, such as semiotics of dwelling and house construction (Baiburin 1983). Moscow school of semiotics (Vladimir Toporov, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Boris Uspensky, Nikita Tolstoy, Eliazar Meletinsky and others) influenced ethnographers and folklorists, who were specializing on Slavic groups (Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Russians) and study of rituals and mythology.

Unlike our ‘hard-science’ colleagues, who turned away from the ideology of cumulativism, following the suggestion of Thomas Kuhn that scientific revolutions create paradigmatic shifts, ruptures and theoretic incommensurability, the moving forces of social sciences and humanities seem to be instead of revolutions, just scandals and fashions. A minor scandal created by a new set of arguments, data, or new public sentiment and sensitivity could put an end to anthropological preoccupation with one particular theory or concept and create incentives to produce another, as happened at various times with ‘tribe’, ‘race’ ‘assimilation’, and in the case of Soviet/Russian anthropology, is happening now to ‘ethnogenetic studies’ and the concept of ‘ethnos’. Fashions are subtler than scandals, as the change of preferences often happens without any proclamation of war, with no arguments pro and contra. People just not so much ‘turn away from’ certain subjects, as they are ‘drawn to’ another research agenda which promises some new impressions, vistas, and, well, yes, funding.

New research directions after rapid institutionalization often become isolated and ‘compartmentalized’, that is, instead of integration of their findings and visions into the mainstream anthropology, they establish separate networks of researchers who establish their own journal, regularly meet at specialized conventions and strategically position their sub-discipline as additive, but not as demanding the revision of methods in
other ‘traditional’ research areas. A case in point is the organization of a department of ‘ethno-gender studies’ at IEA RAS around 1995. So, now, instead of gender-sensitive anthropology we end up with a small group of scholars who are doing cross-cultural gender research in different ethnic communities, whereas others continue to ignore gender issues.

Table 1. Publications in the Russian anthropological journal *Sovetskaia etnografia / Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 1975-2004 by subject / sub-discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines, traditional for Russian anthropology</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity studies and theory of ethnics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture theory and cultural anthropology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social anthropology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methodology and research methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical anthropology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnogenetic and ethnic history studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnoarcheology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folklore studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnonymics and onomastics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies of religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic and historical demography</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archival studies and historiography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history of anthropology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New research fields</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnopsychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnosophiology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnopolitical studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic conflicts studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal anthropology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human ethology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum total:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research. Specialized anthropological research institutions were established in USSR during 1920s and 1930s. The already mentioned IEA RAS was organized in 1933 (its Moscow branch in December 1943). Today, besides research institutes within Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Irkutsk, Yakutsk, and Vladivostok, there is a number of research centers at large universities (Moscow State University and Russian State University for Humanities – RG GU; Kazan’ university; European University in St. Petersburg), anthropological research ‘laboratories’ at smaller or new universities, and teams of researchers at central and local ethnographical and local history museums.

In Moscow the oldest institute for physical anthropology (Dmitry Anuchin Research Institute and Museum of Anthropology of the Moscow State University) was organized in 1922. Its goals are ‘the study of individual, age, gender and territorial diversity of Man’ and its current staff comprises more than 30 bio-anthropologists specializing in anatomy, human genetics, craniology, anthropometry, osteology, human ecology and other branches of bio-anthropology and primatology. The Institute is a member of the European anthropological association. In terms of interdisciplinary research
anthropologists of the institute regularly contact and work in joint teams with archeologists, medical scientists and biologists (including medical and population geneticists, primatologists).

Teaching. Though the number of chairs and university research centers where students receive training in of ethnology / sociocultural anthropology has substantially increased compared to the period of mid-1980s, when there were only 4-5 chairs providing such a training, the understanding of what should be taught remains highly idiosyncratic and unpredictable and ranges from art history and philosophical anthropology to physical anthropology, archaeology and local history. The oldest chairs are located at Moscow University (Dept. of History: 1939 – a chair of ethnography), St. Petersburg (former Leningrad) University (Dept. of History: 1968 – a chair of ethnography and [physical] anthropology,) and Kazan’ University. Their younger associates were established at Omsk (Dept. of History: 1985 – a chair of ethnography and historiography that was renamed in the same year as the chair of ethnography and museum studies), Tomsk and Irkutsk (Dept. of History: 1970 – a research laboratory for ethnography and archaeology; 1988 – a chair of archaeology and ethnography, later renamed “a chair of archaeology, ethnology and ancient history) universities. In mid-1990s with the establishment of Ph.D. programs in social and cultural anthropology and the creation of new universities and colleges a score of new chairs, centers and even departments appeared (for details see the table in the Attachment).

