

INTRODUCTION



Presentation of the Topic, Its Pertinence and Context of the Research

This introduction will place the research topic in context and justify the pertinence of an anthropological study on the life and work of Mendes Correia (1888–1960) and the Porto School of Anthropology in the first half of the twentieth century. One of the motivations for starting research on this subject was the realization that eighty-seven years (when I wrote the project in 2005) after the foundation of the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology (SPAÉ) in 1918, no study had been carried out on this school – of which the main representative was Mendes Correia¹ – the works he produced or his relationship to the scientific knowledge and the political order in Portugal and its former colonies. As a matter of fact, he was the main figure not only of SPAÉ, but also of Portuguese anthropology up to the 1950s. It was therefore a timely moment for an in-depth study of the work produced by the actors connected to this school, a reflection on its purposes and an analysis of the initiatives it promoted, the works it carried out and also its legacy. Furthermore, I believe that one of the ways to carry out an anthropological study is to examine the evolution and development of anthropology itself. In that sense, this book contributes towards a better knowledge of the academic history of anthropology in Portugal. As mentioned by João Leal, the ‘natural result of anthropology’s recent history’ led to it becoming a ‘disciplinary subfield inside anthropology’ (Leal 2006: 123). In this case, I intend to highlight one of the leading exponents of this discipline in Portugal, whose personal (academic, political and institutional) path and work were highly productive. However, I intend to go far beyond a mere biography and I am aware that the task of ‘biographing’,² although it should not be mistaken for the ‘invention of facts’, can also involve a process of ‘fiction’,³ ‘re-creation’ and reconstitution (Oliveira 2003).

This book aims to be an intellectual biography of the work undertaken by Mendes Correia. It also aspires to reach beyond his life, his work and the place he occupies, no matter what that place currently is within anthropology. I therefore intend to also approach the context in which his work was produced. This work will include: new information on the life of Mendes Correia, on the period in which he lived and in which his work was carried out; his professional relationships and friendships; a systematization and a critical analysis of his work; his theoretical contributions; and his legacy in general. Although Mendes Correia was a graduate in medicine, he was mainly devoted to anthropology and archaeology. I also wish to understand why, despite being perfectly integrated into both academia and the politics of his time, he is today utterly marginal in anthropology itself, with a peripheral role in the history of anthropology, since references to his works are often ignored or omitted. However, I do not intend to write a laudatory text, but rather a critical and reflective one, not so much by questioning or denying his value, but rather with the aim of gaining understanding and finding explanations.

I believe that there were several factors that contributed to the establishment of a school of anthropology in Porto: the University of Porto was the setting where this discipline was taught, in a duly institutionalized manner, within the Faculty of Sciences; there was a consistent group of professors and students/disciples who shared common ideas, topics and methods, and who were able to train people who later on became experts in this area; and, lastly, it produced scientific knowledge based on research that was acknowledged by its peers for decades – that is, it had a longevity of about half a century. In Portugal there are already some works on the history of Portuguese anthropology: Manuel de Areia and Maria Augusta da Rocha (1985); Jorge Freitas Branco (1986); João Leal (2000, 2006); Rui Pereira (1986, 1998); João de Pina-Cabral (1991); Ricardo Roque (2001a); Gonçalo Duro dos Santos (2005); and José Manuel Sobral (2007), among others. However, except for some authors, such as Rui Pereira (1998), Ricardo Roque (2001a, 2006), Duro dos Santos (2005) and my own work (Matos 2013), it is not common for Portuguese anthropologists and historians to recognize the existence of a school of anthropology rooted in Porto, as well as the legacy of Mendes Correia and his collaborators. We still lack a critical review of its works and an integrated synopsis on the precursors of anthropology, especially in Portugal, which are mostly and widely ignored.

