

From Rivals to Partners on the Inter-War European Scene Sigurd Erixon, Georges Henri Rivière and the International Debate on European Ethnology in the 1930s

BJARNE ROGAN

On 27 August 1937, Sigurd Erixon mounted the rostrum at l'Ecole du Louvre in Paris, where he delivered a paper on "Some notices on connections and differences in the rural buildings of Europe". The event was *le Congrès International de Folklore*, or CIFL, a congress that mustered the vanguard of European ethnology and adjacent disciplines, with around 300 participants.¹

In another session, Georges Henri Rivière, initiator of the congress and leader of the forthcoming Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires (MNATP) in Paris, gave his views on the principles of museology to be applied in the MNATP. At the new Musée de l'Homme, parallel to the congress, Nordiska Museet – Erixon's own institution – had been invited to present an exhibition on popular culture in Sweden.²

The CIFL congress represents an important phase in the efforts to establish a unified European ethnology.³ CIAP (la Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires, 1928–1964) had been founded in 1928,⁴ but CIFL offered a better opportunity than CIAP had done for the different ethnological and folkloristic traditions – *grosso modo* the German-Scandinavian-Celtic and the French-Latin clusters – to meet, test one another's strength and discuss strategies for cooperation.

The aim of this article is to outline some aspects of the academic politics of ethnology and folkloristics on the European scene in the 1930s. It was a decade characterized by a strong will to cooperate and a spirit of internationalism, in terms of scholarly networks, or-



Le Congrès International de Folklore (CIFL), Paris, August 1937. Georges Henri Rivière (to the right) is leaving a session. Photo: PhW-1937-1424, Mussia©MuCEM.

ganizations and journals. In the same years, however, with Communism as the backdrop and the rising Fascism, threatening ideological clouds hovered above these disciplines.

It is a complex organizational landscape that appears; my focus will be on the efforts to create a platform for the discipline(s), on two of the new ethnological organizations – competitors to CIAP, on their leading scholars, and on the political hindrances. The main focus is on organizational matters. However, a few words will be said about Erixon's scholarly contributions in the 1930s, since he was the foremost exponent of a theoretical basis for the science of European ethnology.

Two Protagonists on the Scene

To Nordic readers, the role of Sigurd Erixon (1888–1968) and his impact on ethnology in Scandinavia are well known, but less so his

persistent work internationally to establish a common arena for European ethnologists. Erixon's efforts to internationalize European ethnology took two directions: theoretically oriented articles and essays on the one hand, and practical organizational work on the other. Several of his articles in the 1930s endeavoured to establish a theoretical and methodological basis for a unified discipline. His two long, programmatic articles in *Folkliv* 1937 and *Folk-Liv* 1938, entitled "Regional European Ethnology" Parts I and II, go to the heart of the matter. The scientific journals he launched were also meant as tools for raising the regional ethnologies of Europe to the level of general ethnology.

Sigurd Erixon was not a stay-at-home researcher, as posterity might be deluded into believing through the bias of the biographical literature.⁵ He made numerous trips abroad. We meet him in Prague in 1928, when CIAP was founded, and for the following four decades he assiduously took part in the efforts to create a platform for European ethnology. The path was full of obstacles, however, as can be seen in a letter where he gave his apologies for being unable to attend a SIEF board meeting (la Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore, 1964–present) in Antwerp in September 1967:⁶

I will soon reach the age of 80, which means that I decline invitations as often as I can and I refuse to accept offices. For SIEF my absence will hardly be a loss. I cannot describe all the efforts we have made earlier, as the international dictionary has come to a dead end and the European atlas is taken over by a separate organization.

During most of these forty years Erixon was intermittently in contact with the organizer of the 1937 Paris congress, Georges Henri Rivière (1897–1985). Their contacts would last until 1967–68, when Rivière retired and Erixon died. Rivière had visited *Nordiska Museet* and Skansen as early as in 1929. In October 1935 they were present at the reopening of the Berlin *Volkskunde* museum, where both were invited by its director Konrad Hahm to give speeches at the opening of an exhibition on German folk art – an exhibition that has been characterized as "giving ideological concessions to the Fascists in power" (Gorgus 2003:240).

Rivière was not a researcher and a university academic, like Erixon, but an intellectual and a strategic organizer who stands out as the foremost figure in French and Southern European museology.



Georges Henri Rivière and Josephine Baker posing with African music instruments. The occasion is the exhibition on the Dakar-Djibouti expedition at the ethnographical museum at Trocadéro, Paris, 1933. Photo: Litnitzki.

He was trained as a musician, but started working with exhibitions on primitive art in the museum of applied art and quickly made a career as vice-director of the ethnographic museum at the Trocadéro. Being an excellent organizer, an ability that he combined with enthusiasm, personal charm and an extraordinary capacity to create networks, he was the main architect behind the founding in 1937 of the national ethnological museum in Paris (MNATP), which he led until he retired in 1967. Rivière's great impact on other museums, on ICOM, and on the ecomuseum movement, is unquestionable. With his artistic and aesthetic approach to museum exhibitions, he earned the reputation of the "magician of showcases" (See Gorgus 2003 (1999)).

Even if Rivière's own contribution to ethnological research was modest, his impact on the discipline (which he preferred to call *folklore* in the 1930s, hence the title of the congress in 1937) was considerable. He took a keen interest in museum collections and material popular culture. Traditional folklore topics interested him less, and in many ways he professed a modernist conception of the discipline, not unlike that of Erixon. His relations to oral literature and folk belief studies – and also to "the father of folklore", Arnold van Gennep, his senior by 25 years – had much in common with Erixon's critical attitude to some aspects of C. W. von Sydow's approach to folktale studies.⁷

The latter half of the 1930s, with its left-wing political climate, represented an important period for popular culture studies in France. European ethnology/folklore, which unlike the German and Nordic countries did not have a university basis, finally got an institutional anchorage in Rivière's new national museum. But Rivière's ambitions went further than the national borders. He was well aware of the solid academic traditions of German and Nordic culture studies, and he wanted France to catch up with the lead that these nations could muster in some fields, especially in the field of cartography.

It is significant that the two published biographies on these protagonists are entitled *Utforskaren: Studier i Sigurd Erixons etnologi* [The Researcher ...] and *Der Zauberer der Vitrinen: zur Museologie Georges Henri Rivière* [The Magician of the Showcases ...] The one was primarily a researcher, the other a museologist. But for Rivière, however correct it might be to label him a museologist, he believed that a national museum could not become a success without a renewal of the discipline. That is why European ethnology came to be Erixon's and Rivière's common field of interest.

Our two protagonists shared one disappointment: the failure of CIAP to become an acknowledged international forum for European ethnology. Consequently, they also had one ambition in common, which was to found a new international association for the regional ethnologies of Europe. Or rather, they had *similar* ambitions, because each wanted to do it his own way and each wanted to control the direction and the goals of the new organization that would hopefully replace CIAP. Instead of fighting each other, however (at least openly), they found – during the Paris congress of 1937 – a way of joining forces that might perhaps have succeeded, had it not been for World War II.

The Backdrop: Decline of CIAP

La Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires (CIAP) had had a difficult birth in Prague in 1928.⁸ The congress took place under the auspices of the League of Nations, organized by its Paris-based executive institution IICI (l'Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle) with Arnold van Gennep as the congress secretary. How-

ever, the League of Nations was fearful of the possibility that a permanent scientific organization on popular culture could become politicized by competing nationalisms. On the other hand, the League acknowledged the likely benefits of supporting such efforts for peaceful ends and the promotion of mutual understanding. They clearly saw the dangers that popular culture represented in the volatile inter-war years, with border disputes, annexation claims, and the instauration of both left-wing and Fascist regimes. In the eyes of the politicians, the disciplines of ethnology and folklore might be useful, but also very dangerous, in this period of political instability.

The years from 1928 to 1931 represented a stormy period in the history of CIAP. The League of Nations first tried to prevent the founding of a permanent organization. Losing that battle, their strategy became to secure control over CIAP. After a tug-of-war that lasted a couple of years, the League regained control – which meant, among other things, the right to appoint the secretary and one board member, and to decide the venues and to some extent the topics to be treated at the CIAP meetings. The only asset of CIAP was a permanent secretariat in Paris and a modest budget.

By the beginning of 1931, then, the League of Nations and its politicians had secured control over CIAP and its “rebellious” scientific members. CIAP had become a permanent organization, with around 30 member states, but its state of health declined very quickly during the following years. General assemblies were postponed or cancelled, and the worldwide economic crisis contributed effectively to keeping its activities at a minimum level. Most of the meetings held through the 1930s were administrative board meetings. Through one of its agencies, the International Labour Office (ILO), the League tried to enforce a policy of applied ethnology upon CIAP: that is, a policy of filling the increasing leisure time of the workers with folkloristic activities, as well as fighting the unemployment problem by the same means.⁹

Another major headache for CIAP was funding, as the allocation from IICI/the League was very low. But the creativity of its scientific members was also at a low level. To be associated with a bureaucracy with steadily less power and international status, and without sufficient funds, was not good for CIAP.

To this must be added the political problems. CIAP’s patron – the League of Nations – was itself in a state of decline and decreasing

prestige. In 1933, the president of CIAP, the German professor Otto Lehmann (Altona), had to resign as a consequence of Germany's withdrawal from the League. The Italian Emilio Bodrero took over as president. But Italy followed the example of Germany in 1937, and in January 1938 he too was obliged to resign.

The last couple of nails in the pre-war CIAP coffin came from two rival organizations that appeared on the scene in the mid-thirties. Together with Nordic, British and German colleagues, Sigurd Erixon founded the International Association for Folklore and Ethnology, (IAFE, later IAEEF), with support from the British Isles to the German-speaking countries. Another challenge came from France and G. H. Rivière, who – disappointed with the lack of French influence on CIAP, but also wanting to collaborate with German researchers – started another rival organization, the above-mentioned Congrès International de Folklore (CIFL).

A Survey of a Complex Landscape: Journals and Organizations

In the mid 1930s, three new international organizations appeared on the scene, as well as three new ethnological journals with a European scope. The emergence of all these bodies almost simultaneously – actually five of the six came into being within two years, 1936 and 1937 – necessarily created some rivalry. However, it soon became clear to those concerned that these organizations and journals had to collaborate, as they sprang out of more or less the same needs and had partly convergent aims and operated in the same market. The journals and the organizations will be treated separately in the following paragraphs, but a brief survey may serve as an introduction.

The development of the three prewar *journals* is seemingly easy to follow, but not so easy to explain – unless we look at the journals as strategic tools in certain strivings for hegemony, and also take the German situation into consideration. The first one to appear, *Acta Ethnologica* (1936), was conquered by the third, *Folkliv* (1937), though it was formally described as a merger. The second, *Folk* (1937), fused with the third, under the name of *Folk-Liv* (1938). When the war ended and the smoke cleared, *Folk-Liv* remained alone on the battlefield.

The three *organizations* joined forces in several ways, instead of conquering each other: they established a formal cooperation committee, they had sessions and meetings at each other's congresses, and they even decided to share a journal (first *Folk*, then *Folk-Liv*) as their official organ. Also, several of the most central people led promiscuous lives, holding offices in two or three of the organizations, as did Sigurd Erixon and Georges Henri Rivière, Jan de Vries (Netherlands) and Albert Marinus (Belgium), among others. Two of the organizations (IAEEF and CIFL) fought a silent battle for hegemony on the European scene, whereas the third one (ICAES) had nothing to fear from the others, having the world and not only Europe as its scope. And they all neglected the more or less moribund CIAP.

The first of the new organizations to appear on the scene was ICAES (the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences), with a congress held in London in 1934, as the first of a regular series. The congress had no session for European ethnology and folklore, but "a number of scholars in this field had none the less been invited" and their lectures put into the other sessions (Campbell 1938). Among these were Åke Campbell (Uppsala) and C. W. von Sydow (Lund), who took the occasion to discuss with Irish and Scottish colleagues possible ways of cooperation – a contact that was one of several steps towards the Lund congress (1935) and the creation of IAEEF.

