ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

THE CASE OF SLOVAKIA
(LATE 20th AND 21st CENTURIES)

Tatiana Zachar Podolinská

ETHNOLOGICAL STUDIES 59

Reviewers:
Zuzana Beňušková, Institute of Culture and Tourism Management, Cultural Studies and Ethnology, Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra
Alexandra Bitušíková, Department of Social Studies and Ethnology, Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica
Elena Marushiakova, Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS, Bratislava

Language proofs: Judita Takáčová, 2024

Design and layout: © Matúš Hnát, 2024

The publication was supported by the APVV-22-0389 project (RELIROMA): Research on Religiosity, Spirituality, and Non-religiosity among the Roma in Slovakia.

ISBN 978-80-974434-7-4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443474

ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

The Case of Slovakia (Late 20th and 21st Centuries)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This publication stems from regular conversations with PhD students at the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS (IESA SAS), where they candidly and openly discussed the pitfalls and challenges they faced in creating ethical designs for their PhD research. During these conversations, I realised the challenging journey they undertook in an honest effort to implement their research designs effectively, while adhering to both national and international ethical standards, as well as relevant national legislation.

Given the specific contexts of their field research, many students found themselves in a challenging position of multispectral negotiation when developing their ethical designs. In the initial phase, researchers had to familiarise themselves with relevant legislation, consult various national authorities and legal representatives, and study applicable national and international ethical codes. In the next step, they crafted their own context-specific ethical designs for their research, which were then reviewed by their supervisors. Finally, the ethical designs were consulted with and approved by the Ethical Committee of the IESA SAS. In most cases, after finalising their pilot research, or even during the main field work, students repeatedly approached the Ethical Committee of the Institute to consult newly emerged issues. In this context, I realised the importance of the decision to establish a special Ethical Committee at our Institute in 2019, rather than relying solely on the Ethical Committee of SAS or existing international or national ethical codes.

During conversations with the students, I also realised that many of them encountered both common and uniquely specific challenges, requiring them to devise sensitive and innovative solutions. Their supervisors and the members

of the Ethical Committee found themselves in a similar position—squeezed between their honest attempt to deliver the most relevant research and collect the best data for further analysis and interpretation, and their honest attempt to prevent any harm to the interlocutors, communities involved, and the institution responsible for the research—the IESA SAS.

In this situation, a completely spontaneous—yet very logical—idea emerged: to publish the authors' reflections on their journey of drafting and negotiating the most appropriate ethical design in one edited volume, creating an inspiring corpus of effective solutions for future researchers.

The first volume (Kinczer and Zachar Podolinská, Eds., 2024) features four authorial reflections, each addressing ethical dilemmas in conducting ethnological and anthropological research in highly specific environments: healthcare research among people from marginalised communities (Cichová, 2024), research within senior care homes (Kinczer, 2024), research on online anti-vax groups and communities (Slivková, 2024), and research on the negotiation of orthodoxy in local narratives (popular religiosity versus church doctrine) in post-communist Belarus (Serdziuk, 2024).

While editing the first volume, I understood that an introductory chapter would be appropriate to provide a general overview of the topic. Therefore, as I edited the submitted texts, I simultaneously began working on this chapter. The more I immersed myself in what had previously not been a central focus of my professional interest, the more I became aware of the gap in the formulation of qualitative research guidelines in Slovakia. After sending the chapter to reviewers for feedback, I received insightful comments and even various supplementary studies or references to

expand and deepen the topic, particularly in relation to the Slovak and Czechoslovak contexts. Embracing this challenge, I began incorporating the suggested passages.

The biggest challenge was writing a section on professional ethics during the socialist period because of the apparent lack of primary source material. Professional ethics, including the ethical dilemmas of how to approach interlocutors sensitively or how to critically reflect on the social role of ethnology in a socialist society, was not a topic at all within Czechoslovak ethnography. To address this, I relied on combining research from studies and discussions published in the *Slovenský národopis* and *Etnologické rozpravy* journals with qualitative interviews conducted with several colleagues who contributed to shaping the discourse on ethical research in ethnology and anthropology in the socialist and post-socialist eras.

I also realised that while writing a comprehensive publication on the history of the IESA SAS (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023)—one of the leading institutions currently overseeing basic and applied scientific research in the field of ethnology and anthropology in Slovakia—we had overlooked the topic of the establishment of professional ethics in our disciplines. We only briefly touched on it when discussing the case of *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma history], but this was more in the context of the story of the Institution's internal cohesion, which the publication explores against the backdrop of historical events (pp. 222–228).

While writing the text on ethics in qualitative research, we also began preparing the ethical design of the RELIROMA[1] project, in the framework of which our team initiated discussions on how to implement a sensitive

1 Project *APVV-22-0389 (RELIROMA) Research of Religiosity, Spirituality and Non-Religiosity among the Roma in Slovakia*. https://uesa.sav.sk/en/projects/national/research-of-religiosity-spirituality-and-irreligiozity-among-the-roma-in-slovakia/

research design. Our field research is challenging in several respects, as we frequently engage with marginalised people from excluded Romani communities, addressing deeply personal and intimate topics such as religiosity, spirituality, or non-religion. Qualitative open-ended interviews often include personal stories that reflect journeys *in* or *out* of religiosity. These personal testimonies include stories of conversion, personal miracles, spirituality, as well as deconversion, disappointments, loss of faith, and trust in God and church(es) as an institution(s). Additionally, we encounter distancing from traditional religiosity and spirituality within the local community, as well as from non-preferred ethnicity and identity.

These stories reveal both joy and pain, personal struggles, as well as family or individual tragedies. They are shared in good faith, in situations of absolute trust in the people present in conversations, particularly the researcher, from whom understanding, acceptance, and sometimes even explanations and psychological relief are expected. These situations generate not only a unique kind of *knowledge*, but also *understanding*, in which both the "participant" and the "researcher" become integral parts.

Interviews are often marked by a role reversal, where the "participant" asks questions and conducts a *reverse interview* with the "researcher", who then participates in the participant's mini-research in the role of a researcher. In doing so, the researcher helps expand the participant's knowledge about the world of science or about both the internal world and external environment in which the researcher operates.

Informed consent alone does not capture the complexity and intimacy of these situations, just as anonymising locations or interlocutors is often insufficient. Therefore, in designing the ethical and methodological framework of the

RELIROMA project, it was particularly important for us to draw lessons not only from the controversies within Romani studies in Slovakia—which I have attempted to summarise here—but also from trends in contemporary qualitative research. To create the most sensitive and up-to-date ethical design possible—while avoiding numerous pitfalls associated with qualitative research on sensitive issues in vulnerable communities (e.g., Sriram et al., Eds., 2009; Aldridge, 2014;)—we must learn not only from the ethical controversies in Romani studies but also from best practices in current ethnology and anthropology worldwide.

The text of the introductory chapter eventually expanded into a monograph. After consulting with reviewers, I decided to publish it as a follow-up in the Ethnological Studies, under the title *Ethical Challenges in Current Ethnology and Social Anthropology, II*. Given the circumstances of its creation and the timeframe, the book does not aim to provide an exhaustive overview of the topic. Instead, it offers a preliminary summary of the basic aspects of the development of ethical standards in ethnology and social anthropology in Slovakia during the latter half of 20th century and early decades of 21st century, set against the backdrop of the transforming Western and Central European ethnology and anthropology.

The book is intentionally designed as a kick-off contribution, or a compendium and a basic guide reviewing the foundations and evolving landscape of ethical challenges in ethnology and social anthropology during the 20th and 21st centuries. It examines the dynamics and implications of adhering to ethical standards, discusses ethnical controversies and cases of accusations of breaching ethical standards and scientific integrity. The publication highlights the importance of context-specific ethics over universal

codes and explores the impact of these ethical considerations on the relationship between ethnologists/anthropologists and the interlocutors and communities involved in research. Additionally, it introduces key themes from the latest discourse on research ethics in the social sciences, ethnology, and anthropology. The goal is to bring these insights to the Slovak context, encourage updates to national codes, and inspire innovations in the decision-making processes of various ethics committees operating in Slovakia.

The book thus serves as a theoretical and discursive take-off to the discussion on the increasingly sensitive issue on limits and challenges of professional ethics in ethnology and anthropology. It opens the floor for a deeper, sincere discussion about the researcher's positionality, caught between the responsibility to protect and avoid harming participants and communities involved in the research, institutions responsible for research and possible donors, and oneself, and the duty to the academic community, driven by the ambition to make a personal contribution to knowledge production and science *per se*.

The book ultimately aims to critically reflect on the development of discussions about professional ethics and ethical regulations in Slovakia in the 20th and 21st centuries, including an overview of the most significant ethical controversies in the 21st century which, surprisingly or not, happened in the field of Romani studies. By doing so, it partially fills a gap in the theoretical and reflective literature within contemporary Slovak ethnology and anthropology, especially concerning research on sensitive topics and vulnerable groups. More importantly, it calls for ongoing dialogue, inviting scholars to share their experiences and reflections on advancing more reflexive, sensitive, yet data-grounded and robust ethnography and anthropology today.

THE EVOLVING LANDSCAPE OF ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN ETHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Current ethnological and anthropological research is guided by both international and national ethical codes, which outline the general rules of ethical research conduct. The ethical designs of specific research projects are generally subject to various rigorous approval protocols from the institutions that host or fund the research.

The development of ethical codes in anthropology has been a response to various disciplinary controversies and the profession's engagement with global social issues. The evolution of these codes in social anthropology has been shaped by the discipline's growing awareness of the complex relationships between researchers and the communities they study. Social and cultural anthropology, deeply embedded in diverse cultural contexts, thus faces unique ethical challenges that evolve with both societal changes and academic discourse. Researchers must navigate complex relationships and power dynamics with the communities they study, often balancing scientific inquiry with respect for local norms and individual rights.

Contemporary ethnologists and anthropologists find themselves operating within various social fields,[2] where individuals, groups, and institutions involved in research have different positions and interests, possess diverse forms of economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital.[3] Researchers face the challenging task of impartially and sensitively respecting and protecting the interests of as many of these actors as possible. From this perspective,

2 Bourdieu (2010, p. 282) defines the *social field* as a relatively autonomous part of the social space that operates according to its own rules and is structured by its own system of capital distribution. The social field is a universe that "follows its own laws of functioning and transformation; in other words, it is a structure of objective relationships between positions occupied by individuals or groups competing in the pursuit of legitimacy".

3 In Pierre Bourdieu's terms, the ownership of different kinds of *capital* (and their different amounts) is what determines the position of an "actor" in the social structure/in the social field/in social (and also physical) space. One could thus say that the structure of the distribution of forms of capital is in fact a "balance of power relations" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 172).

researchers are required to *negotiate* ethical research designs with multiple stakeholders—individuals, groups, and institutions—across different spaces, including fieldwork, academic, private, and intimate contexts.

Ethical codes, which succinctly summarise the fundamental ethical standards of their respective disciplines, serve as a crucial ethical compass. However, these codes themselves have undergone turbulent development during the 20th and 21st centuries, reflecting both global and local social phenomena and encompassing specific events.

ETHICAL CODES, GUIDELINES, AND REGULATIONS

In the early years of social anthropology, formal ethical guidelines were largely absent. Researchers often conducted fieldwork with little explicit consideration of the ethical implications, focusing instead on data collection and observation. However, as the field matured, anthropologists increasingly recognised the importance of ethical considerations.