Some of the figures of the past were marginalized during their lifetime, reaching the status of great precursors, heroes or striking historical figures only after their death. Others were given due importance while living, but, after their death, they were disregarded and forgotten as if they had never existed or contributed to anything relevant. I would name the following

possible reasons for this forgetting of the anthropological past, or for the rejection of its study: 1) the fact that some anthropological studies were influenced by racial (and racist) theories; 2) the existence of anthropological studies performed in the colonial context, which may be criticized based on the type of studies performed (mainly in physical anthropology, based on prejudiced and discriminatory assumptions about the individuals analysed), and the fact that these focused on populations under the domination or the authority of the Portuguese colonial administration; 3) the connotation of some of those works with the policies of the Estado Novo (New State) (1933–74); 4) the large number of works produced, as well as their length, along with the diversity and complexity of the topics studied. This book therefore intends to make the work of Mendes Correia – a significant figure in his time – better known, explain why he deserves that status and examine his influence. By doing so, I am inspired by the work coordinated by Richard Handler (2000), in the *History of Anthropology* (HOA) collection, created and directed, for many years, by George Stocking, with the title *Excluded Ancestors, Inventible Traditions: Essays toward a More Inclusive History of Anthropology*. This volume invites readers to gain a better knowledge of the academics that remained forgotten in time, but who made a (decisive) contribution to the anthropological work performed in their own time. To discover Mendes Correia's work, as well as the initiatives he promoted and animated, will allow us to contribute to a more inclusive history of anthropology, as suggested in the subtitle of the volume edited by Handler.

In the copy on the inside cover flap of this book, we can read that 'history-making can be used both to bolster and to contest the legitimacy of established institutions and canons' (Handler 2000). In this work I also intend to present a research that reveals history, regardless of its potential legitimation or refutation. During the 1990s, as we are reminded by Handler, anthropologists increasingly gained knowledge on the ways in which the participation in professional anthropology depended, and still depends, on categorical boundaries such as 'race',⁴ class, gender, citizenship, institutional and disciplinary filiation and proficiency in the English language. Those who write the history of anthropology 'play a crucial role interrogating such boundaries; as they do, they make newly available the work of anthropologists who have been ignored' (Handler 2000). According to Handler (2000), Stocking led a subfield of anthropology – the history of anthropology – and was the person responsible for displacing it from the margins to the centre of the discipline (2000: 3). Since Franz Boas (1858–1942) and Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917), anthropologists had occasionally followed this genre, but, as noted by Stocking (1966), this subfield only arises in the 1960s⁵ (Handler 2000: 3). With regard to this discussion, Handler reminds

us that the word 'subfield' (of the history of anthropology) is not a reference merely to the four fields of anthropology sacralized by Boas, but rather to less inclusive areas of interest than the former, such as politics, medicine, psychological anthropology and historical archaeology (2000: 4).

The role of the history of anthropology regarding the wider anthropology discipline may be structured in several ways. Stocking referred to Hallowell's (1965) notion of the history of anthropology as an anthropological project. From this perspective, history and anthropology are similar in their fundamental goal – to understand worlds with human significance and specifically located events – although the disciplines may differ in terms of their methods and disciplinary cultures. Therefore, as mentioned by Handler, the interpretation or explanation of past anthropological practices in their relationship to specific historical and cultural moments should be a common work for anthropologists who are familiar with the empirical research in local communities and situations, despite the need to devote themselves more to archives than to field research; however, up to a point, the collection of oral stories establishes the methodological bridge (Handler 2000: 4). According to Handler, the historical contextualization of the anthropological work should be a source of anthropological self-criticism. On the other hand, the reflexive critical view may be established as a sign of disciplinary decadence. In this negative view, we might say that the discipline, no matter how securely institutionalized it is, has been intellectually eroding itself – its object of study, whether it is conceived as the 'culture' or as the exotic *others*, is being banished or declared as inappropriately objectified in the first place. According to this author, when abandoned without a real-world object to legitimize itself as a field of scientific study, anthropology must now 'cannibalize itself' and take hold of its own history, its methods and its epistemology as its main subject (2000: 4). Although I do not share Handler's analysis, I believe that the current alternative is not to cannibalize itself, but rather that it is necessary to continue developing reflexive thought on what has been done and how it has been done. This work and this reflection should not replace the research recently developed by anthropologists, but rather should walk side by side with them.