The second ICAES congress took place in Copenhagen in 1938, with a separate session for "European ethnography and folklore". Erixon and Rivière – probably the two most prominent actors in European ethnology at the time – were elected members of the Permanent Council of ICAES, to represent European ethnology and folklore and to ensure that the practice of having a Europeanist section be continued in succeeding ICAES congresses (which actually was the case until the 1960s). The 1938 ICAES congress gave the occasion for formal meetings of and between the two other organizations that had recently appeared on the scene, the Swedish-inspired IAEEF and the French-dominated CIFL. At this stage the two rivals managed to reach an agreement for a division of labour, joint commissions, co-editorship of the journal *Folk-Liv* and a plan to arrange the second CIFL congress in Stockholm in 1940.

The organizations will be revisited in the following paragraphs,

but a brief discussion of some of their main similarities and differences and the division of labour might perhaps serve as a point of orientation in this confusing landscape. Whereas CIAP had had on its programme both network activities and congresses, IAEEF gave priority to network activities (archive cooperation, catalogues, questionnaires and atlas work, etc.). CIFL was also interested in some of the latter tasks, especially atlas work, but it was primarily an association for congresses, as was also ICAES. The formal agreement from 1938 actually stated that CIFL should serve as the *ordinary* congress for IAEEF, and that these congresses and the ICAES congresses (with their sessions for European ethnography and folklore) should have four-year cycles and thus alternate every second year.

There was an important difference in scope between the two rivals, in theory if not in practice. The French-dominated CIFL pursued CIAP's policy of being a global organization; this had been the initial idea of CIAP's first organizer, van Gennep, and a consequence of its affiliation to the League of Nations. However, CIFL was even less successful than CIAP in the pursuit of this aim. The initial focus of the Swedish-initiated IAEEF, on the other hand, was on North-western Europe, even if this scope was broadened following the discussions with CIFL. One might say that the focus of the two organizations converged during these few years: CIFL narrowed its scope from the world to Europe, and IAEEF broadened its scope from North-western Europe to the whole of the continent. As an anthropological association, ICAES was programmatically (and successfully) a worldwide institution; the problem was, rather, that many anthropologists of the day disdained any preoccupation with Europe.

Finally, IAEEF was marked by a certain tension – more visibly at least than within CIFL – between folkloristics and an emerging ethnology, understood as the study of material culture and social life.

Sigurd Erixon's Striving for a Unified Science

Erixon was – much more than Rivière – preoccupied with theoretical issues. And he aimed far higher than to exchange material, translate texts and to compare across borders – the primary goal of many folktale researchers – and to draw maps. Erixon's ambitions in the



Sigurd Erixon doing fieldwork in the 1930s. From the Gotland mission, 1937. To his left Dag Trotzig. Photographer unknown©Nordiska Museet.

late 1930s were to lay the methodological and theoretical foundations for a new science, ‘European ethnology’ – in the sense of a modern study of material culture and the social life of common people, to bridge the diversity of regional ethnologies and folklore studies.

Erixon’s view, however, was that neither ethnology nor folklore studies could become a mature science on national grounds alone. He pleaded for a study of culture “in as universal a manner as possible” (Erixon 1948–49) that was as valid for exotic peoples as it was for Europeans, and he claimed a close relationship, based on similarities of the object of study, between European and general ethnology.¹⁰ In this study folkloristics, and especially folktale studies, as they were practised by some of his contemporaries, played but an insignificant part.

Erixon looked westward for inspiration, and he found it in American sociology of the behaviourist school, and especially in their functionalist time-and-motion studies, in vogue in the 1930s. He argued that “it is in behaviour that the ethnologist has his main object”, and he strongly advocated time measurement studies. Used with circumspection, he maintained, this method could bring forth valuable results in investigations of working life, the life cycle, etc. He was on the lookout for “a method ... for measuring and comparing human functions” so that “the proposition that man is the total of his activities can thus be mathematically applied” (Erixon 1938a:

270, 275). Erixon himself applied these principles in extensive studies of the peasants' working year, measuring how much time they allocated to different tasks such as ploughing and tilling, haying and harvesting, mending, fishing, transporting, etc., and elaborated series of tables based on percentages and statistics.

It was in the comparative, culture-geographical approach, combined with objective techniques like time measurement, that Erixon saw the future for European ethnology. Where his points of view deviated from those of many of his contemporaries was not in the empirical and positivistic platform in itself. This platform he shared with all who laboured on the ethnological and folkloristic atlases. But his behaviouristic approach, i.e., his preoccupation with observable and functional activities, and his strong faith in data that could be measured exactly and represented statistically, were not shared by all, and especially not by many folklorists, whether at home in Sweden or elsewhere in Europe. It was the methodology, the precision and the apparent objectivity of time measurement that some functionalists advocated that attracted him, but not functionalism as such. Erixon could not accept functionalism's lack of attention to historical processes in culture; he saw no problem in studying isolated culture elements over a time span. Also, with his interest in the cultural-geographical approach and cartography, he had strong objections to functionalism's lack of interest in comparison.¹¹

The strongly behaviouristic and empirical-positivistic attitude that Erixon professed in these years explains why he – the foremost exponent of a unified science – found little room for one of its main branches at the time, the study of folkloristic material, at times characterized by Erixon as psychic, non-measurable culture elements. He was quite negative about some of the folktale research methodology and the "psychological method" professed by von Sydow (Erixon 1948–49). These methods were not compatible with his vision of European ethnology as a science on the level of general ethnology.¹² He was more positive to the philological school of folkloristics, as found in Uppsala and represented by several Gustavus Adolphus academicians.¹³ However, to relegate folkloristics in general to a corner of his new science would have been an untenable position in both a Nordic and a European context, and he acquired a more acknowledging attitude towards folkloristics than some of his prewar articles might suggest.

In Paris, George Henri Rivière had to fight another battle, that of gaining acceptance for his choice of the term *folklore*. In a short article in *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale*, edited by two of the participants at the congress, Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre, Rivière (and his second-in-command, Varagnac) claim that French folklorists lately had managed to replace the earlier “second-rate activities” associated with *folklore* by a new “science of Man”. The article is very short and succinct, but it sounds like an echo of Erixon’s two long articles. Rivière states that *folklore* is a branch of (general) sociology (*la sociologie descriptive*), and the only way for *folklore* to reach maturity as a science will be to follow the recipe of sociology, chiefly by turning to statistics.

To the extent that one can compare two long essays with one very short article, the main difference between them – except for the thoroughness and depth of Erixon’s line of argument and the more slogan-like form of Rivière’s – is that Rivière, claiming objectivity as the guiding idea but being less occupied by detailed measuring of data, proceeds directly to the study of distribution and culture areas by means of cartography and atlases. Rivière did not share Erixon’s ideas about time measurement as the most objective way of establishing data. But neither Erixon nor Rivière forgot that their discipline had an historical dimension. Rivière ends his vision of the future with the following appeal to the historically-minded readers of *Annales* (Rivière & Varagnac 1936:196):

After having laid such a basis [i.e., statistics, objectivity, cartography, ...] for its edifice, *folklore* will come to understand that this access to the dignity of a science necessarily places it among the young “sciences of Man”, the collaboration of which has already turned out indispensable to every historian.

Lund 1935, or the Ethnologist’s Coup

In November 1935, Carl Wilhelm von Sydow hosted a folklorist congress in Lund. Even though the congress was initially intended as a specialist meeting for folktale researchers, it initiated a chain of important events in European ethnology.¹⁴ One of the most long-standing and acutely felt problems in international folklore research was the difficulty of access to folktale archive material. Comparison across geographical and linguistic borders had been one of the main



The Lund congress, November 1935. From the opening session in the auditorium of Kulturen. First row from the left: Sigurd Erixon, Séamus Ó Duilearga, Reidar Th. Christiansen, Herman Geijer, K. G. Westman, Stith Thompson, Hans Ellekilde, Knut Liestøl. Photo: Folkklivarkivet, Lund.

approaches of the students of folktales and related material. But texts written in vernacular languages posed problems, and translations and catalogues were sorely needed. This problem had motivated the creation of the Folklore Fellows as early as 1907, and the challenge was taken up again in the 1930s, first in Copenhagen and Lund (von Sydow) in 1932, during and after a philological congress, then in London in 1934 at the above-mentioned ICAES congress (Campbell and von Sydow), then in Edinburgh in July 1935 (Campbell), and then again at the folklorist congress in Lund in November 1935.¹⁵

The organizers of the Lund congress were von Sydow and his apprentice Sven Liljeblad (Lund), and co-organizers were two other Nordic folklorists, Professor Knut Liestøl from Oslo and the archivist Hans Ellekilde from Copenhagen. The congress gathered around thirty researchers, mainly from the Nordic countries and the British Isles, but also from the Baltic area, Germany and the USA. The American scholar who followed most major congresses in Europe in these years, professor Stith Thompson (Bloomington), was present in Lund as well.

Even if the initiative of the congress came from folktale research-

ers, Sigurd Erixon and Herman Geijer – representing ethnology and philology – had made von Sydow and his co-organizers accept putting on the programme a plan for wider international cooperation than for folktales only (Campbell 1937:10). The participation of ethnologists was not a matter of course, as von Sydow regarded folklore and ethnology as two clearly separate disciplines, based on quite different methods. In general, Erixon and von Sydow seem to have had a good personal relationship, but on some occasions von Sydow accused Erixon of promoting ethnology to the detriment of folklore studies. Also, at this Lund congress Erixon warned against von Sydow's agenda of a "centralization programme", which included centralized, national archives in every country and translation of folktale material from less known languages to the world languages, for exchange and distribution.

Only two days before the Lund congress, a small, preliminary meeting was organized in Uppsala. In a letter Herman Geijer calls it "a quite private meeting" – to discuss beforehand one of the important issues to be treated in Lund, notably "plans for collaboration in some ethnological [*volkskundliche*] and dialectological investigations". Von Sydow had been invited but could not find time for the travel to Uppsala. In addition to Geijer, Erixon and Campbell, R. A. Gair (Edinburgh), Karl Kaiser (Greifswald), Uno Harva (Åbo) and Stith Thompson (Bloomington) were present at the preliminary meeting.¹⁶

However, this preliminary meeting did far more than discuss plans for "collaboration in ... investigations". It formed a concrete and detailed proposal for an international organization for ethnology, folklore and affiliated branches of philology, and it established an interim steering committee of British and Swedish researchers.

At the congress G. R. Gair, president of the Scottish Anthropological and Folklore Society, reported on the earlier discussions between Scottish, Irish, English and Swedish scholars and on the role of his society and of Landsmålsarkivet (the dialect archive) in Uppsala, led by Professor Herman Geijer, and he presented the plan conceived in Uppsala. The debate that followed Gair's revelations shows that many of the folktale researchers present felt caught off guard by the ready-made plans for a broad platform, fearing that their special needs would be ignored. Albert Nilsson (Eskeröd) reports (1935:74):

After the presentation of this comprehensive proposal, there followed an animated discussion, where uncompromising opinions met. Among the participants there were clearly three different groups. First, there were the persons who had actively contributed to the proposal in Uppsala ... who wanted the congress to accept it without reservations ... and leave all details to the committee. A second group consisted mainly of the researchers of folktales proper [den egentliga folkdiktsforskningen]. They were from the start rather sceptical ... and claimed their specific needs and wishes ... and they were not willing to leave these questions to a large committee. A third group were more passive, but interested and optimistic.