In central institutions of Moscow and St. Petersburg, where professional communities were well consolidated and institutionalized, the innovations in research were processed in additive manner. In peripheral centers and chairs the interdisciplinary boundaries were to be re-negotiated which often led to schisms and splits of groups of researchers, and to fissions and fusions of various sub-disciplines into new coalitions. For example, in 1992 a new chair of archaeology and ethnography split from the chair of world history at Novosibirsk state university. In 2000 a chair of philosophy and social anthropology was organized at Chita state university, which was reorganized into the chair of social and cultural anthropology in 2004. The data for other departments and chairs are summarized in Table 2).

While ‘ethnographers’ grappled with new challenges trying to adopt their accumulated knowledge of the terrain to new circumstances, their neighbors from other social sciences and humanities departments were faster to occupy the opening niche for sociocultural anthropology and were quicker to institutionalize it by establishing new university chairs (mainly at departments of sociology and political sciences) and Ph.D. programs. The chairs of ‘scientific communism’ and ‘economy of socialism’ ceased to exist, their personnel was ready to get the opportunity to stay by affiliating with new departments to study ethnic conflicts and ethnic mobilization, ethnopoltics, nationalism, local history of culture etc. There are no good Russian textbooks of sociocultural anthropology so far; most of the published textbooks are either methodologically out-dated, or just reflecting authors’ highly idiosyncratic views what ‘proper anthropology’ should be engaged with. Fieldwork methods are rarely taught, and the last comprehensive textbook has been re-printed in mid-1960s.
To sum up all above, Russian anthropology goes through a period of transition and suffers all the plagues of disorientation; it has lost its previous focus on ethnic studies but did not acquire any new common focus. Various research teams and university faculty throughout the country ‘invent’ social anthropology as a discipline, often indiscriminately confusing it with art history, applied sociology, public relations and the like. The borders of the discipline and its scope have encompassed a lot of new topics and objects, but the lack of professional training and low standards of teaching prevent the integration of borrowed methods and ideas and fuel conservative reactions on the side of ‘old school’ ethnographers.
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## Ethnology and Anthropology Chairs at Russian Universities (More than 30 chairs (10 chairs of ethnography and archaeology; 3 chairs of ethnology and archaeology; 14 chairs of social and/or cultural anthropology; 2 chairs of physical anthropology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
<th>Research areas/institutions</th>
<th>Professions given</th>
<th>PhD programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abakan</td>
<td>Khakassian State</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnography, and regional history</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnaul</td>
<td>Altai State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnography, and source study</td>
<td>1988 Regional research</td>
<td>Archeologist, historian, ethnographer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelyabinsk</td>
<td>Chelyabinsk State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnography, and natural and social history Ethno- and social political processes in the regions of Russian Federation</td>
<td>1997 2000 history and culture of the South Urals peoples religious factors in politics</td>
<td>Ethnologist Political anthropologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chita</td>
<td>Chita State</td>
<td>Social and cultural anthropology</td>
<td>2000 Research and Development (ethnic-cultural history of the Urals region)</td>
<td>Anthropologist, culturologist</td>
<td>studies of religion, philosophy of culture and philosophical anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheboksary</td>
<td>Chuvash State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnography, and regional history</td>
<td>Research of the peoples of the Volga-Kama region; history of religions of the Volga region of the Middle Volga</td>
<td>Ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekaterinburg</td>
<td>Urals State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnology, and special historical disciplines</td>
<td>1999 Regional research (ethno-cultural history of the Urals region)</td>
<td>Archeologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornoi-Altaisk</td>
<td>Gornoi-Altaisk State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnology, and regional history</td>
<td>? Regional research</td>
<td>Archeologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irkutsk</td>
<td>Irkutsk State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnology and ancient history</td>
<td>1988 Archaeology and ethnography research lab. (1970)</td>
<td>Archeologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazan'</td>
<td>Kazan' State History</td>
<td>Ethnography and archeology</td>
<td>? Ethnography and ancient history of the peoples of Volga-Ural region; Ethnography and Archeology</td>
<td>Ethnography and archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasnodar</td>
<td>Kuban' State History</td>
<td>Archaeology, ethnology, and regional history</td>
<td>? Research and Development (ethnic-cultural history of the Kuban region)</td>
<td>Anthropologist, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makhachkala</td>
<td>Dagestan State History</td>
<td>Archaeology and geography</td>
<td>2002 Regional research</td>
<td>Anthropologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Moscow State Biology</td>