Anglophone Anthropology—The Evolution of Codes of Ethics in America and the UK

The adoption of ethical codes in anthropology, supported by peer review and professional association sanctions—a practice borrowed from the medical and legal fields—only emerged after 1945. Before this, the discipline relied on different standards, such as the moral authority of "objective facts" or the empathy that fieldworkers were expected to show toward "natives" or "aborigines" (Pels, 1998; 1999; 2018, p. 391).

In the 1950s and 1960s, discussions began to emerge about the responsibilities that anthropologists had towards their "subjects". However, the formal codification of ethics following a professional model was a relatively late development in anthropology (Pels, 2018, pp. 391–392).

In one of the influential papers on research ethics, Joseph G. Jorgensen (1971) addresses the necessity of an ethical code and potentially a decision-making ethics committee for professional ethnologists and social anthropologists. He focuses particularly on the relationship between ethnologists and the interlocutors and communities they study. In his paper, he distinguishes between *normative ethics* and *metaethics*, arguing that a normative ethics for ethnologists cannot be based on scientific methods or

principles ("metaethics"); instead, it should be grounded in an understanding of human behaviour in various situations. He thus proposes that a "normative ethics for anthropologists should be assessed based on the current social environments in which we work, as well as our expectations for future environments" (1971, p. 321). In his understanding of research ethics, Jorgensen was significantly ahead of his time. In this sense, the development of ethical codes in the latter half of the 20th century tended to focus more on postulating strict rules ("metaethics") rather than on creating contextually embedded solutions through negotiation, communication, and respect for local knowledge and rules.

The 1960s and 1970s were pivotal decades for the development of ethical standards in anthropology. Influenced by the broader civil rights movements and increased attention to human rights, anthropologists began to advocate for more formalised ethical guidelines. It was only during the Vietnam War that the momentum to draw up an ethical code gained sufficient force to produce the *American Anthropological Association's (AAA) Statement on Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility* of 1971 (Pels, 2018; *AAA Statement*...). This document was a response to the increasing recognition of the ethical complexities involved in anthropological research and the need for formal guidelines. Key principles of *AAA's Statement* are responsibility to research subjects, obtaining informed consent, avoiding harm, and maintaining transparency (CE AAA).

During the 1980s and 1990s, ethical codes became more detailed and comprehensive. Anthropologists recognised the need for establishing guidelines that covered specific issues such as informed consent, confidentiality, and the potential impact of research on communities. In 1983, the *Society for Applied Anthropology* (*SfAA*) adopted its *Statement of Professional and Ethical Responsibilities*. This document emphasised the application of anthropological knowledge to address social problems and provided guidelines for ethical conduct in applied settings. The code promoted respect for communities and individuals, responsibility to scholarship, and upholding ethical obligations to the public and clients (*Statement of Ethics..., SfAA*).

In the late 1990s, the *AAA* and other professional organisations revised their codes to reflect these concerns, emphasising the importance of obtaining informed consent and ensuring the welfare of research participants. In 1998, the *AAA* updated its ethical guidelines with the *Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association* (CE AAA). This revision introduced more detailed provisions addressing issues such as collaborative research, intellectual property rights, and the responsibilities of anthropologists to the public. The updated code outlined several key principles: do no harm, be open and honest, obtain informed consent, weigh competing ethical obligations, make results accessible, protect and preserve records, and maintain respectful and ethical relationships.

The evolution of anthropological codes of ethics in the UK is closely linked to the *Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth* (*ASA*). In 1999, the *ASA* issued its *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice*. This document reflected a growing international consensus on the importance of ethical considerations in anthropological research. *ASA*'s Ethical Guidelines outlined the following key principles: respect for participants, responsibility to scholarship, ensuring informed consent, protecting confidential information, and considering the impact of research on local communities (EG ASA).

In February 1974, a group of 120 anthropologists launched the *Canadian Ethnology Society/Société Canadienne d'Ethnologie (CESCE)* during a meeting at Laval Université. In 1988, the society changed its name to the *Canadian Anthropology Society* (*CASCA*) to clarify its identity and highlight its role as an association for anthropology. In 1997, the society negotiated the merger of its journal *Culture* with the independent journal *Anthropologica*, which became its official journal in 1998.[4] *CASCA* does not have its own Code of Ethics; instead its official website directs members to follow *Code of Ethics of AAA* (CE AAA), *Code of Ethics of the Association of Social Anthropologists of Aotearoa New Zealand* (2016),[5] *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice of ASA* (2011) (EG ASA), *Code of Ethics of the Australian Anthropological Society*,[6] *Ethics Resources of the Canadian Association for Biological Anthropology*,[7] *Guidelines for Ethical Practice of the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology*,[8] *Statement of Ethics & Professional Responsibilities of the Society for Applied Anthropology*,[9] *Code of Conduct of the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences*.[10]

Decolonisation of Western Anthropology in the Latter Half of the 20th Century

The development of ethical codes in "English-speaking anthropology" during the latter half of the 20th century was largely a response to growing concerns about the impact of anthropological research on the communities being studied and the need for clear ethical guidelines to govern the conduct of anthropologists.

Decolonisation emerges from a neo-Marxist political perspective but also experiments with interpretive and reflexive ethnographic analysis to generate knowledge at the intersection of these approaches. One of the first influential works was a paper by Kathleen Gough, presented in late 1960s at the *Southwestern States Anthropological Association* meeting in San Francisco, California (March 1967).[11] In this reflexive and critical paper, Gough discusses the role of anthropology in Western societies in the earlier half of the 20th society as follows:

> "Anthropology is a child of Western imperialism. (…) Until the Second World War, most of our fieldwork was carried out in societies that had been conquered by our own governments. We tended to accept the imperialist framework as given… In spite of some belief in value-free social science, anthropologists in those days seem to have commonly played roles characteristic of white liberals… Anthropologists were of higher social status than their informants; they were usually of the dominant race, and they were protected by imperial law; yet, living closely with native peoples, they tended to take their part and to try to protect them against the worst forms of imperialist exploitation.

4 Source: https://archive.cas-sca.ca/about/history-of-casca [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
5 Source: https://www.asaanz.org/code-of-ethics [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
6 Source: https://www.aas.asn.au/ethics#:~:text=The%20AAS%20Code%20of%20Ethics,as%20members%20of%20the%20AAS [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
7 Source: https://caba-acab.net/ethics-physical-anthropology-0 [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
8 Source: https://practicinganthropology.org/practice/ethics/ [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
9 Source: https://appliedanthro.org/annual-meeting/information-logistics/meeting-instructions/statement-of-ethics-professional-responsibilities/ [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
10 Source: https://www.federationhss.ca/en/about-us/about-federation/code-conduct [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
11 The paper was initially broadcast on KPFA radio and later published in *The Economic and Political Weekly*, Bombay, Sept. 9, 1967. It was ultimately published in the Monthly Review (1968) under the title *Anthropology and Imperialism* (1968).

> Customary relations developed between the anthropologists and the government or the various private agencies who funded and protected them. Other types of customary relationships grew up between anthropologists and the people whose institutions they studied. Applied anthropology came into being as a kind of social work and community development effort for non-white peoples, whose future was seen in terms of gradual education, and of amelioration of conditions many of which had actually been imposed by their Western conquerors in the first place" (Gough, 1968, pp. 12–13).

Gough's paper concludes with a quotation from K. Marx: "We should not seek to anticipate the new world dogmatically" because "our task is ruthless criticism of everything that exists" (Gough, 1968, p. 27). In line with this critical and reflexive statement, she questioned the role of "small-scale" anthropology which explores local communities, focuses on local cultures, and defines local patterns. She outlined the ambition of anthropology in the latter half of the 20th century to achieve a synthesis and a potential to capture not only the vanishing pre-modern world but also the modern world, aiming to formulate general patterns of human societies:

> "… we shall eventually have to choose either to remain, or become, specialists who confine themselves to the cultures of small-scale, pre-industrial societies, or else, bringing to bear all our knowledge of cultural evolution and of primitive social institutions, embark fully on the study of modern societies, including modern revolutions. If we take the former path, as our subject matter disappears, we shall become historians, and will retreat from the substantial work we have already done in contemporary societies. If we take the latter path, which is the one some of us must inevitably follow, we shall have to admit that our subject matter is increasingly the same as that of political scientists, economists, and sociologists. The only way that we cannot admit this is by confining ourselves to studies of small segments of modern society. But as the scale of these societies widens, such studies are less and less justifiable theoretically or methodologically except within a framework of understanding of what is happening to the larger system. Anthropologists have, moreover, some right to demand of themselves they do study the larger system as totality… anthropologist do have some historical claim to play a synthesising role" (Gough, 1968, p. 18).

In the late 1970s, Edward Said's seminal work *Orientalism* (1978) had a pivotal impact on the discourse surrounding *decolonisation* within Western thought, including in anthropology. In his work, Said argued that the Western depiction of the "Orient"—encompassing the Middle East, Asia, and North Africa—was not merely a body of knowledge but a tool of power and control. This body of knowledge, constructed by Western scholars, artists, and

writers, portrayed Eastern societies as exotic, backward, and fundamentally different from the West. This portrayal justified colonial domination and intervention. Said critically reflected on how anthropology, as part of this broader Western knowledge system, contributed to the construction of the "Other", thus becoming complicit in colonial projects. Said also criticised the Western epistemological framework that claims "objective knowledge" about the non-Western world.

In the late decades of the 20th century, post-colonial theory was developed, drawing heavily on Said's ideas and his appeal to "decolonise" social sciences in the "First World" countries.

Post-colonialism, "Woke" Culture, Cancel Culture, and Critical Research—Early Decades of the 21st Century

Post-colonialism emerged as an interdisciplinary field focused on the hierarchies of power and knowledge in a world shaped by both European and American colonialism. It draws from neo-Marxism, deconstructionism, psychoanalysis, linguistics, feminism, and post-modernism, and is applied across disciplines such as social anthropology, literary theory, historiography, philosophy, and political science. Post-colonialism mainly developed as a critical stance, analysing ethnocentrism and the centring of knowledge, power, and meaning.[12] It challenges traditional hierarchies of knowledge and advocates for the inclusion of indigenous perspectives and methodologies.

In this context, numerous volumes were produced in social anthropology. Notably, Faye V. Harrison's edited

12 For post-colonialism in Central Europe, see Pucherová and Gáfrik, 2012, pp. 2–3.

collection of essays *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation* (Ed., 1997) emphasises the importance of including marginalised voices in anthropological research, or Linda Tuhiwai Smith's publication (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* challenges traditional research methods in anthropology and advocates for approaches that respect and empower Indigenous communities.

The origins of Harrison's volume (Ed., 1997) trace back to the 1987 meeting of the *American Anthropological Association*, where the *Association of Black Anthropologists* (*ABA*) hosted its inaugural invited session titled "Decolonizing Anthropology". This group, later known as "the decolonising generation", catalysed a transformative approach that has significantly influenced subsequent generations of anthropologists. The concept also encompasses the idea that global racial apartheid serves as the foundation for social, economic, and gender inequality, now understood as structural oppression or structural racism:

> "To decolonise anthropology means to recognise and confront the discipline's colonial legacies, which have led to the marginalization and exploitation of Indigenous peoples and their knowledge" (Bolles, 2023, p. 519).

Decolonisation in the late 20th and post-colonisation in the 21st centuries have significantly influenced not only the discourse on the ways we construct/generate scientific knowledge and what methodologies we employ but also on the ethical treatment of the "subjects" of our studies. In the 21st century, post-colonialism has evolved, shaped

by "multiculturalism, which, while appearing to promote cultural equality, often obscures global economic injustice, neo-imperialism, and the marginalisation of otherness through the exoticisation of Third World cultural products" (for more, see Pucherová and Gáfrik, 2012, pp. 4–5).