The proposal for the new international organization was finally accepted by the congress. The disciplinary scope of the new organization was as wide as its geographical circumference was restricted. The resolution states that an “International Association for the Ethnology, Folklore and related Linguistics of Northern, Central and Western Europe” should be established. These three fields were described as “the chief branches of the discipline”.¹⁷ The council should have three representatives from each member country, in order to have all three fields represented. Herman Geijer was elected president of the board and Knut Liestøl vice-president. Three secretaries were appointed; Åke Campbell for Northern Europe and the Baltic states, G. A. Gair for Western Europe (UK, Holland and Flanders), and Lutz Mackensen for Central Europe (the German-speaking countries).

Among the tasks to be addressed was the creation of an international journal. The question of a journal had already been raised at a number of international gatherings, and Erixon urged the congress and the board to come up with a solution (see below), which in his opinion would be “without any doubt one of the most central questions for international cooperation”.

Sigurd Erixon played a major role at this Lund congress, and so did Geijer and Campbell. Furthermore, the fact that the Gustavus Adolphus Academy for Ethnological and Folklife Research organized a meeting outside of Uppsala – probably for the first and last time in its history – and gave a reception for the congress delegates in Lund, underlines the role of the academy. As for von Sydow’s restless fight for an international (archive) institution for folktale research, it was established in 1959 – after his death, and only on a Nordic level, through Nordisk Institut for Folkedigtning in Copenhagen (see Bringéus 2006:127ff).

IAFE – from Lund to Berlin (1936) and Brussels (1937)

Lund had offered the venue for the folktale congress in 1935, but from a Scandinavian perspective, Uppsala and Stockholm became more centrally involved in this European association.

As for the connections westward, several Nordic ethnologists took a strong interest in the Celtic area. At the Lund meeting, Séamus Ó Duilearga (Dublin) praised the influence and impact of Nordic ethnology for the ongoing study of Irish folk culture. Åke Campbell from Uppsala, with the assistance of Albert Nilsson (Eskeröd) from Stockholm, had led a field expedition in Ireland during the two preceding summers (1934 and 1935), conducting surveys of Irish farm houses and vernacular architecture, cultural landscape and rural life forms. The Norwegian folklorist Reidar Th. Christiansen and von Sydow himself had done extensive fieldwork in Ireland from the early 1920s and learnt the Gaelic language, and both had translated Irish material (*ibid.*:166ff).

However, if the Celtic fringe offered a tempting research field, Germany represented the most important scientific community, so connections southwards were important. As an academic centre, Uppsala has been nicknamed “the suburb of Berlin”. Back to the very beginning of the twentieth century, university teaching in Uppsala covered both material folk culture and folklore, with philology (dialectology and onomastics) as an important auxiliary science, quite similar to the German tradition. The same was the case for the activities of the Gustavus Adolphus Academy (1932–). In general, the Germanic *Wörter-und-Sachen-Forschung* found a fertile soil in the Nordic countries. The outlining of the field for international cooperation that had been accepted at the Lund congress in 1935, with its three branches, bears the stamp of the academy. The folktale studies in Lund, on the other hand, relied less upon philology but had a stronger orientation towards comparative studies of motif, tradition and classification.¹⁸

The executive board elected at the Lund congress in November 1935 convened in Berlin in April 1936,¹⁹ and then again in Brussels in May 1937.²⁰ At the Berlin meeting all the Nordic countries were represented, and – in addition to Scotland – Germany, Austria, Belgium and Holland. The name chosen for the organization was the International Association of Folklore and Ethnology (IAFE). Her-

man Geijer continued as president, and as vice-presidents were elected professors Adolf Spamer (Berlin) and Jan de Vries (Leiden). Several new countries were accepted as members, and henceforth the council comprised 16 nations, but only from the northern, western and central (Germany) regions of Europe plus the United States.

A couple of details mentioned in the minutes of these two meetings deserve comment. In Berlin the board decided to accelerate the date of the forthcoming 1937 Edinburgh congress, from August to July, and to accept representatives of the “Latin countries of Western Europe” to the congress. In Brussels the board opened up a broader membership basis than earlier decided – that is, three national representatives from each country, to make it possible for individual scholars and institutes to become members. There are no explanations for these decisions in the official documents, but there can be only one reason: the anticipated competition from the French Congrès International de Folklore (CIFL), initially planned to take place in July 1937 but postponed until August. It must have been clear to both parties that some sort of collaboration and mingling would be necessary.

In Brussels in May 1937, only two months before the event, the board also decided – surprisingly – that “the Edinburgh Congress should not be reckoned as the first general Congress of the Association, but it should be a Scandinavian-British Folklore Congress under the auspices of the Association”. Once again, no reason is given in the official documents, except for one mysterious paragraph in the minutes: “Professor Geijer will personally in conjunction with Dr. Campbell explain the situation to those in Edinburgh.”²¹

There are two possible explanations, which do not exclude each other. IAFE had probably realized that it might be difficult to carry through two major events, in Edinburgh and Paris, more or less identical as to the disciplinary fields to be covered and almost simultaneous in time. And Paris aimed high – and had more resources, including local political support and a World Exhibition to lean upon – because much was at stake for Georges Henri Rivière: the Paris event was planned to be a broad Europeanist congress, even with an broader, worldwide scope, covering all branches of the discipline.

But there must also have been another reason, even more compelling and even more difficult to broadcast, and that was the German

problem – a problem that almost led to the cancellation of the Edinburgh congress.

In a letter to von Sydow in spring 1938,²² Åke Campbell explains the delicate relationship to the researchers from Germany but also from Russia. The backdrop is that von Sydow was not fully informed about the deliberations within IAFE concerning the Germans and the membership question, probably because von Sydow himself still had a high esteem of Hitler and the political development in Germany – he changed his mind totally in 1940, however, when Germany attacked two of the Scandinavian countries. At the same time he was very critical of what he saw as – in his own, often repeated wording – “a decadent science” pursued by several Nazi-oriented German *Volkskundler* of the time.²³ Being a very impatient and quick-tempered person, von Sydow seems to have criticized his former pupil Campbell – now secretary of IAFE – for not having the guts to select and invite as IAFE members those German scholars who he himself did not see as “decadent”, ideology-ridden researchers. The dilemma – as explained by Campbell – was whether IAFE should invite individual scholars, according to international standards of good scholarship, or ask the German authorities to appoint official representatives. In the former case IAFE would create a very dangerous situation for the elected researchers, and in the latter case IAFE would end up with German members whose research coincided with the Nazi ideology.

There had already in an early phase come up strong criticism from English researchers against IAFE, partly in the press and partly in the scientific journal *Nature*. As rumours ran, IAFE was accused of being “a clandestine, international Nazi organization, and its board was prepared to serve the Nazi research ideology, under German leadership”.²⁴ Actually, under the editorship of Sir Richard Gregory, who took a strong interest in international scientific contacts, *Nature* gave generous space in its columns to accounts of the activities of international scientific unions. The most outspoken critics were John L. Myres and Charles G. Seligman, both famous anthropologists. This led to strained relations between IAFE and the Royal Anthropological Society in London. The Germans reacted to the British criticism, which they perceived as mainly inspired from Jewish milieus – Seligman being a Jew – by proposing that the Edinburgh congress be cancelled. The German IAFE secretary Lutz

Mackensen persuaded the Dutch Jan de Vries to raise a formal protest against the local congress committee, the Scottish Anthropological Society.

On this background, as revealed later in the private letter from Åke Campbell, we can better understand why the IAFE board only two months before the congress suddenly decided that the Edinburgh congress should be changed into a Scandinavian-British folklore congress under the auspices of the association, and not the first general congress of IAFE. This must have been perceived as the only alternative to calling the whole congress off, or to risk, as Campbell states in 1938, that IAFE/IAEEF would have been eradicated – “by this time no other international fora than the Anthropologist congress [ICAES] or the French CIFL would have existed.”²⁵ All official documents, however, minutes from the meetings included, are silent on this vital point.

The British suspicions and criticism of IAFE, as quoted above, may today seem exaggerated. The criticism was logical, however, in the sense that the accusations were quite in line with what was the actual policy of most if not all organized German folklore of the day. German *Volkskunde* “umbrella” organizations, like Der Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde under Professor John Meier (an old contact of von Sydow’s), Die Abteilung Volkskunde under the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (which actually hosted the 1936 Berlin meeting), directed by Professor Adolf Spamer, as well as several other German organizational “umbrellas” or “leagues”, had as their goal “the creation or annexation (or political co-ordination) of disciplinary institutes, associations, leagues, journals, series, publishers” within what has been termed *Grossdeutsche Volkskunde* (Lixfeld 1991:98).

An organization like IAFE, covering precisely the countries of Western and Northern Europe considered to be “Germanic”, was a tempting prey for these Nazified organizations. Actually, one of the goals attained by the Germans at the 1935 Berlin meeting was a decision of the board (not carried through, though) to distribute a series of questionnaires from *Atlas der Deutschen Volkskunde* – then led by the Nazi professor John Meier – to all adhering IAEEF countries (also observed by Lixfeld 1991:103). No smoke without some fire ...

However, Campbell’s letter indicates an acute understanding of

the problem – at least in 1938 – and the handling of the question of the journal *Folk* underlines the independent line of IAFE.

Another clue to ‘the German Problem’ is that the IAFE board in Brussels decided to go on with applications for financial support to various governments – except the German.

Edinburgh (1937) – from IAFE to IAEEF

At the Edinburgh congress in July 1937 there were no Germans present, a fact that was deplored by Geijer in his presidential address (Geijer 1936:11). Also, when cartography failed to become a major subject for the council at this congress, it was probably because of a desire to put a damper on the German initiative (Berlin 1936) to distribute a series of questionnaires in the IAFE (IAEEF) countries, in conjunction with the *Atlas der Deutschen Volkskunde*.

It was decided to change the name of the organization from IAFE to IAEEF – the International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore. This meant that “ethnology” now came to precede “folklore” in the title, a change not without symbolic significance. There had been differences of opinion as to the name from the very beginning; in the editorial of the first issue of *Folk*, the new association is simply called the International Association for Ethnology – seemingly by a slip of the pen.²⁶ At least some of the initiators of the association had clearly divergent views of the relationship between the disciplines; von Sydow regarded folklore and ethnology as two separate sciences, whereas Erixon in the 1930s tended to see folklore studies as a (minor) branch of European ethnology.

The other important change in the name of the association, the introduction of “European”, may be seen against the background of Rivière’s worldwide aspirations for CIFL. But it certainly also signified a change of policy, in an Erixonian spirit, towards covering all of Europe, not only its northern and western regions. The general council decided to open up for representatives from southern Europe. Finally, the council gave the board a free hand to cooperate with CIFL on all practical questions concerning congresses, etc. And Rivière, who was invited, greeted the congress on behalf of his own forthcoming congress. The abandoning of the former geographical policy is also seen in the editorial of the first issue of the



The Edinburgh congress, July 1937. In the first row from the left: C. W. von Sydow, Åke Campbell, Herman Geijer (probably) and Jan de Vries. Second row, to the left, behind Campbell: Sigurd Erixon. Photographer unknown@Nordiska Museet.

journal *Folk*, published in January 1937, which stresses “the relationship in or out of Europe” of both material and non-material elements and invites the “co-operation of folklorists and anthropologists all over the world”.

On one point the Edinburgh conference satisfied the old aspirations of the folklorists. The issue that was given most attention by the general council was the recurrent problem of making accessible folk tale texts preserved in national archives, and in connection with this to make the “several schools of folk tales” cooperate. A committee consisting of C. W. von Sydow, Stith Thompson and Walter Anderson (Tartu) was given a wide mandate to solve the problem of both translating “into a widely-known language the text of folk-tales preserved in all the archives” (*Folk-Liv* 1938), to have them copied and distributed, and to find the necessary funding for this enormous project. The project had long been one of von Sydow’s cherished ideas. The result of the committee’s work, if any, is not known. Questions of areal distribution and mapping were also treated, but the atlas question would receive much more attention at the forthcoming congresses in Paris (August 1937) and Copenhagen (1938).