On the other hand, we may reflect on the role of the history of anthropology in its relation to theoretical currents and methods of teaching in this discipline. On several occasions Stocking observed the quality of a great deal of disciplinary history, since its practitioners read and write the history of their discipline as a prelude to the triumph of their own theoretical positions. In the hands of institutionalized 'winners' (those, for example, with tenured positions at elite universities), this type of justification of their own theoretical agenda becomes the defence of an established canon

(Handler 2000: 4). In addition, ‘those who see themselves as excluded from the anthropological establishment, however defined, can use history of anthropology to resurrect forgotten ancestors’ (by creating them) and forge alternative anthropological pasts that suggest alternative canons (Handler 2000: 4–5). In that volume, the debate around the concept of canon was inspirational to me: to speak of ‘excluded ancestors’ and to work ‘toward a more inclusive’ discipline is to assume that ‘the boundaries of that discipline, and the roster of accepted, acceptable, and/or canonized practitioners/ancestors, can be specified and agreed upon’; by looking at the discipline from a more global point of view, we may ask who belongs to ‘the history of anthropology’ or ‘Which different histories of anthropology include which different ancestors?’ (Handler 2000: 5).

The analysis of the process of recruiting and excluding people in anthropology can also be of interest. Some books by Mendes Correia were very frequently read and quoted in his time, but not afterwards. It therefore seems that a related, but different way of creating canons and disciplinary boundaries is by referring to the institutionalized antecedents of anthropology. The anthropology courses typically include writers who would not be categorized as anthropologists in their time or authors who worked before this science existed as an institutionalized discipline. As mentioned by Handler, the origins of anthropology cannot be traced with certainty; in fact, they should be re-established in retrospective, in an imaginative process that is able to unite all kinds of ancestors (2000: 6). This idea is in accordance with Stocking’s observation on the way that ‘the boundaries of anthropology have always been problematic’ and the fact that ‘anthropology may best be visualized historically as originating by processes of fusion rather than fission’, with antecedents from older academic traditions in ‘natural history, philology, ... moral philosophy, ... [and] antiquarianism’ (Stocking Jr.⁶ 1995a: 933, 936). Considering the undetermined boundaries in anthropology, the way we carry out its history matters. This is because, as mentioned by Handler, anthropology historians may bring to light the work of practitioners of anthropology that may have been marginalized in their time and subsequently erased from the memory of the discipline (2000: 7). In the case of Mendes Correia, he was not marginalized in his time, but rather erased from the discipline afterwards, partly due to a change in the country’s political context and to a parallel change in the attitudes towards the idea of ‘race’ and of possessing colonial territories. However, the memory of his work can be brought back. In writing this book, I approached various materials, mainly paper documents and photographs, old and yellowed documents, degraded by time, fragile to the touch, that required very careful handling. When reading, translating and deciphering them, I also felt that, in a way, I was saving that past from a

definitive oblivion. In that sense, I am aware that bringing the work of Mendes Correia into the memory of the discipline is, in a way, forging a new memory of anthropology in Portugal.

An Intellectual Biography as an Object of Study

According to João de Pina-Cabral, anthropology recently observed a new development in its longstanding methodological tradition based on life stories, giving way to a series of biographies of past anthropologists (2008: 26). According to this anthropologist, this is fertile ground for the development of a kind of interpretative problem that requires our attention. On the other hand, the idea that human beings are determined in their interpretations of the world (i.e. that our beliefs adapt to the type of world in which we grow up) is commonplace in social sciences and is fundamental in anthropological research. This author also reminds us that what anthropologists want is to identify the conditions – material or mental – that structure the specific human event being studied. He also mentions that a person's actions and beliefs are motivated by factors from diverse origins that may come into conflict, partly cancelling out each other's influence (Pina-Cabral 2008: 26). In general, he considers that biographical studies on past anthropologists are a precious development in anthropology and may contribute to moving it outside its worn-out, post-imperialist parochialisms. Pina-Cabral further suggests that we should work towards a more theoretically inclined history of anthropology, i.e. produced by anthropologists who have anthropological arguments in mind (2008: 27).

In the introduction to the special issue of *Reviews in Anthropology* entitled 'Biographies of Anthropologists', Roger Ivar Lohmann is peremptory when stating that anthropologists' biographies are largely acknowledged as useful for the history of science and of this discipline (2008: 89). Lohmann further argues that biographies not only provide information *about* anthropology, but also data *for* anthropology, since they are studies on human agents entangled in social and cultural contexts, comparable to the life stories of ethnographic informants, as stated by Pina-Cabral (2008: 26). This might also have been the reason, among others, that led Margaret Mead (1974), several years earlier, to write the biography of Ruth Benedict. Lohmann adds that biographies are as important to empirical and theoretical anthropology as ethnographies, textbooks and monographs in archaeology and biological anthropology (2008: 89). Furthermore, they allow a description of the cultural dynamics based on a central person, with an experience of his or her own, as is the case in this study on the figure of Mendes Correia.