In the late 2010s, social science and humanities have seen the emergence of phenomena such as *woke culture*, *cancel culture* and *critical research*.

The term "woke", originally from African-American Vernacular English (AAVE), initially described an awareness of racial and social injustices. In its original context, *woke* referred to being alert or awake to the systemic discrimination faced by African Americans, especially regarding issues such as police brutality, racial inequality, and social justice. Over time, it has since evolved into a broader, more global concept. Woke culture advocates for acknowledging and addressing social inequalities, including systemic racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination. It often involves active support for movements like Black Lives Matter, LGBTQ+ rights, and gender equality. A significant component of woke culture is its focus on identity politics, which frames social and political issues around group identities. This approach highlights the experiences and perspectives of marginalised groups. Woke culture frequently challenges traditional societal norms by questioning and deconstructing established power structures, cultural narratives, and historical interpretations that are seen as perpetuating inequality (e.g., Žižek, 2020; Rzepka et al., 2023; etc.)

"Woke culture" is closely associated with "cancel culture", where individuals or organisations face public criticism, boycotts, or ostracism for actions or statements deemed offensive or harmful, especially in relation to social justice issues. The term "cancel" implies that the person or entity is being "cancelled" or essentially excluded from social or professional circles.

Critics argue that both "woke" and "cancel" cultures can lead to excessive political correctness, suppressing free speech and open debate. Some believe these cultures exacerbate social divisions by focusing too heavily on identity differences and promoting a confrontational approach to discourse. Some academic papers have critically examined the impact of Woke culture on the social sciences, particularly in terms of research priorities and the framing of social justice issues. These discussions often explore the balance between advocacy and scholarship, considering the ethical and methodological implications of Woke-inspired research agendas.

In her essay, Meredith C. Clark (2020, p. 1) offers an etymological examination of "cancelling" as a digital discursive accountability praxis, from its origins in Black oral tradition to its subsequent "misappropriation by social elites". Clark concludes:

> "[Representants of woke culture] In their attempt to separate Black discursive accountability praxes—calling out, reading, and cancelling—from their origins in the creative spaces occupied by the oppressed, and reposition them as a threat to their real and aspirational peers, elite public figures fall victim to their own worst fears: a realisation that the social capital they've worked so hard for is hyperinflated currency in the attention economy" (Clark, 2020, p. 4).

From the academic perspective, it is useful to explore whether "cancel culture" is a necessary tool for social justice or rather a harmful trend that undermines free expression in academia. Critics argue that the fear of being cancelled stifles open debate and discussion, leading to self-censorship (e.g., Williams, 2016) and a lack of diverse perspectives in academic and public discourse (e.g., Duarte et al., 2015; Clark, 2020; Norris, 2021; Traversa et al., 2023; etc.).[13]

In this context, sociologist Pipa Norris analysed in her research data from the global survey *World of Political Science* (2019), which involved nearly 2,500 scholars studying or working in over 100 countries. Her research revealed a notable global divide:

> "In post-industrial societies, characterised by predominately liberal social cultures, like the US, Sweden, and UK, right-wing scholars were most likely to perceive that they faced an increasingly chilly climate. By contrast, in developing societies characterised by more traditional moral cultures, like Nigeria, it was left-wing scholars who reported that a cancel culture had worsened. This contrast is consistent with Noelle-Neumann's spiral of silence thesis, where mainstream values in any group gradually flourish to become the predominant culture, while, due to social pressures, dissenting minority voices become muted. The evidence suggests that the cancel culture is not simply a rhetorical myth; scholars may be less willing to speak up to defend their moral beliefs if they believe that their views are not widely shared by colleagues or the wider society to which they belong" (Norris, 2021, p. 145).

13 The impact of cancel culture aimed at Russia is discussed in Rustamova and Ivanova (2023).

Research by T. Sádaba and M. Herrero (2020) on the impact of cancel culture in the Hispanic world (Latin America and Spain) revealed that Hispanic countries "do not follow the traces of the Anglo-Saxon world, but they share some aspects of the culture of fear in the new digital context".

To date, there has been no specific research on "woke" and "cancel" cultures in Slovakia. One of the first encounters with cancel culture in Slovakia appears in a blog by Ján Čegiň in *Denník N*, entitled "Why 'Woke' Matters: Cancel Culture Is Also Present in Slovakia" (Čegiň, 2023).

Whereas "woke" and "cancel culture" began as social movements and were presented as critical voices spread by social media, later evolving into theoretical debates within academia, *critical research* originated in the social sciences and humanities. This approach also seeks to challenge and question traditional perspectives and power structures in society. It is grounded in critical theory, which traces its origins to thinkers like Karl Marx, the Frankfurt School, or more contemporary scholars who examine how societal structures and ideologies perpetuate inequality, oppression, and social injustice.

Critical research focuses on the ways in which power is distributed and exercised in society, examining how it affects individuals and groups, particularly marginalised communities. It often draws on insights from various disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, political science, education, and cultural studies to provide a comprehensive

analysis of social issues. Critical research challenges mainstream or dominant narratives, seeking to uncover the underlying assumptions, biases, and interests that shape these perspectives. Unlike traditional research that may aim for objectivity, critical research is often explicitly committed to social change. It aims to empower those who are marginalised and to transform the conditions of inequality and injustice. Researchers engaged in critical research are expected to be reflexive, meaning they must critically examine their own positions, biases, as well as the impact their research has on the communities they study.

Critical research may employ a variety of methodologies, which are often qualitative and include: (a) *ethnography*, i.e. in-depth studies of cultures or communities, focusing on the lived experiences of individuals; (b) *critical discourse analysis*, examining language and communication to understand how they reflect and perpetuate power relations; (c) *participatory action research*, i.e. collaborative research involving the subjects of the study as active participants in the research process.[14]

These social and cultural phenomena, along with evolving discourses, have significantly impacted the methodology and conduct of research in ethnology and social anthropology in the 21st century. They have led to a refinement of ethical codes and guidelines, as well as the ethical designing of research projects. There is now a stronger emphasis on collaboration and partnership with communities, aiming not only to amplify their voices but also to empower those "we are studying".

14 For the implementation of critical research within Romani studies, see: Šotola et al., 2018. The authors of the study claim that, in Slovakia, the construction of Roma homogeneity and otherness contributes both to their marginalisation and exoticisation. The authors discuss how the cliché of marginality and the construction of whiteness as representants of power structures represent the crucial principles in construction of Roma as "marginal and exotic Others".

21st century ethical guidelines stress the importance of mutual benefit, respect for cultural differences, and the accountability of anthropologists to the people they study. This period also reflects a growing recognition of the global and interconnected nature of research, necessitating sensitivity to diverse ethical standards and practices worldwide. The social role of anthropologists, their potential ties to the ideological and political foundations of modern societies versus their commitment to advocating local knowledge and empowering individuals and local communities is a prominent topic in current anthropological debates alongside the "golden rules" for implementing legal restrictions on personal data protection and management in post-GDPR ethnology and anthropology.

Ethical Standards in Ethnological and Anthropological Research in Central Europe in the Latter Half of the 20th Century—Socialist Ethnography in (Czecho)Slovakia

20th-century ethnology and anthropology have long been disciplines deeply intertwined with the cultural and social fabric of Central Europe (CE). Over the decades, these fields have evolved significantly, particularly in terms of ethical considerations and codes of conduct.

In the early 20th century, ethnology in CE primarily focused on documenting and understanding the diverse cultural practices within and beyond the region. The core part of the disciplines of Folklore or Homeland Studies centred on documenting and collecting the remnants of the pre-modern 19th-century world, particularly in the countryside and peasant culture. This period was marked by extensive fieldwork (see, e.g., Slavkovský, 2009; 2012). Ethical considerations were minimal, with a predominant

focus on data collection rather than on the rights and dignity of the "subjects" studied. Researchers often operated under the belief that their work served a greater scientific purpose, which overshadowed any ethical dilemmas. Moreover, the research results were frequently utilised in the fortification of newly constituted nations in CE following the dismantling of the Habsburg monarchy.

The aftermath of World War II brought significant changes to CE, influencing anthropological and ethnological practices. The establishment of socialist regimes in countries like Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary led to a shift towards Marxist interpretations of social phenomena. This period saw an increased emphasis on understanding the lives of the working class and the impact of socio-economic structures on cultural practices. Ethical considerations began to surface more prominently, especially concerning the representation of marginalised groups and the potential exploitation of research subjects for ideological purposes.

The post-war period in most CE countries corresponds to the rise of communist regimes, which brought with them thematic censorship and methodological indoctrination (*dialectical materialism* and *scientific atheism*). The discipline faced the challenge of mandated (e.g., research on manifestations of proletarian culture) and forbidden topics (e.g., manifestations of spiritual tradition and religious culture) (for the case of Slovakia, see Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 30–33). By virtue of normative ideology, research subjects were *de facto* obliged to participate in this research, which was in a vast majority of cases conducted by state-established institutions.

Nevertheless, ethnography in Slovakia was considered to exhibit significant resistance and managed to maintain its scientific autonomy, largely independent of the dominant

Communist ideology (e.g., Slavkovský, 2006, p. 18). While some authors argue that "in the early latter half of the 20th century, Marxist ethnography compelled the field to become politically engaged, albeit without a clear theoretical framework or consistent terminology" (Kiliánová and Popelková, 2010, p. 421), others disagree designating Slovak ethnography during the socialist period as a "politically-engaged discipline", pointing to the tendency of only "formal discursive politicisation" (O. Danglová in Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 32).

To our knowledge, there were no written ethical guidelines or codes of ethics in CE countries during the socialist era. In this context, it is noteworthy to mention *The Ten Commandments of an Ethnographer* by Russian ethnographer and anthropologist, Lev Yakovlevich Sternberg (1861–1921).[15] Sternberg conducted his fieldwork research in Sakhalin (1889–97) and later worked at the Museum of Ethnography and Anthropology in Leningrad. *The Ten Commandments* can be regarded as one of the first sets of guidelines in ethnology and cultural and social anthropology. Although it does not contain a rule about written consent, its ethical sensitivity was ahead of its time by more than half a century, warning researchers against ethnocentrism, the application of asymmetrical approaches, careerism, encouraging responsibility towards the public and science as such, condemning falsification and plagiarism, and indirectly pointing out possible colonialist approaches or attempts at inculturation and interference in Indigenous communities.

15 I am thankful to the manuscript reviewer, Prof. E. Marushiahova, for referring to the author of the *Ten Commandments*. I also thank her for providing valuable information in her email correspondence (from August 2, 2024) in which she discussed Sternberg's *Ten Commandments* with her supervisor, E. Horváthová, from the Ethnographic Institute of SAS when conceptualising her candidate thesis on Roma in Slovakia in the 1980s.