Elected as the new president of IAEEF was Jan de Vries (Leiden), and as vice-presidents Adolf Spamer (Berlin) and Knut Liestøl (Oslo). Herman Geijer, who had acted as president since the Lund

meeting, must have stepped down with a light heart. In a letter²⁷ to Knut Liestøl, he confesses that he finds the position as president too demanding, especially in Edinburgh, and asks the assistance at the meetings of Knut Liestøl and Reidar Th. Christiansen – simply because he, like quite a few other Nordic scholars at the time, was so strongly oriented towards Germany that he could hardly speak English. This confession – also repeated in his presidential address – is worth mentioning because it highlights the problem of more than one Nordic scholar in the late 1930s, when the discussion of boycotting German research milieus came up. Another incident, a curiosity that probably tells most about the weakened position of CIAP, is the council's invitation to Albert Marinus, vice-president of CIAP and one of its most skilful strategists, to become member and Belgian representative of the IAEEF council. At this point in time, CIAP was for all practical purposes moribund.

Unlike CIAP, whose charter specifically expressed *equality* between the aims of peaceful understanding between peoples on the one hand, and the promotion of scientific activities on the other, IAEEF documents stress the *scientific* aims of the organization, to the virtual exclusion of any other aims. To the IAEEF decision-makers it was not *the substance* of folklore that would serve the peaceful purposes and mutual comprehension between peoples – as was the idea in CIAP. To IAEEF this purpose would be served by encouraging scientific contacts, cooperation, and mutual sympathy between researchers across borders. “Not only will science be advanced thereby but a service will be rendered to the cause of peace” (*Folk* vol. I, no. 1, p. 3). This wording was repeated in the closing address, with the following addition (de Vries 1936:43):

Where should the wish for mutual understanding and cooperation be more vivid than among men of science? If they should fail in trying to realize this ideal of common work in the service of civilization, who else may be expected to succeed? But now we may say with confidence that we have *not* failed. ... Scholars from many different countries, working in a branch of science that is particularly liable to national prejudice and narrow-mindedness, have come together and have discussed their problems in an atmosphere of cordial friendship.

The address must be seen as a comment on the difficult political situation in Europe. An irony is that the man behind these words was Jan de Vries, the newly elected president and the chief editor of the

journal *Folk* (see below). De Vries was the perhaps most important bridge-builder between the Nordic-dominated IAEEF and the French-dominated CIFL. But due to too close relations with Germany during the war,²⁸ de Vries – German philologist by profession – did not reappear on the scene after 1945.

Few persons, however, knew better than de Vries how difficult it was to keep the balance in these years. It was him who on behalf of IAFE/IAEEF travelled several times to Germany to discuss with individual researchers and with German authorities questions of representation, membership and journals, a topic we shall come back to.

Three New Journals Become One

To all parties, the question of a scientific journal was felt to be of vital importance for international contact and cooperation. A journal could create broader, more regular and more lasting bonds than (expensive) congresses and (cumbersome) travelling. A discussion of the journal question is a prelude to a presentation of the last organization, CIFL, and its negotiations with IAEEF.

CIAP never published a scientific journal before the war, and one of the frequently expressed wishes when ethnologists met in the 1930s was the establishment of an international journal.

The idea of an international journal – named *Laos*, like the post-war CIAP journal – was discussed during a visit by Swedish folklorists to Germany early in 1932. Campbell mentions in a letter in April 1932 that he and von Sydow had taken on responsibility for going on with the planning. In May 1932 Campbell writes to Lutz Mackensen (Greifswald) and reports from a meeting between himself, Geijer and Erixon, where it was decided to proceed immediately with a subscription list. The editors would be Alfred Taylor (Chicago), Mackensen and Erixon. But the editorial board needed to be strengthened, and Mackensen was requested to propose more German and American scholars. In September 1932 Campbell reported that Erixon had received strong support from Nordic ethnologists and folklorists for an international journal, enough to launch the project, but there was a clearly expressed fear that the journal might be considered “an inter-Nordic enterprise with German connections”, unless Mackensen came up with proposals for other Euro-

pean researchers to join the board. Erixon wanted an editor situated in Central Europe, whereas Mackensen wanted Erixon to take the main responsibility. This correspondence,²⁹ which expresses impatience from the Swedes towards Mackensen, invites two remarks. One is that to Nordic scholars, international contacts – still in 1932 – seem to have been more or less synonymous with (Northern) German contacts. The other is the total silence around CIAP. It is remarkable that this recently established international association, which even had a North German president, Otto Lehman from Hamburg/Altona, was not approached in this question.

The efforts in 1932 were fruitless. But in Lund in 1935 (see above) there was a broader international representation. The final session was devoted to the journal question, with papers given by Erixon and Mackensen. Erixon proposed two alternatives: if one single journal could not cover both folklore and ethnology, with their philological, psychological, etc., branches for an area so vast and diversified as Europe, one might consider splitting Europe into smaller regions, each with its own journal (Nilsson 1935:79).

The latter idea was not a new one, since one of those present in Lund, the folklorist Gunnar Granberg from Uppsala, shortly after emerged as the main editor of a new review for the Balto-Nordic region, *Acta Ethnologica*, which published its first volume in 1936. On the editorial board appeared also a couple of the other participants from the Lund congress, representing mainly the younger generation of Nordic folklorists and ethnologists.³⁰ Surprisingly, there was no mention of this journal during the Lund meeting; the minutes are silent, as is also the detailed report from the congress written by Albert Nilsson (Eskeröd), who himself published an article in the first issue.

Several sources confirm that the forthcoming journal was kept secret for the seniors present in Lund. Herman Geijer claims in a letter to Knut Liestøl that neither he nor Erixon or Campbell were informed about the forthcoming *Acta Ethnologica*:³¹

Your remark about the difficulties of 'launching an abundance of journals' concerns an unforeseen worry that emerged after we left Lund. [...] We must now raise the question, which would have been both easier and more comfortable, if the architects of the new journal plans had revealed them in Lund. During the congress debate [on the journal question] they did not utter one word [on *Acta Ethnologica*] and they kept their deliberations secret.

Correspondence³² between the editor Gunnar Granberg and his Norwegian accomplice, Reidar Th. Christiansen, confirms the secrecy of the operation. On 11 December 1935, Granberg refers to the (secret) talks during the Lund congress and reports on the finances and the contributors of the forthcoming journal; he asks Christiansen to forward his greetings to professors Nils Lied and Knut Liestøl, but adds immediately: “Secrecy should be kept only until we have secured [economically] the first issue.” On 16 June 1936 Granberg writes to Christiansen:

AE 1936:1 is released [...] Munksgaard [the Danish publisher] is satisfied, and the journal has been well received here too. Even Geijer has sent his congratulations, and the jealousy that perhaps existed against AE among the *Volk*-people here in Sweden seems to be a thing of the past.

The latter statement was hardly correct. Sigurd Erixon did not approve of the journal, in spite of his recent proposal in Lund of geographically restricted journals,³³ and its very short duration tells its own tale. Erixon had made his own coup at the congress and won acceptance for a broadly composed organization, but he did not accept a coup against his own journal plans!

The aim of *Acta Ethnologica* was to cover the Balto-Nordic region, from Iceland, Scandinavia and Finland to the Baltic states (and also with some incursions into the USSR), in the editor’s words “a region crossed and recrossed by a variety of cultures and waves of cultural impulses” (*Acta Ethnologica* 1936, vol. I, p. 1). Thematically it intended to publish articles – in English, German and French – on both non-material and material culture and with a focus on methodological questions. As a folklorist, Granberg had been preoccupied with mapping, or “folklore-geographical studies” as he called it, partly under the leadership of Åke Campbell. Granberg’s argument was that much systematic research work in this field had recently been done in the Nordic countries, but “these results are for the most part published in the local languages, and on that account inaccessible to, and therefore often unnoticed by, international research” (*ibid.*:2). So the scope was international, even if the journal focussed on a region only of Europe. In the few volumes that were published, a balance was maintained between folklore and ethnology, but perhaps with a predilection for folkloristic subjects.

Acta Ethnologica had a short life, partly for financial reasons, but

mainly because another journal entered the scene only one year later: Erixon's *Folkliv*, launched in 1937. It was a strong rival in a double sense. In spite of its Swedish name, *Folkliv* was international in scope and published in German and English. Furthermore, its editor Sigurd Erixon was Granberg's superior at Nordiska Museet, where the latter worked as a lecturer in 1937. An agreement was reached to merge the two journals from 1939, under the name of *Folkliv*, but with a clear internationalist message (and a reminiscence of *Acta*) in its subtitle: *Acta ethnologica et folklorica Europaea*.³⁴ The chief editor was to be Sigurd Erixon, and Gunnar Granberg and some of his co-editors would join the editorial board. *Folkliv* kept the new subtitle for some years, but with the war Granberg left Sweden and Swedish ethnology (Svensson 1983), and the subtitle disappeared.

But other events intervened which complicated the merger, the name and the composition of the editorial board of *Folkliv*. *Folkliv* merged with another newcomer at the same time, the IAFE/IAEEF journal *Folk*, and its new name from 1938 became *Folk-Liv*, as a gesture toward *Folk*. It is perhaps more correct to say that *Folkliv* simply swallowed *Folk* as well as *Acta Ethnologica*. *Folk* had experienced an even shorter life than *Acta Ethnologica*, actually less than one year. It was intended as a quarterly, but only the first half of the 1937 volume was published. Why? It has been hypothesized that the reason was that the war was approaching (Bringéus 1983; see also Bringéus 2001). However, a closer scrutiny of the events reveals that the discontinuation of the journal was a consequence of the "German problem", but that the fusion with *Folkliv* must be seen also in the light of the struggle for hegemony in European ethnology.

From *Folk* to *Folk-Liv* – and from Leipzig to Stockholm

The journal *Folk* had been the direct result of the resolution at the Lund congress in 1935. The 1936 Berlin meeting, when IAFE was constituted (see above), decided that "a journal must be issued as soon as possible" and ordered the secretariat to proceed immediately with the work.³⁵ The journal was an urgent matter for IAFE, not least because of the competition from Paris: to have a journal estab-

lished would be an important asset in the forthcoming trial of strength with CIFL.

On the same occasion, IAFE welcomed the establishment of “every ethnological journal that would assist our studies in any region of our activities ...; without any attempt at coercion, we would hope for the most friendly co-operation, which should be of such wise as would be dictated by each set of circumstances.”³⁶ Why such a statement? It was certainly not intended for *Acta Ethnologica*, which published its first issue the same spring. More likely, it aimed at *Folkliv*, which Erixon was now planning, with assistance from the Gustavus Adolphus Academy.

Folk appeared in January 1937, and the first issue presented the journal as the official organ of IAFE. The main editor was IAFE’s vice-president, Jan de Vries – not Erixon, the grey eminence behind IAFE and the strongest advocate of an international journal. Erixon was preoccupied with his own forthcoming journal. Co-editors of *Folk* were the secretaries for the three regions of IAFE, the Swede Campbell, the Scot Gair and the German Mackensen. The journal found a publisher in Leipzig, but information about its funding is lacking. The German Forschungsgemeinschaft, which hosted the Berlin meeting, may have contributed. Of the announced four issues and 450 pages a year, only two issues (vol. I, nos. 1 and 2), containing 228 pages, were actually published. The second and last issue appeared in August 1937.

The journal was bilingual: editorials, reports or *Mitteilungen* of the association, minutes from its meetings, etc., were published in both English and German versions, and scientific articles in either English or German. Most of the articles, Erixon’s own included, treat cartography and distribution, and there seems to be more material of interest to an ethnologist than a student of folklore – though half a volume is an inadequate basis for any meaningful statistical analysis. A substantial part of the journal was reserved for information, on IAFE as well as on the situation in the different member countries; this was a corollary of its function as an official organ for the association and its intended role as a bridge-builder in North-western European ethnology.