<td>(Physical) Anthropology</td>
<td>1919 General anthropology, anthropogenesis, human morphology, evolutionary anthropology, medical and ecological anthropology, ethnology</td>
<td>Anthropologist, primatologist Physical anthropologist Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Moscow State History</td>
<td>Ethnology</td>
<td>1939 Ethno-sociological lab. (1988); Center for applied ethnology (1995)</td>
<td>Historian, ethnologist Ethnography and anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow City</td>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>Ethno-psychology and politico-cultural development</td>
<td>? Research and Development (political and legal anthropology, evolution, anthropology, visual anthropology, human ethology)</td>
<td>Anthropologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian State</td>
<td>Social U. U. for Humanities (RGGU)</td>
<td>Centre for Social Anthropology Institute for cultural anthropology</td>
<td>2000 political and legal anthropology; evolutionary anthropology; visual anthropology; human ethology</td>
<td>Social anthropologist Theory and history of culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian State</td>
<td>Social Psychology and Pedagogical</td>
<td>Ethno-psychology and politico-cultural development</td>
<td>? Research and Development (interethnic relations; studies of aggression and extremism)</td>
<td>Anthropologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Russian State Work, pedagogics and</td>
<td>Social anthropology</td>
<td>? Research and Development (political and legal anthropology, evolution, anthropology, visual anthropology, human ethology)</td>
<td>Anthropologist, historian, ethnologist Psychological anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
<th>Research areas/institutions</th>
<th>Professions given</th>
<th>PhD programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novosibirsk</td>
<td>Novosibirsk State</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Archaeology and ethnography</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>integrative anthropology; body culture</td>
<td>applied culturology</td>
<td>culturology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novosibirsk</td>
<td>Novosibirsk State Technical</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ethno-archaeology; visual anthropology; ethnology of peoples of Western and Southern Siberia</td>
<td>Social anthropologist (since 2004), ethnologist</td>
<td>ethnology, ethnography and anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omsk</td>
<td>Omsk State</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Ethnography and museology (former 'Ethnography, historiography and source study')</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Ethno-archaeology; visual anthropology; ethnology of peoples of Western and Southern Siberia</td>
<td>Social anthropologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>St. Petersburg State</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Math</td>
<td>Ethnography and geography</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>historical ethnography; ethnic history and culture of the North-West region</td>
<td>ethnology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Ethnography Dept.</td>
<td>Historical ethnography; Ethnography and anthropology</td>
<td>1938-44</td>
<td>political anthropology; intercultural communication studies; anthropology and sociology of migration; gender and kinship studies; urban and organizational anthropology; studies of globalization</td>
<td>Social anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Republican state institute of humanities</td>
<td>Social anthropology and psychology</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cultural anthropology; folklore studies; sociolinguistics and semiotics; Ethnics Studies Program and Ethnic Tolerance Training</td>
<td>Center for Field Ethnological Research; Permanent Ethnographic and Folklore Expedition &quot;Russian North&quot;;</td>
<td>ethnography, ethnology, anthropology, folklore studies; theory and history of culture; linguistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>European University</td>
<td>Ethnology</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ethno-cultural history and historical anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratov</td>
<td>Saratov State</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>Social anthropology and social work</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Ethno-cultural history and historical anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratov State</td>
<td>Saratov State Technical</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>Social anthropology and social work</td>
<td>1993-98</td>
<td>Social anthropology of modernity; medical anthropology; economic anthropology; visual anthropology; studies of youth sub-cultures; social adaptation etc.; organizational anthropology</td>
<td>Social anthropologist and social worker</td>
<td>sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>Syktyvkar State</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Archaeology, source study, and ethnography</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ethno-archaeology; regional studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladivostok</td>
<td>Far-Eastern State</td>
<td>Institute for International Relations in the Asia-Pacific Region</td>
<td>Social and political anthropology</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
<td>Social anthropology</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of political systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Urban anthropology; ethno-cultural processes in the Far East</td>
<td>Ethnology, ethnography, anthropology and history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>