Sternberg's *Ten Commandments* fully correspond with the key principles of what is now known as *non-harming anthropology*, a concept that only began to be explicitly formulated in Western anthropology during the latter half of the 20th century:

(1) "Ethnography is the crown of all the humanities because it makes a comprehensive study of all peoples and all mankind, past and present.
(2) You shall not make for yourself an idol of your people, your religion, or your culture. You should know that all people are created equal: there is no Greek or Jew, no white or coloured. He who knows one ethnos, knows none; he who knows one religion, knows none.
(3) You shall not prophane science, or defile ethnography by career-seeking—a true ethnographer is he who nourishes enthusiasm for science and bears love for mankind and Man.
(4) Six days you shall labour, but on the seventh day you shall draw conclusions. Remember that you owe a debt to the public and science.
(5) Honour your great predecessors and teachers in academic and public life, and you will be duly honoured.
(6) You shall not kill science with forged facts, superficial observations, and hasty conclusions.
(7) You shall not plagiarise.
(8) You shall not change your once chosen profession of ethnographer. He who has entered upon the path of ethnography, shall not wander from it.
(9) You shall not bear false witness against your neighbour, other peoples, their spirit and rites, customs and mores, etc. Love your neighbour more than yourself.
(10) You shall not impose your culture on the ethnos you explore. Treat this ethnos with care and alertness, love and attention, whatever the stage of their cultural development—and they will strive to rise to the level of higher cultures" (for the Russian version, see: Гаген-Торн, 1971, pp. 142–143).[16]

In this context, it is noteworthy that although the works of many Soviet ethnographers were frequently cited in socialist ethnographic literature, Sternberg's *Ten Commandments* remained unquoted, despite his field research being cited by Marx and Engels.[17, 18]

In the early 1950s, a *civilisational role* for ethnography was established in the USSR, which soon spread to socialist

16 English translation cited from: http://ethnographica.kunstkamera.ru/en/index.php?title=The_Ethnographer%E2%80%99s_Ten_Commandments [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

17 Lev Yakovlevich Sternberg (1861–1927): An ethnographer, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the Department of Paleo-Asiatic Peoples (since 1924). Professor at Leningrad University (since 1918). For participating in the "Narodnaya Volya" organisations, he was exiled to Sakhalin (1889–97), where he studied the ethnography of the "Nivkh" ("Gilyak") people. He established the presence of a clan structure with a classificatory kinship system and remnants of group marriage among them, which was noted by K. Marx and F. Engels (see K. Marx and F. Engels, 1986, pp. 364–367) (for more about L. Y. Sternberg, see: https://relstud-hist.spbu.ru/en/articles/en-sternberg-lev-haim-lejb-akovlevic [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

18 Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov comment on the knowledge of Sternberg's *Ten Commandments* in Slovak and Bulgarian ethnography as follows: "Certainly, many folklorists knew him; Veselin [Popov] and I certainly did since our university days—if my memory serves me right, his works were part of the curriculum at the university—at least in Sofia—as part of the history of Soviet ethnography. Sternberg's *Ten Commandments* were not a normative document from a legal or other standpoint, but rather a moral code–I believe many were familiar with it and followed it :)" (reviewer's note on the manuscript, August 19, 2024).

satellite states in Eastern, Central, and Southern Europe. The primary task of ethnography was framed as the "study of the remnants of pre-capitalist and capitalist epochs" with the aim of "eliminating those forms that are unhealthy, in the interest of the growth of communism" (Scheffel, 1992, p. 8).

This perception of the social role of ethnography not only as an ethnographic but also as a nation-building and socio-engineering discipline was quickly disseminated to these socialist satellite states. For example, in Czechoslovakia, three consecutive national ethnographic conferences (1949, 1952, and 1953) played a central normative role in shaping the field of ethnography. While the first conference claimed inclination towards Soviet ethnography and the programmatic role of ethnography in building a socialist society (I. celostátní..., 1949, pp. 44–45), the second conference focused on combating cosmopolitanism and bourgeois methodologies (Skalníková, 1952), while the third one consolidated a clear programme that highlighted both the preferred areas of research (revolutionary elements in folk culture, expressions of class differentiation and class struggle, with a privileged position of rural and urban proletariat) and the neglected ones (folk religiosity and spiritual culture) (Všetičková, 2015, p. 20).[19]

This civilisational role of ethnography and the programmatic role of the discipline to actively engage in the struggle between "healthy" and "unhealthy" tendencies were reflected, for instance, in the contributions and articles by the founder and methodologist of Czech Marxist ethnography (Jiřikovská, Mišurec et al., 1991, p. 10), Otokar Nahodil (e.g., Nahodil, 1950). As a recent graduate of Zhdanov University in Leningrad, he presented a paper titled "Ethnography in Socialist Society and Our Tasks in Building Socialism" at the 1949 First Nationwide Ethnographic Conference at Charles University in Prague (Petráňová, 2017, p. 6).

At this nationwide conference, one of the fundamental obligations of ethnography was articulated as "assisting in the creation of a new culture that will be socialist in content and national in form" (Nahodil and Kramařík, 1951a, p. 92). During the first ethnographic conference, a brochure by Soviet ethnographer S. P. Tolstov, "Soviet School of Ethnography", was distributed to the participants. The brochure was translated by O. Nahodil, who also wrote the preface (Petráňová, 2017, p. 6) with the intention of making the book a model for Czechoslovak ethnography. In the 1950s, O. Nahodil lectured on general ethnography also in Slovakia (Petráňová, 2017, p. 11). During the second round of reviewing his habilitation thesis, a positive review from Andrej Melicherčík, a key proponent of Marxist ethnography in Slovakia, played an important role. Melicherčík highly praised his publication "J. V. Stalin and Ethnographic Science" (Nahodil and Kramařík, 1951a) (Petráňová, 2017, p. 13).[20]

The second nationwide ethnographic conference, organised by the Department of Ethnography and Prehistory at Charles University, was held on April 6 and 7, 1952, in Prague, on the initiative of the Government Commission for the Establishment of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (Skalníková, 1952, p. 1). O. Nahodil presented a paper titled "The Fight Against Cosmopolitanism and Some Current Tasks of Czechoslovak Ethnography". In his contribution, the author emphasised the importance of combatting cosmopolitanism specifically in ethnography, which

19 Regarding the ethnography of the proletariat and the study of religiosity in Czech ethnography during the socialist era, see Štofaník, 2017.

20 Paradoxically, both leading figures of period of sovietisation and establishers of Marxist ethnography in Czechoslovakia—O. Nahodil in the Czech Republic (e.g., Petráňová, 2017) and A. Melicherčík in Slovakia (Hlôšková, 2021)—were later (for various reasons) expelled from the Communist Party.

"bourgeois" scientists, by failing to recognise ethnography as a science closely connected with the national community, are dragging into the abyss of non-nationalism and putting it in the service of the most reactionary forces (Skalníková, 1952, p. 1).

The Slovak speaker at the conference, Andrej Melicherčík from the Ethnographic Cabinet of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, addressed fundamental issues in folkloristics. The main task he set was turning to Soviet scientists and learning from their experiences. Melicherčík referred to the works of Maxim Gorky. The conference participants established the principle that "any further work should be grounded in the scientific worldview, ensuring that our ethnographic science would contribute to combating cosmopolitanism, bourgeois nationalism, and become a valid force in the implementation of socialism in our country" (Skalníková, 1952, p. 2). Another subject of their criticism was the use of "functional-structuralist" methods, associating the functional-structuralist school with collaboration with colonial, imperialist, and racist political systems (Nahodil and Kramařík, 1951b, p. 14).

The third nationwide conference in 1953 on "Ethnographic Study of Contemporary Village Life in the USSR" (Skalníková, 1953) was led by Pavel Ivanovich Kushner from the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (Kušner, 1953). In the discussion, an academic from University in Moscow criticised Czechoslovak scholars for setting too ambitious goals and mechanically applying the methods of Soviet ethnography, believing that the objects and environments under study were similar (Všetičková, 2015, p. 19).

Although none of these conferences addressed questions of professional ethics, it is noteworthy that the academics of that time recognised the importance of proper documentation of ethnographic research and its storage in institutional archives, the education of museum workers, and the development of curatorial standards. They also recognised the need for what we now call "normative science". The resolution of the 3rd conferece declared the urgent need to "recommend to the Ministry of Education the inclusion of lectures on the basics of ethnography and folklore in the curriculum of pedagogical high schools and universities" (Resoluce III..., 3c).

In Slovakia, the key formative figure in the development of ethnography was Andrej Melicherčík. In his 1945 book, *Teória národopisu* [The Theory of Ethnography], he outlined the theoretical foundations of the discipline using the so-called functional-structural method, referencing his mentor, Piotr G. Bogatyriov (Bogatyrev, 1935). The young Melicherčík, who emphasised the significance of field research, viewed ethnography's role as documenting the forms and functions of "current folklore facts", without limiting them strictly to rural populations. According to Melicherčík, the researcher's role was to document the phenomena studied in the field from a synchronous perspective, meaning from the viewpoint of the researched community (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 14–15).

However, in mid-1949, the *9th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia* set out a general line for the building of socialism (Hudek, 2014, pp. 81–82). The Congress had a fundamental impact on social life and the development of social sciences in Czechoslovakia. Both the founders of Slovak ethnography and members of the so-called "Generation of Builders" viewed the *1st National Conference of Czechoslovak Ethnographers* in Prague (1949) as a crucial milestone for the direction of ethnography in Slovakia during the latter half of the 20th century. The conference

postulated ethnography as "science about the people, serving people's needs" (Podolák, 1955, pp. 429–430) and made a commitment to develop the Marxist-Leninist methodology (Slavkovský, 2006, p. 18).[21]

In the 1950s, the "Soviet Ethnographic School" (Tolstov, 1951; Tokarev, 1951) began to assert itself in Czechoslovak ethnography. This school referenced not only the works of Marxist philosophers K. Marx and F. Engels but also those of political leaders V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin. In Slovakia, the *Národopisný sborník SAVU* [Ethnographic Almanac of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] was used for this purpose. The 9th edition published a translation of the article "Stalin's Teachings on the Nation and National Culture and Its Importance for Ethnography" in its introduction, and the works of the Soviet Ethnographic School were also covered in the 10th and 11th editions (Zajonc, 2016, p. 52; Zachar Podolinská, 2021, pp. 140–148).

Similarly to the Czech ethnographic milieu, the early 1950s in Slovakia were marked by a concerted effort to combat *bourgeois nationalism*, which "falsely prioritised Slovak national interests over the class interests of the proletariat" (Hudek, 2014, p. 82).[22]

Witnesses of this period, with the advantage of hindsight, note two main tendencies that were evident in the shaping of scientific discourse and the setting of research agendas in Slovak ethnology: "revolutionary romanticism and external political pressure" (Slavkovský, 2006, p. 18). According to Soňa Kovačevičová, one of the key figures in 20th-century Slovak ethnology and leader of the "Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia" team, this was:

21 On sovietisation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts and ideologisation of research, see Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 16–17.

22 For "Combating bourgeois nationalism and reactionary ideologies", see Zachar Podolinská and Popelková 2023, pp. 18–19.

> "…a period when society began to polarise between those who were building socialist realism and were striving for historical and dialectical materialism and Marxism in science, and those who quietly adhered to artistic and scientific modernism" (for more, see in Zachar Podolinská, 2021, p. 147).

The scientific concept of the leading institution of Slovak ethnology in the latter half of the 20th century, the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, was centred, according to its former employee, D. Luther, around two basic lines:

> "…development and the present (e.g., in the 1950s, worker culture, collectivisation, and the successes of cooperative villages). Interest in traditional culture was based on rescue research (where villages were being demolished or where traditional culture was evidently disappearing and was preserved in material or immaterial forms), as well as on scientific calculation to fulfil the tasks of the State Plan" (D. Luther in Zachar Podolinská, 2021, pp. 147–148).

In line with the orientation of socialist ethnography, research on the "cooperative village" was also to be conducted in Slovakia. These studies were carried out in the Horehronie region. Despite the declared intention to primarily document social changes in housing, rituals, and family life organisation, the research ultimately focused on mapping traditional culture. The project on studying the

"socialist village" thus ended up as a "classical" ethnographic description. In 2021, D. Luther, who witnessed these events, commented on the research as follows:

> "The Horehronie project was intended to showcase the transformation of a farming village into a socialist one. Our team studied it and found no evidence of such a transformation. To demonstrate the research results and justify the financial expenditures, the project was redirected towards producing three classical monographs" (Zachar Podolinská, 2021, p. 145).