Folk was on the agenda at IAFE’s board meeting in Brussels in May 1937, but the minutes state only that it should be developed with a view to an “exchange of scientific information”. In the

minutes from Edinburgh (July 1937) there is no mention of the journal. The journal was discussed at the CIFL congress in Paris, one month later. Here a “coordination committee” was appointed, consisting of representatives of CIFL and IAEEF, to negotiate the modalities of cooperation between the two associations. It was decided that two CIFL members, Paul Geiger from Switzerland and André Varagnac (Rivière’s second-in-command in Paris), should be appointed to the editorial board of *Folk*. This decision, however, was never put into effect. Rivière reports, in cryptic and extraordinarily diplomatic language (that is difficult to translate), *before* the coordination committee had finished their deliberations in Copenhagen (1938):

The journal *Folk* will encounter problems of a general character, which have been discussed in this committee, as a consequence of measures taken, and in a general manner, resulting from the joint work. In order to carry out the collaboration project, the Editorial Board has called upon two new members, in the person of Messrs [Paul] Geiger and [André] Varagnac, thus making *Folk (Folk-Liv)* the official organ of the two institutions. (Rivière 1938:116, my translation)

The decision to sacrifice the journal *Folk*, or to merge it with *Folk-liv*, must have been taken soon after the Paris congress, or probably even earlier – by Erixon and those he trusted, de Vries included, and Rivière must have been informed and given his consent.³⁷

No issue of *Folk* appeared after August 1937. In Copenhagen (August 1938) the cooperation committee confirmed the decision that made *Folk-Liv* the common organ for IAEEF and CIFL, hence the double name of the journal in Rivière’s report, as quoted above.

The Decision to Sacrifice *Folk* – Strategy and Politics

There was only one person in a position to benefit from the discontinuation of *Folk* after only half a year, to present an alternative journal (*Folk-Liv*) and to grant representative(s) from CIFL a place on the editorial board, and that person was Sigurd Erixon. The planning of a new journal is not done overnight; it must have been under way parallel with *Folk*. Actually, in the fall of 1936 Erixon wrote letters asking for support from Nordic colleagues, telling that the

publishing of *Folkliv* now was secured through the Gustavus Adolphus Academy.³⁸

But what could have been Erixon's motives for replacing the journal *Folk*, once his cherished project, by another journal? As the official organ of both IAEEF and CIFL, *Folkliv* would certainly be the ideal platform for a Nordic scholar who was critical of the present state of affairs and had a vision of what European ethnology ought to be. Generally, the course of affairs would be much easier for Erixon to control from Stockholm than from a place in central Europe.

Even if Erixon was quick to draw advantage of the situation and to gain full control in the journal question, it is obvious that the decision to discontinue *Folk* could not have been his work alone. Also, in 1932, when the question of *Laos* was first raised, Erixon preferred a German chief editor. Once again, we must seek an explanation in the political situation in the latter half of the 1930s.

In a letter to von Sydow in May 1938,³⁹ Åke Campbell reveals that the Germans had made it impossible, soon after the Berlin meeting in the spring of 1936, to publish *Folk* on the conditions agreed upon. His suspicions go to the new leader of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, as well as to Heinrich Harmjanz, a *Volkskunde* professor (and later SS-Obersturmführer).

Campbell relates that de Vries made a trip to Germany, probably in the spring of 1937, to check out the chances for "a dependable and reliable German representation" to IAFE and the possibilities of continuing the publishing of *Folk*. His negotiations with Adolf Helbok in Leipzig and Heinrich Harmjanz in Berlin did not lead to anything, however, neither for *Folk* nor for the German representation in IAFE/IAEEF, or as Campbell writes: "... mainly because de Vries got a very negative impression of Harmjanz. After this failure *Folk* was stopped and Germany ended up with almost no representatives on the board."

Another reason why the French might prefer the Swedish-based *Folk-Liv* to the German-based *Folk* may have been the rather aggressive Nazi sympathies expressed by the German delegation to the 1937 Paris congress, led by Professor Helbok. This may also explain the cryptic formulation in Rivière's report: *Folk* had been published in Leipzig, and it must have been felt important to keep it away from Helbok and the Nazi sympathizers. Rivière certainly wanted to col-

laborate with the Germans – and far more eagerly than Erixon and the British and Scandinavian members of IAEEF – but probably not at any price.

But Rivière did not intend to play second fiddle to Erixon. Between the Paris talks and the resolution in Copenhagen one year later, the two CIFL representatives appointed to the editorial board – Geiger and Varagnac – were both replaced by Rivière himself.⁴⁰

Folkliv had been Erixon's own initiative, but he managed to secure support from the Royal Gustavus Adolphus Academy in Uppsala. From the outset, *Folkliv* had a double aim: to promote Nordic ethnology in the European arena, as well as being a common outlet for both Nordic and non-Nordic ethnologies. A third aim, and certainly an important one for Erixon, was to use *Folkliv* as a means of raising regional ethnology to a level of general European ethnology. This is stated in the editorial, and it is hammered out in Erixon's own programmatic articles in the same journal (1937b, 1938a; see discussion above). Furthermore, it seems that Sigurd Erixon wanted to use the journal to promote a conception of European ethnology in which there was less room for folkloristics, and especially the folk-belief and folk-tale research of the Lundian school. Actually, folkloristics is given no room at all in the 1937 volume of *Folkliv*. Not only are there no articles on folkloristic subjects in the volume, but in his brief outline of Nordic traditions, Erixon circumvents folklore and folkloristics, and in his long and rather heavy programmatic articles containing his vision of what European ethnology was, or should be, folkloristics are relegated to a corner in the attic.

Erixon was compelled to stop his "boycott" of folkloristics by the 1938 volume – now re-baptized *Folk-Liv* – as a consequence of the merger with *Folk* and its function as the official journal of the two new international organizations. Erixon had been the sole editor of the 1937 volume, but in 1938 the leader of CIFL, Georges Henri Rivière, joined the editorial board, as well as the former editor of *Folk* and then-current IAEEF President Jan de Vries. The latter takes a swipe at Erixon in Volume II by stating that "as a result of the amalgamation, the two sides of our activity, ethnology and folklore proper, covering the whole domain of the material, social and mental life, are both assured of a platform" (de Vries 1938b:9).

Sigurd Erixon had manoeuvred deftly on the journal question. With his Stockholm-based *Folk-Liv* he remained the victor on the

European battlefield, even if he suffered some minor defeats in his skirmishes with the defenders of folkloristics: oppositions, however, that he largely came to abandon after the war. And Rivière had managed to bypass some German colleagues by knitting contacts directly with Nordic ethnology – even though his relations to German *Volkskunde* are more difficult to assess; at his own congress, CIFL 1937, the Germans played a more conspicuous role.

The Rival from the South: Rivière, CIFL and Paris 1937

The Paris congress of 1937 sealed the relations between Erixon and Rivière. Erixon gave a paper there, his museum was invited to exhibit Swedish folk culture in Paris, and the two men must have had much to talk about concerning the roles and strategies, partnership and a division of labour of their two organizations, the journal question, and probably also the rather tense external political situation that affected European ethnology.

Paradoxically, the radical left-wing climate in France as well as the national-socialist movement in Germany were sympathetic to the “folk culture” movement and its scholarly manifestations, and both proved to be instrumental for the development of the discipline of ethnology.

A pertinent question is why Rivière did not want to channel his ambitions through the Paris-based CIAP, which – theoretically – might have been revived through a French intervention. The answer is complex.

France had actively participated in the first CIAP congress in Prague 1928. The programme had been planned in Paris, and van Gennep had been its scientific secretary. As recommended by CIAP, a national committee had been established in 1928–29, le Comité National des Arts Populaires de la France et de ses Colonies, with a network of regional subcommittees.⁴¹ But the national committee was not very active. According to van Gennep, it “met from time to time [...] for discussions of methods and scientific orientation, but without publishing anything”.⁴² Also, the ties between the French national committee and CIAP were weak – as was however the case for most of the close to 30 membership countries. And Rivière, on the other hand, did not consider the folklore-collecting practised by

the national committee of much interest for his forthcoming ethnological museum.

Even if CIAP had its secretariat in Paris, French researchers played a minor role in CIAP in this period. Van Gennep states that “France found herself steadily more evicted, to a point of no influence, first by the German group [during Otto Lehmann’s presidency, 1928–33], then by the Italian group [during Emilio Bodrero’s presidency, 1933–37]”.⁴³ For the second CIAP congress, held in Belgium in 1930, France was still preoccupied with having a scientific representation “*aussi brillante que possible*”,⁴⁴ in addition to the folklore groups and performances. But from 1931, when CIAP was brought under full control by the League of Nations and its politicians, the French interest in (and influence on) CIAP seems to have declined to zero. A new organization must have been felt a better strategy.

The last and perhaps most important part of the answer is the fact that the strong German *Volkskunde* milieus were refused access to CIAP after 1933, when Germany withdrew from the League of Nations; consequently CIAP could not offer an interesting meeting place for French and German ethnology.

Rivière had several reasons for organizing a spectacular congress in 1937. On the domestic scene, ethnology and folklore had not had any academic basis in France. But in the late 1930s the vogue for national popular culture was rising quickly; public opinion was interested and the attitude of the political authorities – not least the socialist government from 1936 to 1938, le Front Populaire – was favourable. These years represented the public recognition of French ethnology and the musealization of national popular culture.⁴⁵ A new museum department under the Ministry of Culture was established and a chair in *arts et traditions populaires* at l’Ecole du Louvre was being planned (and was established in 1938). The World Fair (Paris 1937) offered large exhibitions – designed by Rivière – on popular culture from French regions. And Rivière’s new museum of French popular culture would soon open its doors. But the separation of “the French collection” from Le musée du Trocadéro and the creation of a national museum was a demanding operation, and “Georges Henri Rivière was omnipresent on the Parisian cultural scene between 1936 and 1938”, states his biographer (Gorgus 2003:96).

To his European colleagues, Rivière argued along the same lines as did the initiators of IAEEF, emphasizing the need to create a unified, scientific European ethnology – or *folklore*, as he chose to call it – ranging from material culture studies to oral literature. The domestic and the foreign lines of argument were by no means inconsistent: a triumph on the international scene would serve Rivière well in the home field and contribute to the acceptance of his conception of *folklore* as a “new science of Man”. The anthropological milieu at the *Trocadéro*, where Rivière came from, did not hold in high esteem the activities associated with folklore. So there was a strongly felt need both to develop a science of European ethnology – or *folklore* – and to bring international recognition back home.

Documents intended for internal use show that Rivière was conscious of France’s lagging behind the ethnologies of Northern Europe. Rivière uses expressions like “countries where the discipline is better organized/institutionalized” and “a terrain where many other nations have outdistanced France”. He shows a strong preoccupation with what might be the French contributions, especially within cartography, and how the French contributions in general would be received by foreign specialists. During the two years of planning of the congress there was a systematic effort to strengthen French ethnology, states Rivière, and he concludes: “thanks to these scientific preparations we need not, from now on, be anxious about letting French ethnological research meet foreign, face to face”.⁴⁶

With this in mind, we can better understand why Rivière had to take seriously the arrival of IAEEF. From CIAP he had nothing to fear, impotent as it was, nor anything to hope for, with the strong German milieux excluded. But IAEEF represented a traditionally very strong cluster in European ethnology and folklore, and it managed in a very short time to establish a scientific journal, *Folk*, a strong asset in the effort to unify European ethnologies. The international hegemony was at stake. For France, it was not an option to join IAEEF as an ordinary member. Rivière remarks in an internal note that a major reason for establishing CIFL was that IAEEF “was not willing to grant France a leading position [*une position de premier rang*]”.⁴⁷ Leadership, rather than membership, seems to have been Rivière’s view of the French role. Also, Rivière feared that IAEEF would focus too much on oral literature instead of material and social culture studies, an attitude that he shared with Erixon.