To trace someone's biography is a complex phenomenon, since it involves a process of selection, assessment, and selective and individual choices by the person performing the task, who must choose between what is most important, or not, to include. The biographer is therefore in a position of power. In this way, according to Lohmann, 'the author of a biography is in the powerful but challenging position of recording and evaluating for posterity someone's legacy' (2008: 91). The recent boom of monographs and volumes that depict anthropologists as biographical subjects occurred mainly in the United Kingdom and the United States, and less so in Portugal, where only recently did the first examples come about, and only in a few works, such as those by Ricardo Roque (2001a) on Fonseca Cardoso, Gonçalo Duro dos Santos (2005) on Eusébio Tamagnini, and Joaquim Lima (2007) on Bernardino Machado. This wave of biographies on great figures connected to science is mainly developed and disseminated in the scope of history as such, where we can find numerous examples.

Another aspect worth highlighting is that the personalities mentioned by Lohmann who are connected to anthropology and the history of anthropology are not always recognized as such in all contexts. On the other hand, it occurs to me that not all current anthropologists acknowledge some of the precursors of anthropology as anthropologists, or consider that their work has made a decisive contribution to their current activity. This wish to cut the strings with the past may, or not, be expressed in the generations that immediately follow the generations whose biographies have been written or about which one writes. Jorge Dias (1907–73), for example, took part in the homage to Mendes Correia in 1957,⁷ although he has directed his work on a different course. One of the specific issues we find in Portugal is the rupture with the Estado Novo and with the status quo it represented (authoritarianism, imperial domination and colonialism), which did not exist in the United States, for example, or which existed differently in countries that despite not being dictatorships – such as the United Kingdom – allowed a plurality of voices in academia, whether favourable or unfavourable to the empire, for instance. However, it seems apparent that whenever a greater distancing exists, this cut is not as necessary and a greater abstraction towards the past is possible, which allows a more distanced and reflexive analysis, and this is my approach in this book.

According to Lohmann, the narrative form of a biography is similar to fiction. However, 'biography is emphatically nonfiction: a representation of reality, including inner, psychological realities reconstructed as accurately as possible from evidence such as statements, letters, analysis of the biographical subject's behaviors' (2008: 90). In the case of Mendes Correia, a behavioural analysis is more interesting if it is performed over time, since his writings clearly reveal that he adapted his discourse and adjusted

his suggestions in relation to the historical and political times and to the external (the colonies) and international (Europe) pressures to which the country was subject. When the events they describe go back to the past, biographies allow for a greater distancing and abstraction, as in this work, since Mendes Correia died in 1960, thus reducing the difficulty in exposing matters considered as personal or private. Lohmann recalls that the topics considered as private – and therefore as inappropriate in public texts – vary according to culture, and this aspect is connected to privacy and anonymity. When ethnographers describe a whole group in an abstract way, even when expressing a critical view, there is no need to expose any individual for the purpose of either canonization or blame. Individuals are often made anonymous or are given pseudonyms. On the contrary, biographers cannot suppress this responsibility. This is one of the reasons why including the individuals' names in anthropology may be problematic, when at the same time anthropologists promise to hide the identities of informants, except when this is impossible, such as when they assess the careers of public personalities (Lohmann 2008: 91).