In connection with the incorporation of research on "socialist culture" into the research programme of Slovak ethnology, S. Burlasová conducted a study on new socialist songs (e.g., *častušky*) in 1964. In addition to analysing the material of these "new songs", she critically reflected on the insufficient theoretical preparedness of Slovak folklore studies for examining "socialist folklore innovations" using the methods and genre typology of traditional folklore studies. Similarly, the attempt to study "workers' culture" in the mining-farming village of Žakarovce ended in a "failure".

The scientific and methodological framework of Czechoslovak ethnology in the subsequent period was implemented in the spirit of the fundamental ideological framework set in the 1950s. Adam Pranda summarised the main programme of Soviet ethnography in his 1972 contribution to *Národopisné aktuality* as follows:

> "(1) The study of ethnic processes within the USSR and globally.
> (2) The study of cultural changes in rural and urban populations, particularly influenced by industrialisation.
> (3) The preparation and compilation of historical-ethnographic atlases for various regions of the USSR.
> (4) Clarifying the role and mission of ethnography within the system of social sciences" (Pranda, 1972, p. 260).

In this context, the preparation of historical ethnographic atlases became a major programme in Slovak ethnology during the 1970s and 1980s. This effort culminated in the publication of a series of atlases of traditional culture in Slovakia and of Slovaks living abroad during the 1990s and the 2000s (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 42, 45–54, 72).[23]

The strong impact of "normalisation" in the early 1970s, as a consequence of softening of the regime in the late 1960s, was also evident in Slovak ethnology. In E. Horváthová's laudatory contribution from 1973, celebrating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, the onset of "normalisation" was clearly felt not only in society but particularly in the social sciences. The author of the contribution recalls the 25th anniversary of the "February Victory of the Working People", while the footnotes cite the document "Lessons from the Crisis Development in the Party and Society after the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia" and "Selected Works of Marx and Engels" (Horváthová, 1973a, p. 169) (for more, see Zachar Podolinská, 2021, p. 149).

23 This ambition was formulated under point 12 of the programme for Czech ethnology in the first post-socialist decade to catch up with Slovak ethnology (see Jiřikovská, Mišurec et al., 1991, p. 28).

Paradoxically, during the harshest times of normalisation, explicitly "provocative works" emerged in Slovak ethnology, openly acknowledging inspirations from "bourgeois theory and methodology". For example, M. Leščák's study on the state of folklore studies in Slovakia (Leščák, 1972) cites the English anthropological school, the French sociological school, functionalism, positivism, semiology, and Saussurean linguistic theory. During this period, M. Kosová also published a study (Kosová, 1973) in which she applied the method of semiological analysis to the practice of imitative magic (killing from a distance). At the end of the 1970s, Z. Apáthyová-Rusnáková produced a study on the interpretation of seating arrangements at a table as a sign system. However, this study was published only after the fall of socialism, partly due to ideological constraints (Apáthyová-Rusnáková, 1999) (for more, see Zachar Podolinská, 2021, p. 150).

The 1970s and 1980s were also a period of certain experimentation, or rather, openness to the methods from other disciplines. For instance, innovative methods such as questionnaire surveys were introduced into ethnological research as part of comprehensive socio-demographic mapping of locations (Zachar Podolinská 2021, p. 150). Similarly, the ethno-cartographic method was an innovation in the Czechoslovak ethnological field. Developing this methodological design necessitated intensive communication with cartographers and experts in statistical data processing (Zachar Podolinská, 2021, pp. 151–153). As a witness to this period and a participant in the *Atlas* fieldwork collections, P. Slavkovský provides the following contextual commentary:

> "The ideological advantage was that the cartographic method was also recognised by the Soviet ethnographic school" (Slavkovský, 2006, p. 20).

In this context, it is important to note that the comprehensive questionnaire surveys and cartographic methods employed in Slovak ethnology during the 1970s and 1980s as prevailing methods of research did not involve the collection of personalised or sensitive data. Consequently, their research designs would not be considered problematic even in today's more ethically sensitive times.

In 1973, E. Horváthová defined ethnography as a *historical and social discipline*, asserting that the primary goal of ethnography was to "understand the laws of human society's development", *primarily through the historical method* (Horváthová, 1973b, pp. 312–314). This definition was consistent with the earlier view of ethnography as *historical discipline* (Filová, 1960, p. 184). Even in the late 1980s, while developing the concept for a new major collective work on traditional culture—"The Encyclopaedia of Slovak Ethnography"—, its ideologist, J. Botík, declared that the guiding principles for preparing the work were the "territorial-ethnic principle", "historicism", and the "dialectical method of understanding phenomena" two years before the fall of socialism (Botík, 1987, p. 10).

Until the end of socialist era, the research programme primarily focused on documenting traditional culture, with a strong emphasis on the historical method, characteristic of Slovak ethnography. Despite increasing external pressures from the regime and an implicit expectation for a more ideologically driven research orientation, the research programme of Slovak ethnology experienced a noticeable decline in its role of studying the present, i.e., "the way of life and culture of the working class" and "socialist forms of folklore".

The topic of professional ethics within Marxist ethnography was virtually non-existent. Postulates regarding the political and ideological role of ethnology, the definition of its direct function in "building a socialist society" (Botík, 1987), the systematic asymmetrical perception of research topics that resulted in the preference, censorship, or tabooing of certain research subjects, sharply contrasted with the professional standards of Western ethnology and anthropology of the time.

When evaluating the professional ethics of socialist ethnography and folklore studies in Slovakia, it is essential to consider that during its establishment and evolution in the latter half of the 20th century, ethnography was primarily regarded as a *historical discipline* (sometimes even referred to as an "auxiliary historical discipline"). The evolution of ethical standards in historical disciplines has followed a different trajectory compared to those in social and cultural anthropology. Since most historical disciplines deal with "dead data" (the full names of deceased individuals and their stories officially documented in historical records), their ethical codes tend to be "less strict" compared to the disciplines that collect "living data" (information about living people, their intimate and personal stories, existing localities, and real places).[24]

After the fall of communism and the Velvet Revolution, a critical assessment and reflection on the forty years of Czechoslovak ethnography under the influence of state ideology were published in *Národopisný věstník československý* in 1991. This report was compiled by a working group established for this purpose by the General Assembly of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society, led by Vanda Jiřikovská and Zdeňek Mišurec. In addition to evaluating ethnography in socialist Czechoslovakia after 1948, the group outlined a detailed programme for the development of new ethnography, folklore studies, and museology. This assessment and the proposed programme reflect a sincere effort to address the key problematic areas of the past and the most pressing challenges of the upcoming transformation period. The evaluation of the past was conducted with sensitivity, focusing on the methodologically, ideologically, and ethically problematic aspects of ethnographers' work during the previous period:

> "And besides, we have also come to the conclusion that, considering the immediate needs for the further, hopefully more successful, development of Czech ethnology, it is not necessary for those working on such a broadly conceived task to act like police investigators or prosecutors, meticulously and demonstrably determining who among us specifically used terms like 'bourgeois scientist', 'reactionary theory', 'working class', 'class struggle', 'socialist village', or who wrote a study on folk superstitions or religion with an atheist focus. Furthermore, it's unnecessary to investigate who supported and defended the so-called new creation of folk song and dance ensembles with predominantly pro-socialist content in the 1950s, studied and promoted workers' folklore,

24 For an example of ethical norms in historiographical research, see *Royal Historical Society Statement on Ethics* from October 2020: https://files.royalhistsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/18102348/Royal-Historical-Society-Statements-on-Ethics-October-2020.pdf, which formulates ethical standards on four pages. One of the nine rules states that researchers are obliged to "take particular care when evidence is produced by those still living, when the anonymity of individuals is required and when research concerns those still living".

> or organised the opening of ethnographic exhibitions or museum expeditions on the occasion of the February events, also known as 'Victorious February'. This approach is avoided because assessing objectively—almost judicially—the degree of guilt, i.e., whether it was a wavering or outright betrayal of scientific ethics, is difficult. It would be challenging to determine whether a person expressed a lesser or greater allegiance to the ideology of the ruling Communist Party due to genuine, albeit possibly naïve, conviction, good intentions and faith, or whether they were driven by personal ambition, desire for a scientific career, or lust for power" (Jiřikovská, Mišurec et al., 1991, p. 7).

The programmatic declaration contains no mention of the need to establish a new professional ethics according to Western standards. The previous passage suggests that the working group members considered the main violations of professional ethics to be ideological isolationism, adherence to the ruling ideology in terms of methodological indoctrination, and programmatic thematic focus or censorship. In this context, paragraph 5 comes closest to formulating new ethical standards, proclaiming the following need for:

> "Conducting a consistent methodological and theoretical confrontation of our science with all positive trends in European and non-European ethnography and folklore, and continuing in the entire field the shift away from isolationist methodological purism that refuses contact with other sciences" (Jiřikovská, Mišurec et al. 1991, p. 26).

In this context, it is undoubtedly interesting to note that when examining the bibliographies of the field and scientific journals published in Slovakia during the socialist period, no scientific reflection can be found on the topic of professional ethics. Throughout the subsequent forty-year period, there appeared to have been no significant critical reflection on the ethical consequences of research methods, the importance of researcher positionality, scientific integrity, and related issues.

I conducted at least a brief supplementary phone and email research with the current chairwoman of the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia* (*ESS*), Katarína Popelková, and former chairwoman, Hana Hlôšková. Both confirmed that the discussion on the need to standardise professional ethical rules within Slovak ethnology and anthropology only began in the early 21st century.

Here, I refer to the valuable personal recollections of another reviewer of the manuscript and member of the *ESS*, Zuzana Beňušková. She recalled that there were orally formulated and transmitted rules of proper research conduct, which students pieced together from the lectures of various teachers, particularly from their memories of how they themselves conducted field research. For example: "not to mention what an informant told to another informant, not to make promises to informants that we cannot keep, and not to contradict the informant", or "If you can't get in through the door, go through the window" (Beňušková, email from August 2, 2024). In the 1980s, it was considered standard practice to include full names, addresses, and birth

years of informants, as well as the official names of research locations; these personal details often found their way into scientific publications.

Based on the memories of researchers who participated in representative ethnographic research in Slovakia in the 1970s and 1980s, most informants were proud to contribute to projects focused on the preservation of cultural heritage and often explicitly insisted that their names be recorded (Marushiakova, reviewer's comment from August 20, 2024).[25]

A notable exception is the work of Czech ethnographer Josef Kandert from the Náprstek Museum in Prague, who conducted research in several locations in Central Slovakia over a span of more than twenty years. Kandert was among the first in Slovakia to apply at least partial *anonymisation* of locations and informants when writing about his field research findings. He also reflected on the *positionality* of the researcher and the tendency of interlocutors to interact in the researcher's presence in the field (idealisation of collective or individual image, etc.).

In his work on the godparenthood system from the 1970s, published in *Slovenský národopis* (*SN*) [Slovak Ethnology], the village he writes about is described as follows:

> "The village from which I draw my material is situated in one of the valleys of the Slovak Ore Mountains. It has a population of just under 450 residents, all of whom are Roman Catholic. The village does not have its own parish; instead, if falls under the parish of the nearby town of Falva[26]" (Kandert, 1974, p. 136).

25 From this point of view, it would be highly unethical to anonymise, i.e. not to mention the name of the informants against their explicit wish.
26 *Falva* is a common Hungarian term for a "village" or "rural settlement".