Why did Rivière choose the term *folklore* for a broad field of studies that comprised – according to his definition and in accordance with the scientific platform of his new museum – material culture, social structures, traditions and oral literature, and methodology?⁴⁸ Actually, he managed to make the congress adopt a resolution – unanimously – that this should henceforth be the definition of *folklore*. Even if Erixon and others did not vote against the resolution, it seems clear that the “unanimity” of the congress was due to politeness towards the host.

There was a certain tradition, in Central and Southern Europe, of using the term *folklore* to cover the study of both material and non-material culture. On the other hand, the term had come, at least in France, to be associated with amateurishness, revitalization and non-scientific collecting activities. It may well be that Rivière chose this designation mainly for strategic reasons. *Arts et traditions* was hardly an option, because it belonged to CIAP. *Ethnologie* might have been a more adequate term, but in a French context confusion would easily arise because this term was interchangeable with, and often used for, *anthropologie* in the sense of “the study of exotic cultures”. Also, the term had already been claimed by IAFE.

The CIFL congress gathered together some 300 participants from 26 nations, there was official representation from several governments, and around 110 papers were given. The congress was organized in two sections, one for *Folklore descriptif*, which covered “general/theoretical ethnology”, and one for *Folklore appliqué à la vie sociale*, or applied folklore.⁴⁹ The latter section was concerned with the use, or revitalization, of ethnology and folklore (folk dances, costumes, vernacular architecture, etc.) in contemporary society, in leisure activities, in schools, and so on. This part of the programme, very similar to the activities at the earlier CIAP congresses, was a necessity for any organization of popular culture that needed support from political authorities in the 1930s,⁵⁰ and fully in accordance with *la vogue du populaire* in Paris in the time of le Front Populaire. As for the scientific part of the programme, it covered both material and social culture and folklore proper.

A long series of recommendations were voted, not least concerning applied ethnology, and the congress decided to become a permanent organization, with a French secretariat. An executive board with seven members was elected, among whom were Rivière,

Erixon, Helbok and Stith Thompson. Formal cooperation between the two organizations was assured by a cooperation committee as well as a joint committee on bibliography. And it was agreed to seek to establish a joint committee on cartography and a European atlas. Finally, it was decided that the next congress should be for both organizations together, and *Folk* should be their common journal.

As stated by Jan de Vries, prominent member of both IAEEF and CIFL and a member of the editorial boards of both *Folk* and *Folk-Liv*, the congress was a very important step towards cooperation between ethnologists and folklorists from the Latin-speaking and the German-speaking camps (de Vries 1938a). The congress also represented a revival for French ethnology, and for Rivière personally it meant bringing home international laurels. The French press and the commentators were unanimous in their praise of the event.

But there were dark clouds on the horizon. As reported by Gorgus (2003), the biggest foreign delegation to the Paris congress was the German one, comprising around 30 persons. Their leader, Adolf Helbok, wanted the delegation to speak with a unified voice. Helbok's declarations, his tendency towards a National Socialist folklore and his ambitions for Germany to play a decisive role for the future congresses (he wanted the next congress to take place in Berlin) caused some conflicts. It is difficult not to see this situation as the backdrop for the steadily closer cooperation between Rivière and Erixon.

The German Problem Revisited

“The German problem” hides behind many of the decisions taken. This is probably also the reason why Erixon at the Copenhagen ICAES congress in 1938, through his assistant Gösta Berg and in connivance with Rivière, invited the next joint CIFL-AIEEF congress to Stockholm – whereas Adolf Helbok wanted it to meet in Germany.

During the 1930s, the main contacts of von Sydow and Campbell with the Germans had been through Professor Lutz Mackensen (Greifswald/Riga), Dr. Karl Kaiser (Greifswald) and Dr. Eduard Wildhagen (Berlin) – the two latter leading cartographers. Later

Professor Adolf Spamer (Dresden/Berlin) joined the group. Mackensen had been present in Lund in 1935, and all four participated in Berlin in 1936, when IAFE was founded and Spamer elected vice-president. Around the time of the IAFE meeting in Berlin in 1936, the situation was as follows:

Adolf Spamer (IAFE's vice-president) was the head of the *Reichsgemeinschaft der Deutschen Volksforschung*, one of the above-mentioned Nazified umbrella organizations. Spamer held a long series of important offices in the Nazi organizations, until he later lost his positions as a result of internal controversies (Lixfeld 1991:102–3).

Eduard Wildhagen, whom Campbell enthusiastically had called “den utmärkte Wildhagen” [the excellent Wildhagen] in letter concerning a visit to the Atlas centre in Berlin in 1932,⁵¹ was by now the deputy leader of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) – another Nazi organization. It was the DFG that hosted the IAFE meeting and which soon after imposed conditions on the journal *Folk* that the Swedes and the British found unacceptable. Lixfeld (1991) describes Wildhagen as the “grey eminence” of the DFG, with a good relationship to Alfred Rosenberg, one of the chief ideologists of the NSDAP and leader of the *Amt Rosenberg* – Hitler's main tool for cultural policies and ethnic questions.

Lutz Mackensen, who had been the main contact between the Scandinavians and Germany for several years, seems to have played a minor political role, but in 1937 he too ended up in the *Amt Rosenberg*, and was immediately dismissed as contact.

John Meier (Freiburg, Berlin), *Volkskunde* professor and later Nazi leader, was one of the oldest contacts of von Sydow. When the latter visited him in Freiburg in 1937, he described Meier as a “friend since 1913” (Bringéus 2006:184–5). It was Meier who had established the *Atlas der Deutschen Volkskunde* (ADV, 1928), which was directly under the control of DFG.⁵² When the Nazified ADV got the IAFE Board's permission in 1936 to distribute questionnaires – as mentioned above – in the IAFE countries, the purpose was to expand the ADV research to include the “Germanic-Nordic” and Baltic peoples.

Of the group of close German contacts and ‘founding fathers of IAFE’ mentioned by Campbell in 1938,⁵³ three – Spamer, Wildhagen and Mackensen – seem to have been on close terms with the Nazi authorities. Karl Kaiser, on the other hand, opposed the Nazi folklore ideologies and was killed in 1940. His family managed – with the assistance of von Sydow – to flee to Sweden (Bringéus 2006:187).

When Jan de Vries had his discussions on behalf of IAEEF in Germany in 1937, his problem was not only whom he could trust, but also whom he would endanger by asking them to participate. As Campbell formulated it to von Sydow in 1938:⁵⁴

As you will understand, it is important for our organization to help – and not to cause problems for – the representatives of genuinely scientific research in Germany. It goes without saying that we cannot place our German members and friends in difficult or fatal situations. You are probably aware of how [... NN] explained for Geijer that a support action for him would help neither him nor his research. He asked Geijer not to complicate his situation through foreign interference. Concerning [Karl] Kaiser, we have obtained such information that we have not dared to take the risk of endangering his situation further.

Kaiser met his fate only two years later. The intricacy of the situation is underlined by the fact that NN in the quotation was Wildhagen, who probably deceived Geijer and Campbell into believing that he belonged to the other camp.

The people whom the IAEEF board chose to listen to in 1938 – Adolf Helbok and Konrad Hahm – also turned out to be researchers with some degree of sympathies or connections to the political system in Germany. Campbell openly discusses the other ‘old friends’ with von Sydow: Helbok was preferred – strangely enough, one might say, as his behaviour in Paris in 1937 is reported to have been rather aggressive – but nothing could be expected any longer from Spamer, Mackensen or Wildhagen. The worst fear, however, was to have some of the obvious Nazis, like Professor Harmjanz, the new leader of the DFG, appointed official German representatives to IAEEF.

Campbell and IAEEF saw no alternative to boycotting Germany in the organization, as other scenarios were even more threatening: either a French–German axis in European ethnology, or a German – Italian axis. Campbell explains to von Sydow, who still was not convinced of the danger represented by the National Socialist authorities:

We now represent even the French initiative, after the Paris congress [CIFL 1937], and I know that the French desire a positive continuation of the efforts to collaborate between Germans and French, that could be observed during the Paris congress. If we do not come to a reasonable agreement with the Germans, we will run the danger that the French will pursue their policy and establish an association directly with the Germans. I must say, however, that this danger is not overwhelming, as our connections with the French are now intimate and cordial.

It may be quite different, however, with the relation Germany–Italy. [Konrad] Hahn certainly told me that, as far as he could see, we should not fear a scientific folkloristic axis Berlin – Rome. But it seems obvious that a folkloristic union between these authoritarian states is something that we must seriously take into consideration.

With this as a backdrop, we understand how important it must have been for Erixon to secure the next congress – planned for 1940 – to Stockholm, and to keep the strategic relations with the French. IAEEF also hoped to keep contacts with reliable persons in Fascist Italy. With the authorization of Sigurd Erixon, Campbell had written to the two Italian folklorists he trusted, Rafaele Corso and Guiseppe Vidossi, and asked them to join the board of *Folk-Liv*. Jan de Vries even wanted to have them as members of IAEEF’s General Council. In May 1938, Campbell informs that he has already written to folklorists in Greece and the Balkans, as a step in a hectic activity of expanding IAEEF’s network. Campbell expresses a genuine fear that IAEEF will break up if the negotiations with the research representatives of the different nations are not given top priority and handled with all possible discretion: “What will happen to the best German researchers if they are isolated because of clumsiness on our part?” is his sincere question to the still sceptical von Sydow.

Campbell’s concern with Russian researchers and their problems is not smaller. He takes his master and senior, von Sydow, to task in the following manner:

Certainly, the situation in Germany is by far as bad as it is in Russia, but we must be careful. I must mention to you that I have been informed of the risk that Russian researchers run, through even the slightest action from us. Will you dare to be responsible for criticism against the Soviet-Russian ideology in our research field, when you know that they will immediately place the responsibility on our Russian contacts? [...] I would be grateful if you could explain to me how your letter [to Sven Liljeblad] could help us in our negotiations with Berlin. De Vries proposes that we should have as our principle that every country decide themselves what sort of representation they want [in IAEEF]. This will mean that from the democratic states we will have the best researchers, and the

research institutions will appoint them, and that from authoritarian states – Germany, Italy, Russia – the governments will make the appointments. Anything else is impossible, that is what I have been told from Italy, from Germany and from Russia. Do you mean that we should not follow this principle, and by our own choice – independently of the governments – appoint members from such states? De Vries and I are convinced that *no one will let themselves be appointed on such conditions.*”

Von Sydow’s undiplomatic advice had been to go directly to the German minister of culture and tell him whom IAEEF wished to have and whom they would not accept, in addition to making it clear that the new direction of German *Volkskunde* research was “decadent”. Luckily, the IAEEF Board did not follow this advice. Campbell’s last – but polite – advice to his senior was that von Sydow himself, as a private researcher, might perhaps try out his own recipe and tell the German authorities the truth: “IAEEF’s foremost task being to create relations between the research of the different nations, in spite of all the all the existing antagonism.”

Copenhagen (1938) – and the End of the Affair

The first International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES), held in London in 1934, had given an occasion for Scandinavian and British folklorists to discuss the possibilities of closer cooperation. The second ICAES congress,⁵⁵ in Copenhagen in 1938, gave a further opportunity for finalizing agreements on the modalities of cooperation between the two organizations established in the meantime, IAEEF and CIFL. The congress included a section on “European ethnography and folklore”, with Jan de Vries as co-organizer, and the theme was “the agricultural year”. Among the speakers we find both Erixon (“Actual tasks by investigations of the agricultural year in Nordic ethnology”) and Rivière (“Croyances et coutumes de l’année agricole en Sologne”). Our ubiquitous protagonists were extremely active. Erixon and Rivière, as well as de Vries and von Sydow, were vice-presidents of the section. And both Erixon and Rivière were elected to the board of ICAES. IAEEF and CIFL held their general councils and board meetings during this ICAES congress,⁵⁶ and the cooperation committee carried through their deliberations. As mentioned in the sur-

vey paragraph, IAEEF had decided to be a network and to use CIFL and ICAESS as their congresses in a four year cycle.