The work I present here is a kind of 'an anthropology of anthropology', as designated by Gerald Sullivan (2008: 226). Furthermore, it allows us to reflect on how we got to the issues that animated anthropology. According to Sullivan, when we work in anthropological archives, we enter a special field that leads us to the past, both of anthropologists and their counterparts, and this allows us to make that past useful once again. With this study, my intention goes beyond that, as I also wish to know Mendes Correia better and make him known among those who are ignorant of him. Regardless of the contributions offered by Mendes Correia's work (the extent to which they are useful or inspiring today and in the future), it is important to know them (even those that were misunderstood, despised or useless). Even if the past contains elements that may be embarrassing to us, we must not ignore or forget it, even if only to guarantee that this negative past will not repeat itself. Anthropologists are also expected to be honest and balanced when telling the facts and revealing their point of view, as well as their sources of knowledge, as correctly as possible. For example, according to Lohmann, a central doctrine of anthropological expectation is to avoid ethnocentrism when writing reports; by applying an analogous principle to biography, the biographers of anthropologists are compelled to write friendly but honest texts on individual biographical subjects, depicting the perspectives of the subjects themselves and analysing the causes and consequences of their actions (2008: 91). At this point, I believe that despite writing about a personality, the anthropologist does not necessarily have to agree with his or her points of view and perspectives, whether theoretical, methodological or analytical. Furthermore, the anthropologist can and

should at least investigate the potential consequences of the biographer's writings and positions. It is necessary to consider not only the writing that almost evokes a hagiography, but also the kind of work that may arise when the person who writes has, from the start, an aversion towards the subject of the biography and disagrees with his or her ideas and practices. The biographical elements can further be revealed in obituaries or in tributes to masters, professors or colleagues. Whether some anthropologists today consider them as anthropologists or not, or whether they relate to their work, is an entirely different matter. During their lifetime, those people saw themselves as anthropologists and were acknowledged as such, and that will be my starting point.

Another aspect highlighted by Lohmann is that the knowledge and the separation of the emic and ethical perspectives are as important in biographies as in ethnographies (2008: 91). Therefore, the greater the proximity of the experience shown by the data and the narrative, the greater the potential emic richness will be. In its turn, when the life of the biographed person belongs in a distant past and is only accessible through documents, the cultural and historical context of his or her life and actions can be accessed with a better understanding of the events and a broader contextual perspective (Lohmann 2008: 92). In the present case, considering a sixty-two-year period after the individual's death, that emic richness can be considered as minor. However, if we consider that history may repeat itself, as well as the social conflicts of today, motivated by the migration of people and by the social and economic crisis context in the world, some issues on which Mendes Correia reflected and wrote may not be as remote, nor may they be definitely relegated to the past.

The publication of diaries⁸ and letters can also be illuminating. This material may provide rich elements about moments and phases in his life, 'highlighting particular relationships and events' (Lohmann 2008: 93–94). In the case of Mendes Correia's path, I realized that he experienced many diverse activities and paths not only in the scientific but also in the political domain. However, as in other paths of life, part of the itineraries may in fact result from contingencies and circumstances that are parallel to their lives and the social environment in which they lived, and may not necessarily result from a previously thought and established strategy. After reading his memoirs *Em Face de Deus* (1946b), written by himself, we are able to say something similar to that referred to by Lohmann: the fact that storytellers, even when telling their own adventures, do not necessarily provide a clear, consistent, chronologically organized tale of their life trajectory. Much is forgotten, mixed or revised, if not for their presentation, then at least in the author's memory itself, in order to create a pleasant self-image; that is, unpleasant experiences may be suppressed as time goes by. Different people

may have complementary or conflicting memories of the same events, based upon which the biographer should create a narrative. Furthermore, Lohmann adds that ‘dreams and fantasies may enter memory as “actual” events in one’s life history’ (2008: 95). The biographies of anthropologists allow us mainly to extend our understanding about the history of this discipline, a goal that was clearly reached in the immense work by George W. Stocking, by giving us the possibility of understanding the path of the discipline, the topics selected and the way in which some ideas were developed and/or abandoned.

David H. Price called attention to the initial phase of anthropology in the United States, during which the possession of any advanced credential in any field was more important than having a degree in anthropology. The most prominent anthropologists at the beginning of the twentieth century had degrees in fields such as physics, chemistry, medicine, psychology, biology and geology. This was a requirement, since anthropology curriculums had to be written by individuals with an advanced degree before the departments in this discipline were able to assign degrees in anthropology (2008: 103). From a comparative perspective, we may say something similar about Portugal: the majority of anthropology practitioners during the first half of the twentieth century were not trained in this area, but rather in areas such as medicine and biology. As for the North American case, according to Price, while ‘amateur anthropologists generally produced shoddy, bigoted work, there were also significant strains of amateurs or self-trained brilliance that never managed to fit into the confines of the emerging academy populated by refined gentlemen’ (2008: 104). He also recalls that some of the first presidents of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) were self-taught, and often had solid careers in the world of business to support their academic activities⁹ (2008: 104). According to Price, in 1913 Roland Dixon became the first President of the AAA to receive a doctor’s degree in anthropology and, in 1919, Clark Wissler, though AAA President, had a doctor’s degree in psychology, not anthropology.