He used a similar anonymisation for the same location in his later study, published in *SN*3/1976, on the real and ideal image of the family. In this study, he describes what is likely the same village as follows:

> "The village from which I draw material is situated in one of the valleys of the Slovak Ore Mountains. At the time of my research (1967–1968), 435 residents lived in the village. Most of them were privately farming peasants, though agriculture was not their main source of income; they worked primarily in industry. Historically, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the village had a glassworks, which was closed during World War I. While it was operational, it provided a livelihood for many of the villagers. From the 1920s onwards, the main source of income was work in the surrounding forests and hauling. The situation changed in 1960–1961 when most of the male population stopped working in the forests and sought employment in industry. In this text, the names of the villages and their inhabitants have been altered" (Kandert, 1976, p. 469).

The second contribution is particularly interesting: first, because the author is not discussing a sensitive topic (family and community relationships in connection with the religious ritual of baptism); however, having in mind the potential threat of disclosure of the previously published text and the potential of causing harm to his interlocutors, he continued using basic anonymisation to protect the locality and the names of the interlocutors. Second, the text

reflects on the researcher's positionality and the potential for (non-)intentional idealisation in the responses given during interviews, which has to do with the tendency to present an overly positive collective image, especially in non-everyday situations, to a foreigner or stranger, which the interviewer and researcher definitively are.[27]

In this regard, one interesting summarising flashback on Czechoslovak ethnography in the real socialism and normalisation periods is offered in the review of his book published in 2004 based on material obtained from the region of Central Slovakia the 1970s and 1980s era (Kandert, 2004). In his review, J. Podoba wraps this period as follows:

> "Josef Kandert was a notable exception in the context of Czechoslovak ethnography during the normalisation period. (…) More precisely, [his works] served as a kind of alternative during a clearly stagnant phase in the field, when the final or preparatory stages of work on large collective projects were at their peak and when local and regional monographs and popular publications on folk visual and verbal art were still considered the alpha and omega of ethnographic production. At the same time, it had become more than evident that the classic Chotek-Mjartan[28] model of Czechoslovak ethnography was intellectually exhausted and problematically outdated" (Podoba, 2007a, p. 235).

27 In this context, however, it is noteworthy that, in his work published in *SN4* from 1982, he no longer used anonymisation of the locations; instead, he worked with the official names of the villages (Sihla, Sebechleby, and Žemberovce), similar to his post-revolution synthesis (Kandert, 1982; 2004).

28 "Founders" of ethnography in Slovakia, for more, see Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 16-17.

Later, during the first discussion on ethical issues in ethnographic and anthropological research, which took place during the *XV General Assembly of the Slovak Ethnographic Society at the SAS* in Svidník on May 22, 2002, Podoba stated:

> "The current practice is indebted to approaches that were shaped in the post-war period by the first, now emeritus, generation of professional ethnographers and folklorists (…). Until the early 1990s [20th century], Slovak ethnography lived in complete isolation from the development of the relevant branches of science in Europe and the world. Fieldwork had the character of 'rescue research', focusing on capturing memories…, facts, and artifacts representing traditional culture…" (Podoba, 2002, p. 86).

According to Podoba, research was oriented mainly towards rural communities and, within them, typically focused on either the elderly population or local elites (such as teachers, activists, folklorists, etc.), for whom it was a matter of prestige to have their names later appear in scientific or professional monographs (2002, p. 87).[29]

In this context, it is undoubtedly necessary to note that the 1970s and 1980s represented the "golden era" of Slovak ethnography, known as the period of large collective syntheses, which were associated with extensive questionnaire surveys conducted across Slovakia. Projects like *The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia* (Filová and

29 This should be extended also to the prestige of "ordinary people", i.e. not only local elites.

Kovačevičová, Eds., 1990) and *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia 1, 2* (Botík and Slavkovský, Eds., 1995) were part of fulfilling state plan tasks.

A valuable recollection of research methodology in the 1980s during data collection for *The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia* was captured in P. Salner's memoirs:

> "During the day, we diligently conducted research, and the evenings were dedicated to conversations over a glass of wine. At that time, I dreamed of rationalising this research. My ideal vision was that the relevant official would gather informants at the national committee or in a school, and we would move from one classroom to another as needed. My colleagues laughed at this, but when the chairman of the Local National Committee in one village—though I can't remember which one—organised it on his own initiative, they acknowledged that it had some merit. Each of us was assigned 'our own' informant, and in case of any uncertainties, we could verify conflicting answers in the neighbouring classroom" (P. Salner in Vrzgulová, Ed., 2020, p. 79).

The recollection confirms that researchers had "political backing", which provided the highest level of legitimacy for conducting field research. Additionally, informants had minimal legal awareness regarding their right to refuse participation or to request the protection of their personal data.

At the same time, it is important to consider that the research content was regarded as a "national treasure".

The research for the *Atlas* and *Encyclopaedia* focused on documenting the data for general syntheses, due to which sensitive personal or intimate information was excluded from the research scope. The collected data were *intentionally depersonalised* and *generalised*. The aim of the *Atlas* research was to verify the presence of selected features of traditional culture in local contexts (selected number of localities) and integrate them into the broader picture/map of traditional culture of Slovakia. For the *Encyclopaedia*, depersonalisation went hand in hand with large-scale generalisation and simplification of microdata into a condensed description of selected types or phenomena of traditional culture from a macro-perspective. As a result, both the collected and published data can be considered "non-sensitive" and consistent with the contemporary Western concept of "do not harming" anthropology.

Post-socialist Transformation of Ethnology and Anthropology in Slovakia

The political transformations of the late 1980s and early 1990s, marked by the fall of communist regimes and the subsequent democratisation of CE countries, had profound implications for anthropology and ethnology in the post-socialist region, including Czechia and Slovakia. Researchers gained greater academic freedom, which allowed for a re-evaluation of past practices and heightened focus on ethical standards.[30]

30 The impressions of some of the researcher who conducted ethnographic research both during the socialist and post-socialist era may be surprising, especially to the new generation of ethnographers familiar with the ethical standards of Western anthropology. For instance, E. Marushiakova remarked, "I do not know why I still hold the view that, in the era of socialism, we did research and published our works in a more correct manner" (reviewer's comment, August 20, 2024). This sentiment aligns with the current trend in anthropology, which questions the effectiveness of using pseudonyms and "unnaming" to ensure the anonymity of informants (Yuill, 2018).

However, the topics of ethical research conduct, the obligation to protect interlocutors, faithful documentation and presentation of data, respect for systems of local rules and norms, informed consent, etc., which constituted prerequisites for the implementation of any scientific research in Western ethnological and anthropological circles, began to gain traction in the CE region only gradually after the fall of the communist regime at the end of the 1980s.

In this context, the reflections of a Western anthropologist who had the opportunity to conduct field research in Romania, Russia, and Czechoslovakia immediately after the collapse of the communist regime in Europe (between 1989 and 1991) are extremely valuable. His study "Social responsibility of scientists", published both in Czech (Scheffel, 1992)[31] and Russian (Шеффель, 1993), reveals that, as a Western anthropologist, he was profoundly shocked by certain practices. These included conducting field research without obtaining informed consent, recording and taking notes against explicit expressions of discomfort from informants, or the practice of disclosing recordings without the informants' knowledge and consent in a community of Russian Old Believers of the Lipovans in Romania (Шеффель, 1993, p. 22), or the unethical acquisition (including through confiscation and theft) and disrespectful handling of sacred objects (icons, liturgical objects and books) (Scheffel, 1993, p. 22) in the collection of ethnographic material for museum purposes in Russia (1989; 1990; Шеффель, 1993, p. 23).

31 D. Z. Scheffel, a professor at the University of the Cariboo in Canada at that time, delivered a lecture on anthropology and ethics in Eastern Europe at the conference of the Association of European Anthropologists in Prague (August 26–30, Prague), following his six-month research stay at Masaryk University in Brno. Half of his contribution was published in Czech in *Národopisný věstník* (Scheffel, 1992) and the full text appeared in the Russian journal *Этнографическое обозрение* (Шеффель, 1993).

In connection with his visit to Czechoslovakia in 1991, he notes that he met students who informally shared details about their research projects. He was particularly intrigued by a description of research on folk healers, known as *bohyňky* [little goddesses]. The students explained that to study the magical practices of these healers, they had pretended to be patients, i.e. doing classified research. Similarly, they claimed to have made several hours of video recordings of healing practices through a hole in the wall, again without the healers' knowledge. The students further indicated that such research practices were quite common and that their professors were aware of and tolerated it (Шеффель, 1993, p. 22).

D. Z. Scheffel (1992; Шеффель, 1993) stated that the lag in Eastern European ethnology was most evident in the area of professional ethics (Шеффель, 1993, p. 21). While Western anthropology had long dealt with colonialist approaches and national associations had formulated ethical codes regulating various aspects of data collection, use, storage, and publication (Шеффель, 1993, pp. 21–22), for Eastern European ethnologists, professional ethics was not a prominent concern. According to Scheffel, this was also reflected in the fact that "national associations... do not automatically formulate ethical guidelines" (Шеффель, 1993, p. 22).

In this context, Scheffel offers an interesting comparison of the social role of Western and Eastern anthropologists in the latter half of the 20th century, considering their (in many ways similar) social ties to the surrounding societal system:

> "Raised in a scientific tradition that prioritised state ideology over any other responsibility, Eastern European ethnographers were, until recently, part of a semi-colonial

> system. Similar to classical British, French, or Dutch anthropology and its representatives, who benefited from the colonial system and, according to some critics, helped subjugate nations in distant corners of the world, Eastern European ethnography during the socialist period also contributed to reinforcing what is referred to as 'internal colonialism'. The oppressed population was not a 'primitive' tribe somewhere in Africa or Asia, but rather the bearers of local folk culture—the culture of Eastern European peasants. However, the fundamental features of Eastern European internal colonialism during the socialist period were no different from the classic overseas colonialism of the capitalist era. Both were based on the assumption that the 'subjugated natives' were culturally backward and that this very fact justified their manipulation in the name of progress and civilisation" (Scheffel, 1992, p. 7).[32]

The relationship between post-colonialism and post-communism in Central and Eastern Europe has become a significant topic of academic debate in anthropology. One of the first articles to address it systematically is David C. Moore's reflection from 2001 "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet?". Moore refused to regard Western European colonisation as the only standard model of colonisation and called for a global post-colonial critique. He argued that the former satellite countries of the USSR

32 Later, Scheffel contributed to the volume *Shifting Forms of Continental Colonialism*, edited by D. Schorkowitz, J. Chávez, and I. Schröder, where he considered the "Gypsy Fringe" as a semi-colonial entity (Scheffel, 2019).

do not fit the classical definition "colonies"; instead, they were zones of cultural and ideological influence and military control. He particularly highlighted the striking "silences" when considering "postcolonial-post-Soviet parallels":

> "The first is the silence of postcolonial studies today on the subject of the former Soviet sphere. And the second, mirrored silence is the failure of scholars specialising in the formerly Soviet-controlled lands to think of their regions in the useful if by no means perfect postcolonial terms developed by scholars of, say, Indonesia and Gabon" (Moore, 2001, p. 115).

Moore's notion that post-communist scholars do not refer to the period of communism in terms of colonialism can be attributed not only to theoretical ignorance or an inability to critically and reflexively evaluate the previous era's ideological, economic, and military vassalage. While in-depth critical reflections on the previous period, including in Czechoslovak ethnography, began almost immediately after the fall of the regime (see e.g., Jiřikovská, Mišurec et al., 1991), a deeper theoretical understanding and nuanced emic insights from the regions required some distance from the ongoing turbulent social changes and the integration of current theoretical approaches from Western social sciences into education. Thus, theoretically and empirically based critical and reflexive studies by non-western, post-communist scholars began to emerge only in the first decade of the 21st century (e.g., Kiliánová et al., 2004; Podoba, 2007b) and particularly in 2010s (e.g., Cervinkova, 2012; Kołodziejczyk and Şandru, Eds., 2016; Nagy, 2021; etc.).