At the IAEEF meeting in Edinburgh (July 1937), the general council had focussed on folk tale archives and the question of translation. In Copenhagen, however, the council of IAEEF returned to another project of greater common interest and more in harmony with the latest trends in ethnology and folklore, that is, atlases. CIFL, on the other hand, had proposed a joint atlas commission in Paris in August 1937, as well as a French-German atlas cooperation group.

Consequently, two joint commissions were appointed in Copenhagen: one to propose questionnaires for the collection of material "suitable for cartographic treatment" in the European countries, and the other for the coordination of cartographical methods used in the different countries. Sigurd Erixon was elected president of both commissions, with Erich Röhr (Berlin) as secretary for the first commission and Win. Roukens (Nijmegen) as secretary for the second. Dr. Roukens had been in charge of the atlas question for CIFL since the Paris congress, and he was to continue this work until long after the war, as secretary of the joint European atlas commission. Also, it was decided that "aims and methods of mapping" should be one of three themes for the next (Stockholm) congress of CIFL/IAEEF.

This switch of main focus from 1937 to 1938 epitomizes a more long-term change of objectives in European cooperation, from a concern with material and accessibility to an interest in methodological questions, as well as a shift from folklore proper to ethnology in its broadest sense. And more concretely, concerning IAEEF, it may also be seen as an effect of the increasing dominance of Sigurd Erixon, professor in Stockholm since 1934.

In the 1939 edition of *Folk-Liv*, now the official organ for both IAEEF and CIFL, there was an invitation to meet in Stockholm for the next CIFL congress, to be held in August 1940.⁵⁷ In a short lapse of time, between 1935 and 1938, the two rivals had become allies, with a common scientific journal and common congresses, as well as joint committees. Åke Campbell states, in a rather dry report, that "the exceptionally cordial tone which made itself so plainly felt at the Copenhagen congress justifies the hope for the future happy development of international cooperation" (*Folk-Liv* 1938:408). It is

as if the tension was finally released. But World War II intervened and put a decisive stop to the project.

Summing Up – and Looking Forwards

CIAP was from the outset the expression of the strong will of European scholars who wanted to create a common forum for a very heterogeneous field of study. But this will had to be subject to another strong will, that of its benefactor, the League of Nations, who wanted to exert political control and to enforce a policy of applied ethnology. The result was that CIAP withered. The parallel decline of the League itself did not make matters better, and the consequence of the weakened position of CIAP was that European researchers sought other solutions from the mid 1930s onwards.

The result was IAEEF and CIFL, both international associations for European ethnology. The initiator and unquestioned leader of CIFL was Georges Henri Rivière, whereas Sigurd Erixon was the power behind IAEEF – and sometimes its campaigning general. There were differences between the associations and their policies, they had their strongest bases in different parts of Europe, and they served their leaders' ambitions in different ways. But both associations responded to a deeply felt need for creating contacts and for raising the many regional ethnologies and folklore studies to the level of a scientific discipline, a unified European ethnology. Yet these associations competed in more or less the same marketplace and needed the same membership support. In that sense they started out as rivals. Among the important tools in the striving for hegemony were international scientific journals and congresses.

This article has described the development of these two associations and their unfolding relationships, from rivalry to cooperation. A backdrop for this study (but not a theme in itself) was the skirmishes between folklorists, especially the defenders of folktale studies, and the representatives of the upcoming studies of material culture and social conditions. The period represents the coming of age of modern ethnology, and Erixon and Rivière were brothers in arms in this movement. The periodically strained relations between folkloristics and ethnology would continue to mark CIAP also after the war.

Another factor, much more important, was the growing Nazi impact on some national ethnologies, a circumstance that may explain why the alliance between Paris and Stockholm grew steadily stronger, to the detriment of German researchers and their formerly influential position. However, the role of Nazi ideology for cooperation within European ethnology is manifold and difficult to assess. Actually, Rivière himself – who before the war was considered a supporter of the French socialist movement – came under investigation after the war for collaboration with German authorities in occupied France. He was suspended in the autumn of 1944 but, unlike Jan de Vries, who suffered a similar fate, he was acquitted and resumed his duties in the spring of 1945 (see also Gorgus 2003:121–43).

The formal agreement in 1937–38 between the two new organizations of European ethnology must be considered a diplomatic achievement, in the greater part worked out by Erixon and Rivière, who both had ambitions on the European scene. The official documents conceal many of the controversies and disputes, and not least all the problems caused by the growing National Socialist ideology in Germany, that we get glimpses of through a few internal documents and letters. When Erixon stressed, after the Copenhagen event, that “the two European organizations ... work in complete harmony” (Erixon 1938: Introduction/Vorwort), one may have one’s doubts. What emerged was a detailed and balanced formal agreement, which was intended to assure a strategic alliance.

We shall never know whether this fragile alliance would have lasted, as World War II shortly afterwards effectively stopped all interaction. It is revealing, however, that no one thought of resuming the alliance in 1945, nor of reviving CIFL or IAEEF. Amazingly, only CIAP rose from the ashes, this time within the UNESCO system, and with support from both Erixon and Rivière. For the next 20 years it was CIAP and its commissions that would offer a common platform for Erixon and Rivière. The themes that came to occupy them in the postwar years were atlases and cartographic techniques, a European bibliography, a dictionary of ethnological terms, a new scientific journal (*Laos*), to mention the main tasks that CIAP engaged in. Postwar life in CIAP, however, would not become less exciting, or less troubled, than before the war. There is more to the story, to be told in a future article.

Bjarne Rogan, dr. philos.
Professor of Cultural History
Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages
Faculty of Humanities
University of Oslo
P.O.Box 1010, Blindern
NO-0315 Oslo, Norway
e-mail: bjarne.rogan@ikos.uio.no

References

Archival sources

Landsmålsarkivet, ULMA Uppsala. Archives (SOFI, ULMA)
National Library, Oslo, Håndskriftsamlingen
Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires, Paris. Archives (MNATP)
UNESCO/The League of Nations, Paris. Archives
University Library, Lund. Handskriftsamlingen

Published material

Acta Ethnologica, Copenhagen 1936–1938.
Arnstberg, Karl-Olov 1989: *Utforskaren. Studier i Sigurd Erixons etnologi*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
Bringéus, Nils-Arvid 1983: The Predecessors of “*Ethnologia Europaea*”. *Ethnologia Europaea* XIII, no. 2, pp. 227–233.
Bringéus, Nils-Arvid 1988: Internationella kontakter. *Folk-livsarkivet i Lund 1913–1988*. Lund.
Bringéus, Nils-Arvid 2001: Carl Wilhem von Sydow och Uppsala. *Saga och Sed*, Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademiens Årsbok 2001.
Bringéus, Nils-Arvid 2006: *Carl Wilhem von Sydow som folklorist*. Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien. Uppsala.
Campbell, Åke 1937: Bemerkungen zur Entstehung des Internationalen Verbandes für Volksforschung/Historical notes on the International Association for Folklore and Ethnology. *Folk* I, pp. 7–11.
Campbell, Åke 1938: International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences: Second session, Copenhagen Aug. 1st–6th, 1938. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 405–408.
Campbell, Åke 1938b: Sitzungsbericht. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 319–20.

- Christiansen, Reidar Th. 1937: Norwegian folklore through 25 years. *Folk* I, pp. 81–94.
- Christiansen, Reidar Th. 1955: A Folklorist's Plea for Co-operation. *Laos* III, pp. 9–17.
- Congress for Science of Folktales, Lund 6th–8th Nov. 1935. Resolutions (pp. 12–15), Protocol (pp. 15–17). *Folk* I, no. 1, pp. 12–17.
- Congress for Science of Folktales, Berlin 2nd–5th April 1936. Minutes. *Folk* I, no. 1, pp. 17–23.
- Congress of the International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore, Edinburgh, July 14th–21st, 1937. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 113–15.
- Erixon, Sigurd 1937a: Introduction/Vorwort. *Folkliv* 1937, pp. 5–12.
- Erixon, Sigurd 1937b: Regional European Ethnology I. Main Principles and Aims with Special Reference to Nordic Ethnology. *Folkliv* 1937, nos. 2–3, pp. 89–108.
- Erixon, Sigurd 1938a: Regional European Ethnology II. Functional Analysis – Time Studies. *Folkliv* 1938, no. 3, pp. 263–294.
- Erixon, Sigurd 1938b: Introduction/Vorwort. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 5–8
- Erixon, Sigurd 1948–49: Nyorienteringar inom folklivsforskningen. *Folk-Liv* 1948–49, pp. 5–14.
- Erixon, Sigurd 1952: Retrospektiv översikt och redogörelse. *Liv och folkkultur* V, Stockholm, pp. 129–138.
- Folk* (Zeitschrift des Internationalen Verbandes für Volksforschung/The Journal of the International Association for Folklore and Ethnology) I–II (Leipzig, 1937)
- Folk-Liv* (*Folkliv*), Stockholm 1937–.
- Folklore de Suède. Exposition organisée par le Musée nordique de Stockholm*, Paris 1937.
- Gair, G. R. 1937: The objects which the International Association for Folklore and Ethnology intends to pursue/Die Ziehe der Internationalen Verbandes für Volksforschung. *Folk* I, no. 1, pp. 4–6.
- Geijer, Herman 1936: Presidential Address. *Proceedings of the Scottish Anthropological and Folklore Society*, II, nos. 2–3, pp. 9–12.
- Gorgus, Nina 1999: *Der Zauberer der Vitrinen: zur Museologie George Henri Rivières*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Gorgus, Nina 2003: *Le magicien des vitrines. Le muséologue*

- George Henri Rivière. Paris: Editions de Maison des sciences de l'homme. (Translation of Gorgus 1999).
- International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore. *Minutes*, Executive Committee (17th of July) and General Council (20th of July), Edinburgh 1937. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 109–13.
- International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore. Congress of the IAEEF, Edinburgh, July 14th–21st, 1937. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 113–15.
- International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore (IAEEF). Die heutige Lage der internationalen Zusammenarbeit. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 117–18.
- International Association for European Ethnology and Folklore (IAEEF). *Minutes*, General Council, Copenhagen, August 2nd and 6th 1938. *Folk-Liv* 1938, pp. 409–411.
- International Association for Folklore and Ethnology. Executive Committee, held on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of April, 1936, in Berlin. *Minutes*. *Folk* I, no. 1, pp. 17–23.
- International Association for Folklore and Ethnology. *Minutes*, Executive Committee meeting, Brussels, May 1937. *Folk* I no. 2, pp. 200–204.
- Lixfeld, Hannjost 1991: Die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Umbrella Organizations of German *Volkskunde* during the Third Reich. *Asian Folklore Studies* 50:95–116.
- Möller, Helmut 1955–56: Untersuchungen zum Funktionalismus in der Volkskunde I. S. Erixons "Folklivsforskning". *Folk-Liv* 1955–56, pp. 32–38.
- Nilsson, Albert (Eskeröd) 1935: Sagoforskarekongressen i Lund 6–8 nov. 1935. *Saga och Sed*, pp. 71–82.
- Renoliet, Jean-Jacques 1999: *L'UNESCO oublié. La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919–1946)*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Rivière, Georges Henri 1938: Congrès International de Folklore, 1937. *Folk-Liv*, pp. 116–17.
- Rivière, Georges Henri & André Varagnac 1936: Le premier congrès international de folklore, *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale* 9, pp. 195–96.
- Rooijackers, Gerard & Peter Meurtens 2000: Struggling with the European Atlas: Voskuil's Portrait of European Ethnology. *Ethnologia Europaea* 30, no. 1, pp. 75–95.