Patrick Lavolette focused on the concept of intellectual biography and explored the relational and symbolic relevance of anthropology’s life stories. According to him, the intellectual biography, as a ‘newly developing self-conscious genre’, is revealing a central role in the way the history of the discipline has been written (Lavolette 2008: 233); however, he suggests that there were some tensions between the practical experience and the intellectual conceptualization (2008: 232). According to Lavolette, many of these books are not exactly biographies in the strict sense of the word and are part of a discursive turning point that arose when anthropologists began taking the understanding and the study of an uncommon ‘species’ – themselves – seriously (Bourdieu 1988). Although biographical writing is

not exactly new, Laviolette considers we are nowadays witnessing a new biographical interest in the lives and experiences of anthropologists' ancestors, both in England and in other locations (2008: 233). On the other hand, by revealing the importance of diaries and informal personal documents, as well as of articles and monographs, the biographies of anthropologists may help us describe the anthropological twists and turns between ontology and epistemology – between experience, method and theory. These biographies are significant epistemological conceptualizations of the way in which theory and method are mixed with life stories and politics. These sources are precious when discovering and discrediting imperial, colonial or other potentially debatable processes that may have occurred, or not, through the practice of fieldwork (Laviolette 2008: 254). In the case of Mendes Correia's path, we must consider not only the relevance of the institutionalization of anthropology in Portugal, but also its internationalization through its own effort to take part in international events and to publish abroad. We are therefore able to conclude that works on anthropologists are information-rich material and emic literature that can be looked up like other cultural productions. Furthermore, the biographical work is important in terms of understanding the permanently changing path of the discipline and also of human beings.

Objectives, Issues Approached and Scientific Methodology

The research for this book was performed mainly between 2006 and 2011. The aim of this work is to contribute to a better knowledge of the history of anthropology in Portugal from the late nineteenth century until the 1950s, based on some of its paths and precursors, and, specifically, on the Porto School of Anthropology and its prime mover, Professor Mendes Correia. I analyse not only the works of the school's mentor, but also the intellectual network he built, encompassing his disciples and collaborators, as well as his peers, in Portugal and abroad. Since he intervened not only in scientific fields, but also in political and institutional fields, I wish to understand the conditions in which scientific knowledge was produced in Portugal in his time.

Since this is an intellectual biography, I shall analyse the discourses and representations produced by Mendes Correia concerning two fundamental research domains: the 'Portuguese people' and the populations in the colonies, showing the relationships between the study of the nation and that of the 'Portuguese colonial empire'. On the other hand, I shall compare the production of Correia and his school in the context of the international development of the disciplinary fields he dealt with (which

includes anthropology, ethnology and archaeology). In general, by means of a hermeneutical and qualitative analysis, I intend to research the school, the knowledge it promoted and the type of dissemination it allowed. As my starting hypotheses, I will analyse the extent to which the Portuguese reality regarding the institutionalization of anthropology and its path was different, or not, from other national contexts and what the differences were within the country concerning different schools of anthropology. Next, I intend to investigate whether the anthropological knowledge produced within the scope of this school was isolated or not in time and space or if, on the contrary, there were several international working and intellectual exchange networks between the people connected to the school and people associated with anthropological schools from other countries. Finally, I shall analyse whether there is a relationship between national policies and the policies proposed in the context under analysis, and the works promoted and developed by this school's representatives.