In her study "Postcolonialism, postsocialism and the anthropology of East-Central Europe", Hana Cervinkova (2012) claims:

> "While postcolonialism was born as a project of indigenous epistemological critique of the persistence of colonialism in the postcolonial present with emancipatory/liberatory implications, postsocialism was developed as an analytical tool by Western scholars to analyse the former societies of the Communist bloc. This hegemonic epistemology of postsocialism makes it a very different concept from postcolonialism and raises questions concerning its usefulness as an intellectually empowering tool for scholars in challenging local inequities arising from the effects of global capitalism" (Cervinkova, 2012, p. 155).

Regarding Scheffel's notion, while his comparison is intriguing and theoretically captivating, it does not hold up under a closer examination of source materials and the history of ethnographic research in Slovakia. In the latter half of the 20th century, peasant or so-called *traditional culture* and village folklore were at the forefront of Slovak ethnography's interests. However, Slovak ethnographers did not approach these subjects as "social engineers" tasked with civilising "backward village tribes". Instead, the motivation behind extensive "rescue collections" was a respect for tradition and enthusiasm for preserving a valuable pre-modern world that was vanishing due to modernisation, urbanisation, and proletarianisation of society at that time. In this regard, it is important to note that Slovak ethnography was in a formative phase during the socialist era, inevitably paying the debts due to the absence of established classical folklore studies from the 19th and the earlier half of the 20th centuries.

The research on *Cigáni* [Gypsies] is a certain exception to this almost idyllic picture. Slovak ethnography began dealing with this topic in the early 1950s, which was positively acknowledged in the *Resolution of the 3rd National Conference of Czechoslovak Ethnographers* (1953, point 2d):

> "The conference accepts the report [by E. Horváthová] on the research into the culture and way of life of Gypsies in Slovakia, conducted by the Ethnographic Cabinet of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. It is recommended to continue this research, recruit new researchers, and systematically popularise its findings. Given the importance of this research, the Ethnographic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague is tasked with facilitating the expansion of this research on the culture and way of life of Gypsies to the Czech lands as well".

As part of its mandate, Slovak ethnography received approval to continue the newly emerged studies on the Roma (referred to as *Cigáni* or Gypsies at the time). In the political context of that period, this research was framed as a means to "uncover the reasons for the low standard of living of this ethnic group" (Podolák, 1955, p. 439), who lived under the conditions of an ethnic diaspora, with some groups being perceived as "extremely anti-social". The research was

expected to contribute to addressing the so-called *cigánska otázka* [Gypsy question] (Slavkovský, Ed., 2006, p. 236), thus giving it both a political and applied dimension.

The leading figure of the *Ciganologist* studies in the socialist era in Czechoslovakia was Emília Horváthová, who conducted her research on Roma both within the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Comenius University. It is worth mentioning the story behind her major synthesis *Cigáni na Slovensku* [Gypsies in Slovakia] (Horváthová, 1964). E. Horváthová, who was politically active and was a member of the Communist Party, encountered significant challenges in the 1960s while completing her research from the 1950s and 1960s in the form of a synthesis. Before the manuscript was published, she faced strong criticism from her colleagues, Communist regime ideologists. She was accused of being overly "romantic" in her admiration of the Roma and of offering "unrealistic proposals" for addressing the "Gypsy issue" in Czechoslovakia. In response to this criticism, Horváthová revised some of her views and significantly altered the concluding chapter of her book. In this final chapter, she expressed a degree of approval for the government's assimilationist and repressive policies of the government toward the Roma. She maintained the belief, which she upheld throughout her career, that the Roma's status as an exterritorial, socially distinct group within a different ethnic environment prevented them from achieving the status of a national minority, despite their preservation of cultural traits (more in Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 29–30).

After the fall of communism, topics that were previously forbidden or censored (such as religiosity and traditional spiritual culture) or underexplored (like ethnic minority studies and environmental ethnology) gained significant

prominence. Additionally, there was a growing interest in folklore and urban studies (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 153). Therefore, in the 1990s and the 2000s, intensive research on religion and confessional groups (Z. Beňušková, D. Ratica, T. Podolinská, T. Hrustič, etc.) (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 211–214), the Holocaust (P. Salner, M. Vrzgulová), *Ma bisteren* (A. Mann), and Romani studies (A. Mann, T. Podolinská, T. Hrustič) was conducted (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 104, 391–392). In the 2000s, research on cultural change, life in socialism and post-socialist transformation were introduced to shift the focus toward contemporary social life and the challenges faced by society during the transformation period (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 167–168).

However, the practice of disclosing the full names of informants in Slovak ethnography continued seamlessly into the first post-socialist decade. In his memoirs, Peter Salner recalls this practice of naming interlocutors in scientific monographs even after the fall of communism and describes an encounter with one such interlocutor who felt endangered by this disclosure:

> "Our conversations began before November 1989, and his wife suffered when he openly spoke about the difficulties of their life and his opinions. She did not hide her fear that the family would be affected again because of this. (…) When the book *Taká bola Bratislava* was published in 1991, including a chapter on cafés, one of the informants (we used full names at that time) sought me out and angrily said that he had been a journalist. After 1968, he was banned from publishing, and I had

mentioned his name. The fear he felt under the old regime had not disappeared, even after November 1989" (P. Salner in Vrzgulová, Ed., 2020, pp. 77–78).

In 1995–1997, P. Salner and M. Vrzgulová joined the non-governmental project *Oral History: Fates of Those Who Survived*, which formed part of the international project carried out at Yale University in the USA (Salner, 2006, p. 107). Through direct participation in an international project conducted by this renowned US university, Slovak ethnologists learnt not only to apply the oral history method but also became acquainted with the use of *written informant consent* in qualitative research (more in Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 113; Diskusia..., 2002, p. 95). M. Vrzgulová recalls her participation in the project as her first encounter with the Western standards of conducting qualitative research:

> "The interview itself, recorded on a professional camera, was supplemented with a clear biographical questionnaire and a comprehensive contract of about nine pages between the research institution and the Holocaust witness. This contract defined what could be done with the recording and under what conditions, including how it could be used. It was truly detailed, and on the last page, there was an empty space where our research partners could write their personal conditions, remarks, permissions, or restrictions, or even impose a ban. In Slovakia, we didn't even think

> during ethnological research at that time about legally and ethically formalising the research relationship. I believe this marked the beginning of our thinking and refining of our own research ethics. Informed consent, as a consequence of European and Slovak legislation, began to be used in our workplace much later…" (M. Vrzgulová in Vrzgulová, Ed., 2020, p. 218).

Similarly, another international project employing the oral history method—*Memory of Women during Socialism*, launched by Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in Bratislava (supported by Open Society Fund, 1999–2001)—contributed to deepening the sensitivity of research conduct in terms of informing interlocutors about the research purposes, obtaining *recorded informant consent*, approving that "interlocutors agree with full awareness, they consent not only to being recorded but also to the processing of recordings for further uses".[33]

In a discussion on ethics in ethnological research at the beginning of the 21st century, Hana Hlôšková, a participant in this research, noted that the studies were anonymised by assigning fictitious initials to the informants (Diskusia..., 2002, p. 98). Similarly, Oľga Danglová applied anonymisation in her published texts from field research on decollectivisation and the broad-spectrum transformation of rural areas by using pseudonyms for both informants and locations, referring to them as "a certain Western Slovak region" (Danglová, 2004; Danglová et al., 2005; Danglová, 2006). According to Z. Beňušková, a direct participant in

33 Based on the interview with Hana Hlôšková (August 2, 2024) and the interview and email communication with Zuzana Beňušková (August 2 and 5, 2024).

the research, these fictional names were also reflected in the Bibliography, where the names of the villages in the cited monographs were correspondingly altered.[34]

This indicates that, by the 2000s, Slovak ethnologists were aware of the necessity of obtaining informed consent to protect informants, researchers, and funding institutions; however, this awareness had not yet fully translated into widespread practice.

Serious discussions about the systematic professionalisation of ethics in Slovak ethnography began around the turn of the millennium, particularly within the context of the discussion forum on "Ethics in Ethnological Research", held during the *XV General Assembly of the Slovak Ethnographic Society at SAS in Svidní*k in May 2002. The record of this discussion was published in the second issue of *Etnologické rozpravy* in 2002, featuring participants such as A. Mušinka, V. Feglová, M. Dubayová, M. Paríková, I. Murín, O. Bodorová, Z. Beňušková, K. Holbová, J. Darulová, and H. Hlôšková (Diskusia..., 2002, pp. 91–99).

The discussion record reveals that researchers became acutely aware of the potential impact of the absence of formalised ethical standards in Slovak ethnology, particularly influenced by the *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma History] controversy. However, the discussion also reveals that, despite Slovak ethnologists being aware of the ethical standards of "Western anthropology" at that time, there was still significant resistance to fundamental standards such as written informed consent or the practice of anonymising locations and informants to protect all parties involved (informants, researchers, institutions, and the discipline itself).

34 Based on the email from Z. Beňušková (August 5, 2024).

J. Podoba, who did not personally participate in the discussion but wrote an introductory contribution, emphasised that professional ethics should primarily consider (1) the protection of the informant and (2) the protection of the researcher, scientific research institutions, and the entire discipline (Podoba, 2002, pp. 90–91), stressing that both aspects are equally important. In this context, he critically reflected on the trends of "American post-modern anthropology" and its emphasis on "political correctness", particularly regarding the censoring of socially sensitive topics and prioritising the protection of informants. In the final part of his contribution, J. Podoba expressed the following view:

> "If such a perception of the social environment under study and the position of the informant were to take hold in Central Europe, (…) it would effectively signal the end of qualitative social sciences" (Podoba, 2002, p. 91).

The feelings and attitudes of the Slovak ethnological community at that time, as expressed in the subsequent discussion, are captured in an extremely valuable and accurate manner. The primarily descriptive overview aims to illustrate the Slovak ethnological community's hesitation to (uncritically) accept and apply the ethical standards of Western European and American anthropology. This hesitation was accompanied by concerns over potential lawsuits against researchers and institutions, as well as the need to defend the interests of basic research against the excessive application of a perspective focused on protecting the interests of informants and the communities being

studied. The following themes resonated in that discussion (Diskusia..., 2002, pp. 91–99):

(a) *Fear of (self-)censorship of sensitive topics:*

> "We thought that once communist censorship was lifted and democracy arrived, we would be able to write and publish whatever we wanted. After all, freedom of speech is guaranteed by the constitution, laws, and international conventions" (A. Mušinka, p. 91);

(b) *Disagreement with the anonymisation of locations*: Arguments against anonymisation were based on the "good practices of the old school" (p. 93), which involved:

> "We were taught to record not only the age, education, and social status of each informant but also their biographies for significant informants. In the work of XY,[35] no informant's name is mentioned; all are hidden under pseudonyms. Even in the photocopies of pages from the village chronicle included in the work's appendix, the name of the village has been changed to ZZ,[36] leaving only the initials of names and surnames" (A. Mušinka, p. 92).

Another argument against the anonymisation of locations and informants was the difficulty of verifying data when locations were anonymised:

35 The name is anonymised.
36 The name is anonymised.

> "But how will I be able to verify what you wrote there? How will anyone conduct a repeat research after several years or decades?" (A. Mušinka, p. 92);

> "But it is absurd to obscure names and villages. Because then, with some experience, I can just write it from the comfort of my desk" (M. Dubayová, p. 94).