- Rogan, Bjarne 2004: The Prague Congress (1928), CIAP and the League of Nations: A short history of *la Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires* (CIAP) from its inception until World War II. In *Everyday Life and Cultural Patterns. International Festschrift for Elle Vunder, Studies in Folk Culture*, vol. III, ed. Ene Kõresaar & Art Leete. Tartu University Press.
- Rogan, Bjarne 2007: Folk Art and Politics in Inter-War Europe: An Early Debate on Applied Ethnology. *Folk Life* 45, pp. 7–23.
- Schippers, Thomas (Ms, 2003). Une carte trop risquée? Note sur la recherche française à l'âge d'or de la méthode cartographique en ethnologie européenne.
- Svensson, Sigfrid 1983: Gunnar Granberg 1906–1983. *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, pp. 157–159.
- Sydow, Carl Wilhelm von 1935: Die jetzige Stellung der Märchenforschung. Ziele und Mittel mit besonderer Hinsicht auf organisierte Zusammenarbeit. *Saga och Sed*, pp. 83–102.
- Sydow, Carl Wilhelm von 1935: Från arbetsfältet. Sagoforskarkongressen i Lund. *Folkminnen och folktankor* 22, pp. 201–207. *Travaux du 1er Congrès International de Folklore. Publications du Département et du musée national des Arts et Traditions populaires*. Tours 1938.
- Vries, Jan de 1936: Closing Address. *Proceedings of the Scottish Anthropological and Folklore Society* II, no. 2–3, pp. 42–48.
- Vries, Jan de 1938a: Allocutio post Coenam ou de l'Internationalisation du Folklore. *Travaux du 1er Congrès International de Folklore*, pp. 437–39.
- Vries, Jan de 1938b: (The Association for European Ethnology and Folklore). *Folk-Liv* 1938 no. 1, pp. 8–11.

1 *Travaux du 1er Congrès International de Folklore*. Tours 1938.

2 Gorgus 2003:108. See also the exhibition catalogue *Folklore de Suède. Exposition organisée par le Musée nordique de Stockholm*, Paris 1937.

3 The term “(unified) European ethnology” is used in a broad sense, comprising the study of material culture and social life as well as that of non-material culture

- i.e. covering the thematic fields and methods of both ethnology (proper) and folkloristics. This corresponds to the way Rivière used the word “folklore”.
- 4 For a discussion of the Prague congress, see Rogan 2004 and 2007.
 - 5 Arnstberg 1989 gives an interesting portrait of Erixon, with a focus on his scientific work. It is however remarkable that this biography does not mention Erixon’s efforts to establish the theoretical foundations of a discipline of European ethnology.
 - 6 Archives MNATP (Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires, Paris). Org. app. CIAP, 1964–65–66–67. Letter of 17 August 1967 to SIEF president K. G. Peeters. Translation from German by B. R.
 - 7 For the relations between Rivière and van Gennepe, see Gorgus 2003:150ff. For the relations between Erixon and von Sydow, see Bringéus 2001 and 2006.
 - 8 For a detailed discussion of the establishment and decline of CIAP in the 1930s, see Rogan 2004, 2006.
 - 9 For a detailed discussion of CIAP’s resistance to this form of applied ethnology, see Rogan 2007.
 - 10 Erixon 1937, 1938a. In a later article (Erixon 1952), he maintains that European ethnology is a regional specialization of general ethnology, called “cultural or social anthropology in England and America”. However, he looked to behaviourist sociology for inspiration in the 1930s.
 - 11 Erixon 1948–49. See also Möller 1955–56 on Erixon’s criticism of functionalism.
 - 12 As for the main branch of Nordic folktale research during this period, the historical-geographical or Finnish school, he did not criticize it for its essential principle, comparison with regard to geographical factors – a principle that was also essential to his own cherished cartography. But he seems to have disdained certain tendencies of a too mechanical application of the method, also criticized by von Sydow. See also Christiansen 1937, 1955.
 - 13 On von Sydow’s difficult relationship with the folklorists of the philological school at Uppsala, see Bringéus 2001, 2006.
 - 14 The following description of the Lund congress is taken partly from Nilsson 1935, partly from The Congress for Science of Folktales, Lund 6–8 November 1935: Resolutions/Protocol.
 - 15 The need for cooperation among the folktale researchers in the 1930s should not be reduced to the accessibility of material only. Cooperation with regard to methods was also important, and one of the other challenges for the Lund congress was a revision of the Aarne-Thompson typology, originally published in the *Folklore Fellows Communication* series.
 - 16 Letter of 29.10.1935 from H. Geijer to K. Kaiser, Uppsala, SOFI: ULMA, Övriga utgående skrivelser 1931–1940, B1. I am grateful to Professor Bringéus for drawing my attention to this correspondence.
 - 17 The Congress for Science of Folktales, Lund 6–8 Nov. 1935; Memoranda ... p. 14.
 - 18 See Bringéus 2001 for a discussion of the different profiles of Lund and Uppsala. Even if the Lundian von Sydow for a long time taught in Uppsala and also participated in the creation of the Gustavus Adolphus Academy, in the

- 1930s there were strong tensions between him and several Uppsala researchers, especially folklorists of the philological school, and to a lesser extent also between him and Sigurd Erixon (Stockholm), who was not very much interested in the folk tale research tradition that von Sydow represented.
- 19 The International Association for Folklore and Ethnology. Executive Committee, held on the 2, 3, and 4 April 1936, in Berlin. Minutes. *Folk* vol. I no. 1, pp. 17–23. Committee members present were Campbell, Erixon, Geijer and von Sydow from Sweden, K. Kaiser, L. Mackensen, and A. Spamer from Germany, P. de Keyser and C. L. Trefois from Belgium, R. Th. Christiansen (Oslo), H. Ellekilde (Copenhagen), G. R. Gair (Edinburgh), U. Harva (Turku), J. de Vries (Leiden), in addition to invited guests.
 - 20 The International Association for Folklore and Ethnology, Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, Brussels May 1937. *Folk* vol. I, no. 2, pp. 200–204. New members present were P. Andersen (Copenhagen), K. Liestøl (Oslo), and among the guests we find A. Marinus (Brussels).
 - 21 *Folk* vol. I, no. 2, p. 202, Minutes (IInd sitting, §3).
 - 22 Lund University Library, Handskriftsamlingen. Letter from Å. Campbell to C. W. von Sydow, dated 19 May 1938. I am obliged to Professor Nils-Arvid Bringéus for having drawn my attention to this correspondence.
 - 23 For a detailed description of von Sydow's relations to Germany, see Bringéus 2006.
 - 24 Lund University Library, Handskriftsamlingen. Letter from Å. Campbell to C. W. von Sydow, dated May 19, 1938. Translation BR.
 - 25 *Ibid.*
 - 26 *Folk* vol. I, no. 1. The balance must have been difficult. In the bilingual editorial *Volksforscher* is translated as “folklorists” (p. 1) and *Volksforschung* as “ethnology” (p. 2).
 - 27 Letter of 18.3.1936 from Geijer to Liestøl. Uppsala, SOFI: ULMA, Övriga utgående skrivelser 1931–1940, B1.
 - 28 Rooijakkers & Meurkens 2000. Actually, de Vries's case was not considered as collaboration, but he was denied the right to publish for a certain number of years.
 - 29 Letters from Campbell of 12.4.1932 to von Sydow, of 17.5. and 5.9.1932 to Mackensen. Uppsala, SOFI: ULMA, Övriga utgående skrivelser 1931–1940, B1.
 - 30 The collaborators, or the editorial board, were Reidar Th. Christiansen (Oslo), Gösta Berg (Stockholm), Martti Haavio and Kustaa Vilkkuna (Helsinki), Oskar Loorits (Tartu) and Kai Uldall (Copenhagen).
 - 31 Letter from Geijer to Liestøl of 18.3.1936. Uppsala, SOFI: ULMA, Övriga utgående skrivelser 1931–1940, B1.
 - 32 Five letters from Granberg to Christiansen, between December 1935 and June 1936. Oslo, Nasjonalbiblioteket. Ms 4, 3516, Reidar Th. Christiansen, IV Brev.
 - 33 Bringéus (1983:229) states that *Acta Ethnologica* was badly received by Erixon. Granberg actually taught at Nordiska Museet, under Erixon, in this period (1937–40). For a biography of Granberg, see Svensson 1983.

- 34 See *Acta Ethnologica* 1938, p. 71, for Granberg's explanation of the fusion.
- 35 The International Association ... Minutes, p. 22. One might have expected, for the establishment of a new journal, plans (economy, publisher, etc.) to be presented for the council. But time was apparently too short for a formal procedure.
- 36 Minutes from the Berlin meeting, 1936, Vth sitting (*Folk* I:1, p. 22).
- 37 In a report for internal use at MNATP, Rivière states that *Folk* and its editorial board were discussed in Paris in August 1937. However, the contents of the discussion is not rendered. *Rapport sommaire ... le 20 oct. 1937*, Archives MNATP.
- 38 Letter of 16 November 1936, from Erixon to R. Th. Christiansen. Oslo, Nasjonalbiblioteket. Ms 4, 3516, Reidar Th. Christiansen, IV Brev.
- 39 Letter of 19 May 1938. Handskriftsamlingen, University Library of Lund.
- 40 *Règlement général du CIFL*, § 4, voted in Copenhagen August 1938. Archives MNATP. Between Rivière and Varagnac a rupture was approaching: the two formerly close colleagues were soon to cease all communication. But we do not know why Rivière replaced *both* persons.
- 41 Archives MNATP. The name of the national committee changes regularly; sometimes it is called *Commission* ... For a period the colonies appear in the name, then *art* is replaced by *arts et traditions* (1939); and in 1942 it becomes *Commission nationale du Folklore*.
- 42 A. van Gennep, *Mémento du 15 oct. 1945: Comité national des Arts et Traditions Populaires*. Archives MNATP, Box 804/M. Cuisenier.
- 43 *Ibid.*
- 44 *Note relative au deuxième Congrès International des Arts Populaires. Participation de la France*. Archives MNATP, box 804/M. Cuisenier.
- 45 For a detailed description of the situation of ethnology in France in these years and the role of Rivière, see Gorgus 2003, chapter IV: "1937 – La vogue du populaire".
- 46 *Rapport ... du 8 juillet 1937*, p. 2. Archives MNATP.
- 47 *Rapport sommaire sur les résultats ...* Archives MNATP (Dumont 5059). Probably written by G. H. Rivière, or possibly by A. Varagnac, who collaborated closely with Rivière for the arrangement of CIFL.
- 48 For Rivière's own arguments, see Rivière and Varagnac 1936.
- 49 Sources are (1) *Rapport sur le Congrès International de folklore*, 23–28 août 1937, du 8 juillet 1937 (Archives MNATP); (2) *Rapport sommaire sur les résultats des travaux du Congrès International de Folklore*, du 20 oct. 1937 (Archives MNATP); (3) Rivière 1938; and (4) *Travaux ...* 1938.
- 50 For a broad account of the political use of popular culture, especially for workers' leisure activities, see Rogan 2007.
- 51 Letter from Campbell to W. von Sydow of 12 April 1932. SOFI: ULMA, Övriga utgående skrivelser 1931–1940, B1.
- 52 See Lixfeld 1991 for further details.
- 53 Letter of 19 May 1938. Handskriftsamlingen, University Library of Lund.
- 54 This and the following quotations: Letter of 19 May 1938. Handskriftsamlingen, University Library of Lund.

55 For a report on the ICAES congresses, see *Folk-Liv* 1938 p. 405ff.

56 For the minutes, see *Folk-Liv* 1938 pp. 319f and 409ff (IAEEF) and 1938 p. 316ff (CIFL).

57 *Folk-Liv* 1939, p. 104ff. The National Museum of Wales volunteered to arrange the congress in Cardiff, but Stockholm was chosen.