Regarding the methodology, this research was focused on libraries, archives, museums and document reserves, and on contact with several people, through formal contacts, interviews and conversations, some more informal and some less so. As to the documental research, I considered the different topics approached and developed in the texts, and made use of sources deposited in several places, in Portugal and abroad, with a special emphasis on the institutions to which Mendes Correia was related. On the other hand, I carried out a bibliographical research aimed at obtaining a genealogy of the disciplines associated with the author (mainly anthropology and archaeology). This research is further based on the analysis of the works by Mendes Correia and other people belonging to the school, seeking to identify research objects, explanatory paradigms, controversies, continuities and changes. Some sources are public, while others are private, but the cross-reference between both types of materials was essential to link ideas and facts and to reach conclusions. For a greater proximity between the reader and the sources, I often chose to include large portions of text, thus also allowing the reader to reach his or her own conclusions. Some of the main venues I visited¹⁰ were the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Porto (FCUP) and, more specifically, the former Zoology and Anthropology Department of this faculty, the Archive of the Municipal Council of Porto (CMP), the Porto Municipal Archive – Casa do Infante –, the District Archive of Porto, the National Library (BN), the National Hemeroteque, Torre do Tombo National Archive (ANTT), the archive of the Portuguese Parliament, the Memory Centre in Torre de Moncorvo and the Institute for Scientific and Tropical Research (IICT).

Lastly, I collected oral testimonies by interviewing people related to Mendes Correia and members of his school, such as former students. I

also contacted people who know or who have studied the context under analysis; individuals associated with institutions to which Mendes Correia himself was connected, such as the former Higher Colonial College (ESC), the Lisbon Geographic Society (SGL) and the Lisbon Academy of Sciences (ACL), and also his relatives, more close or less so. Using this method, I approached people and subsequently met them, and in these encounters they gave me further contacts and information. As to the anonymity of the interviewees, I made the following choice: some of the people I interviewed are public figures, and when the questions I asked are in the public domain or of public interest, they are identified in the text; the people I interviewed on more private and intimate and/or problematic subjects are not identified, mainly for ethical reasons and to protect their privacy. This book also made use of some life stories, by which I do not mean solely the interviews, but also the stories I restored based on a closer relationship with some counterparts, which I was able to maintain for a longer period of time. This was also possible due to the attitude of collaboration and interest that these people expressed towards this study. I believe that the method based on life stories allows us to gain a deeper level of knowledge and to reach the historical truth by saturating the object. Furthermore, the repetitions or coinciding elements in these stories can allow us to discover a pattern when cross-referencing them, as mentioned by Paula Godinho.¹¹ In this case, it mostly gave me a better knowledge of the historical context under analysis and allowed me to establish relationships between elements that were shown to be useful in the interpretation of data.

During the interviews, I took into account that memory is related to forgetfulness, that it is more than just a sum of recollections, and that it is linked together with the reconstitution and reconfiguration of facts, even if with some manipulation of the narrative (Ricoeur 2000). On the other hand, I considered that the way we see the present is influenced by our past and that the evocative repetition of events also serves as memory (Connerton 1989). In some cases, the interviewees had personally met Mendes Correia and spoke about that experience; in others, their memory used biographical elements that they read after his death and then used as their own experience. Since this work focused on the research of historical sources, I sought to contextualize the discourses and the analysed materials. By reason of the object under study, the research was based on proceedings that are characteristic not only of anthropology, but also of history. However, this *modus operandi* did not generate any issue whatsoever regarding identity. As mentioned by José Manuel Sobral:

When anthropologists study the past based on documents and seek to link their research with data revealed by the historical study, and when historians

apply anthropological methods, objects and models in their analysis – when they do not come nearer to privileging the speech and experience of the social agents through ‘oral history’ – it makes no sense talking about strict separations. But the disciplines remain distinct, in their working matter and in the research activity (not to speak of the fact that historians do not produce theories, considering themselves as contributing entities, even if with a critical standpoint, to the conceptualizations produced in other areas). (1999: 27–28)

The Structure of This Book

This book is divided into five chapters. The first two describe the figure of Mendes Correia and the context in which he worked. In Chapter 1, devoted to his biography, I highlight the most important aspects in his life, namely his training in medicine, the work he developed as professor at the University of Porto (UP) and his connection to Porto. On the other hand, I emphasize his projection and his national and international status. I make reference to some honours he received during his lifetime and in the present, and to the way in which these processes were organized. In Chapter 2 I analyse the context in which the Porto School of Anthropology and the SPAE were born. I present a perspective on the process of institutionalization of anthropology in Portugal, which is integrated into a wider process that encompassed other sciences. I further emphasize the efforts made by people connected to the University of Coimbra (UC) and the UP, so that anthropology might be recognized as an autonomous disciplinary field, a process in which Mendes Correia played a fundamental role.

In the three following chapters I analyse Mendes Correia’s scientific and political work, systematize his ideas, critically reflect on some of his theories and describe his main political activities. We shall see how some of his biographical features help us understand his scientific production and his actions at an academic, social and political level. Mendes Correia is a man with diversified interests, from prehistoric archaeology to physical anthropology, and also palaeontology and ethnology. This ‘variety’, presented in Chapter 3, is expressed early on at the classes of anthropology he taught (Correia 1915b). As we shall see, the author revealed nationalist concerns and devoted part of his studies to pre-Roman Lusitania, denoting an obsession with the origins of humanity and of the Earth itself in several works. On the other hand, I shall systematize his main arguments, among which we find the following: *Lusitanians are the ancestors of the Portuguese; race is not culture; raciology is not racism; miscegenation is not a dilution process; and culture is a psychological attitude*. Chapter 4 is devoted to ‘practical applications of anthropology’, as the author understands it. In that sense, I analyse

the fields in which these applications took place, namely in pedagogical, criminal and colonial anthropology. As we shall see, a fundamental part of his work was inspired by issues that, at the time of production, were related to subjects like ‘race’ and ‘hygiene’.

Acknowledged as an academic authority in the university milieu of the time, Mendes Correia eventually intervened in several areas and issued opinions on social and demographic causes, inspired by medical and biological sciences, that is, the areas in which he possessed academic training. He himself classifies some of those interventions as ‘applied anthropology’. In Mendes Correia’s track record we can also highlight not only the relevant academic and scientific offices he held, but also his devotion and the way in which he promoted the performance of colonial studies and the organization of events of scientific diffusion. Chapter 5 approaches his ‘political legacy’ and describes his activities as Mayor of Porto (1936–42), as advisor of the Corporate Chamber (CC) (1935–38 and 1938–42) and as deputy at the National Assembly (AN) (1945–56). We shall see how his academic training, and his social concerns, were decisive in the political proposals he presented publicly.

The Conclusion provides a summary of Mendes Correia’s legacy. In his path, it is not only the creation of the Porto School of Anthropology and of SPAE that stand out, but also a network of collaborators (students and professors) and of individuals with whom he maintained scientific contact. This ‘network’ (Barnes 1972) allows us to trace a map in which we can find the connections between the school and institutional spheres that are relevant to this research. Throughout the text, I seek to stress the fact that this study also allows an analysis of the topics of nationalism and colonialism, often related to and involved in the path and evolution of anthropology in Portugal. Lastly, the appendices contain information that complement the elements described in the book.

Notes

1. There are comprehensive works on the life and work of Bernardino Machado (Marques and Costa 1978; Santos 2005; Lima 2007), founder of the discipline of anthropology in Coimbra (1885), but not on Mendes Correia.
2. Among the biographies on the life and work of scholars, we may refer to that on Marc Bloch (Fink 1991).
3. Maria Antónia Oliveira defines the relationship between the biographee and the biographer as ‘fictional because the biographee, being dead, is an imaginary being, a non-existent person, with whom the biographer gradually is involved’ (2003: 110).

4. Throughout the text I use the expression 'race' in inverted commas because it does not make sense to speak of the existence of human races, and 'race' is a term that has long been scientifically discredited (Matos 2013).
5. To help in this process, Stocking founded the *History of Anthropology Newsletter* in 1973, with a view to informing practitioners of new or newly announced publications, dissertations and sources that may be relevant to their work and to the HOA (in 1983) as a step towards publishing this academic work within this subdiscipline.
6. Quoted in Handler (2000: 6-7).
7. See *Boletim da SGL*, April-June 1957.
8. An example of a published diary is that of Bronislaw Malinowski (1989 [1967]).
9. While W.J. McGee produced and sold agricultural produce, the others graduated in natural sciences (F.W. Putnam and Jesse Fewkes in biology, Franz Boas in physics, Walter Hough in chemistry and geology, and Aleš Hrdlička in medicine). Others were trained in arts, such as William Henry Holmes, who studied drawing (Price 2008).
10. See the list of Archives and Libraries for a full list of the places visited.
11. 'História de vida – Academia' – video with Paula Godinho, available at: http://www.memoriamedia.net/historiasdevida/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=70&Itemid=57 (accessed May 2011).