The discussion also pointed out that research and outputs in visual anthropology are difficult to anonymise:

> "It is relatively easy for you when your output is a textual report. But what about us, who conduct visual research? How do we blacken that out? Visual anthropology is over that way!" (I. Murín, p. 95);

(c) *Doubts about whether anonymisation truly protects locations and informants*:

> "If you are conducting a case study from a specific location, you must illustrate the key influential groups in that area, their arguments, and various strategies. In such cases, even the initials of the informants are often identifiable by local residents" (V. Feglová, p. 93);

> "…we anonymise or conceal their identity using different initials, etc. However, because the content is highly individualised, filled with

> specific facts, names, locations, and contexts, it is very likely that their identity could still be revealed" (H. Hlôšková, p. 98);

(d) *Dilemmas over whether to censor sensitive statements made by informants* (in recordings or transcripts) *or to preserve and not censor them for the sake of scientific accuracy* (V. Feglová, p. 93);

(e) *Acknowledgement of the inconsistent application of obtaining of written consent during research* (V. Feglová, p. 94);

(f) *Concerns about potential lawsuits against researchers* (highlighted by the *Rómsky dejepis* case) (A. Mušinka, pp. 91–92; M. Dubayová, p. 94) were described by M. Paríková as the "absurd boundlessness of possible accusations" (p. 94);

(g) *Concerns about exploring sensitive topics, particularly in Romani communities* (as highlighted again by the *Rómsky dejepis* case):

> "I sincerely hope that if problems arise, I can somehow defend myself. However, I intend to stop researching them [Roma], because it is becoming increasingly delicate, especially given the sensitive issue of race. (…) For any small matter, one can be labelled a racist" (M. Dubayová, p. 94);[37, 38]

(h) *Perceived problems with so-called "political correctness"* (e.g., J. Podoba, 2002 p. 91);

37 In this context, Ethnic and Racial studies, including the Romani studies, use a recent term "libeling".

38 After *Rómsky dejepis* causa there was a tendency to anonymise the locality and interlocutors' names in Romani studies in Slovakia, see, e.g., Kužel, 2003.

(i) *The need for the formulation of standards of research conduct* (M. Paríková, pp. 94, 98; J. Darulová, p. 98), as well as guidelines for handling archival material (O. Bodorová, p. 95), or the creation of a "protective organisation" (V. Feglová, p. 97).

At the end of the meeting, the future president of the *ESS*, H. Hlôšková, proposed to set up a working committee composed of representatives from various institutions with the aim of drafting ethical regulations inspired by existing ethical codes (H. Hlôšková, p. 98).

In the contribution that followed the open discussion, A. Bitušíková summarised key regulations of Western anthropology, including the use of written informed consent and statements on authorship and use of research results. Bitušíková emphasised that the fundamental requirement of ethnological research is to avoid harming the people and communities being studied. In this context, she informed the audience that, in Western anthropology, pseudonyms are commonly used instead of real names for locations and authors. However, this practice comes with the risk of unverifiable data and the possibility of falsifying research or writing publications from the comfort of one's desk. Additionally, Bitušíková raised questions she considered highly relevant to anthropology: What specific challenges do anthropologists face when researching vulnerable and marginalised communities? Is there a hierarchy among the levels of responsibility for an anthropologist (informants, the communities being studied, the general society, science and the scientific community, particular research donors, the state, and the decision-making sphere as the founders of institutions employing researchers)? (Bitušíková, 2002, p. 100).

In the final contribution to the discussion, J. Zajonc addressed the legal background governing ethnological

and anthropological research in light of new legislation. He outlined the rules for collecting and using information for scientific purposes (even without the need for explicit consent from affected persons). He also detailed the regulations concerning the archiving of data from field research within the scientific collections of the Institute of Ethnology SAS and the rules for making these scientifically accessible (Zajonc, 2002, pp. 101–103).

Another discussion on ethics was initiated in 2009 by the *Slovak Association of Social Anthropologists* (*SASA*) during the workshop "Ethics in Ethnology/Social Anthropology" (January 23, 2009, Bratislava) (for more, see Kiliánová 2010, p. 98). These discussions gradually led to the formalisation of ethical codes regulating professional ethics in ethnology and anthropology in Slovakia (2013 and 2017).

Ethical Codes and Guidelines in the Czech Republic and Slovakia

During the transformation period (1990s and 2000s), CE anthropologists and ethnologists were increasingly engaged with international scholarly communities, adopting and adapting ethical codes from organisations such as the *American Anthropological Association* (*AAA*), the *International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences* (*IUAES*), and the *European Association for Social Anthropology* (*EASA*). These codes emphasised informed consent, respect for the dignity and privacy of research subjects, and the avoidance of harm.

The first code of ethics for ethnological research in the Czech Republic was the *Code of Ethics of the Czech Ethnological Society* (*CES*, founded in 1891), which was approved by the General Assembly of *CES* in Pilsen on September 16, 2014 (CE CES). The most recent version of the code, updated in 2016, is available on the official *CES* website, which has recorded 6,074 reads and 1,600 downloads of the English version [accessed Sept 15, 2024]. The *Code of Ethics of CES* aims to outline:

> "…the basic principles for defining professional responsibility of ethnologists concerning the discipline of ethnology, studied people (subjects of research—respondents, informants, narrators), collected data of tangible and intangible character, initiators and sponsors of research, colleagues and coworkers, students and volunteers (including correspondents to CES), the general public, and the entire society" (CE CES).

The Code claims to be inspired by "the structure of key Czech and foreign ethnological, folkloristic, anthropological, and museological ethical codes, which have been modified for the purposes of the CES" (CE CES). The Code explains the core rules of ethics in research, publishing, archiving, and care for research results, applied ethnology and publicity, promotion, and education in ethnology.

The *Czech Association for Social Anthropology* (*CASA*, founded in 2008) is the scientific non-governmental platform for social anthropologists in the Czech Republic. *The Ethical Code of the Czech Association for Social Anthropology* (EC CASA)[39] was written to guide ethical practices in social anthropology, ensuring that researchers conduct their work with integrity and respect for the communities they study. EC CASA aligns with broader

39 The EC CASA document does not indicate the official date of approval.

European and global ethical standards, including those of the *AAA* and the *World Anthropological Union*. EC CASA declares in its preamble to be based on the *Ethical Code of Research Workers of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic* (EC CAS). This ethical code outlines the fundamental issues, values, and attitudes to which the members of the *CASA* subscribe. It calls for respect for human dignity, informed consent, confidentiality, and responsibility towards research participants and communities.

On a more specific level, these issues are addressed (mostly in the form of recommendations) in the *CASA Ethical Guidelines* (EG CASA), which declare to rely on the *Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association* (version from March 2002), the *Code of Ethics of the AAA* (version from May 1998), the *Code of Ethics of the Australian Anthropological Society*, and *Plagiarism Guidelines of the Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Cambridge University* (EG CASA).

The guidelines are informed by the findings of ethical panels convened for specific cases and reflect the outcomes of the broader ongoing discussion on the ethics of scientific and research work within the *CASA*, organised around four major thematic clusters:

> "(1) Relationship of researchers to people/ studied community; (2) Relationships and responsibility towards financial support providers and research sponsors; (3) Relationships with colleagues; (4) Relationships with students" (EG CASA).

In Slovakia, researchers only gained the opportunity to freely study the works of Western ethnological and anthropological literature, and to follow contemporary methodological discussions and the development of humanities and social disciplines in the post-modern era, after 1989 (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 97). Towards the end of the first and at the beginning of the second transformation decade, as part of the developing comparative religious studies, the first-ever stationary anthropological research in Slovakia that adhered to Western standards was conducted among the Indigenous Maya ethnic group of the Lacandons at Nahá, Lacanjá, and Betel in the tropical forest of Chiapas, Mexico (1999–2000).[40]

The translation of the current version of the *Code of Ethics of the AAA* in the *Slovenský národopis*, *48*(3–4) journal in 2000 was an attempt to at least partially bridge the gap in the professional approach to ethical design of fieldwork research in Slovakia (translated from English to Slovak by T. Podolinská). In the post-socialist period, given the limited language proficiency and availability of resources, this option of introducing the source document to the Slovak academic fellows seemed optimal.

According to K. Jakubíková, the initial attempts to address research ethics in ethnology appeared shortly after 1989. During that period, Milan Leščák and Kornélia Jakubíková prepared the first draft of the *Ethical Code of ESS*. However, the document remained only in the form of a proposal (Kiliánová, 2010, p. 98).

In 2007, the *Slovak Association of Social Anthropologists* (*SASA*) was founded, and its first General Assembly was held in 2008. Among other commissions and sections established, the *SASA* Ethics Commission was formed. In January

40 For the research results, see Kováč and Podolinská, 2001; Podolinská and Kováč, 2001; Kováč and Zachar Podolinská, 2017. For the research context, see Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 212–213).

2009, the Commission organised a workshop on "Ethics in Ethnology/Social Anthropology" to discuss the progressive development of a code of ethics for the discipline (Kiliánová, 2010, p. 98).

Based on the discussions held, the *Ethical Code of the SASA* was developed and adopted by the *SASA* Council on February 25, 2013 (EC SASA), marking the first domestic ethical code specifically addressing anthropological research in Slovakia. The code drew inspiration from international initiatives and codes of ethics in social and cultural anthropology, particularly the *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice* of the Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth 1999 and the *Statements of Ethics. Principles of Professional Responsibility*. Council of *AAA* of 1971, with subsequent amendments made in 1986 (based on Kiliánová, 2010, p. 98). The core thematic topics of the EC SASA are as follows:

> "(1) Relationship of researchers to research participants (informants); (2) Responsibility towards the scientific community; (3) Ethics and the teaching process; (4) Relationship to government and political authorities; (5) Relationship to sponsors and employers; (6) Responsibility towards the public" (EC SASA).

The key principles of the Code are: no harm, informed consent, respect for cultural diversity, and maintaining professional integrity. The updated Code was approved by the *SASA* General Assembly on October 7, 2021.

The *Ethical Code of the Ethnographic Society of Slovakia* (*ESS*), adopted at the 20th General Assembly of the *ESS* in Párnica on September 7, 2017 (EC ESS), is another ethical code for ethnological and anthropological research. The key principles of Code are: respect for research participants, informed consent, confidentiality, and avoiding harm. The EC ESS drew inspiration from the *Code of Ethics of the AAA*, the *Considerations and Recommendations Concerning Internet Research and Human Subjects Research Regulations* (SACHRP, 2013), *Ethical decision-making and Internet research* (AoIR, 2002, 2012), CE CES (version 2015), as well as domestic sources, EC FSES CU (2014) and the Personal Data Protection and Copyright Act (2015) (EC ESS). The areas covered by this Code are primarily scientific research, archiving, data management and publication, media coverage and promotion of research results, and teaching ethnology. The basic principles of the *Ethical Code of ESS* are as follows:

> "(1) the researcher shall ensure that their research does not to harm or endanger the people and communities he or she is researching; (2) the researcher shall maintain transparency in all situations and honesty regarding the objectives and implications of their research; (3) the researcher is accountable to research subjects, the scientific community, and the wider public" (EC ESS).

In the late 2010s, Slovakia saw significant progress towards establishing a national strategy in the field of ethics and scientific integrity. In October 2019, key stakeholders from the science and research sectors in Slovakia convened to form a working group tasked with developing a *National Declaration on Strengthening*

Research Integrity in Slovakia.[41] The Declaration, which was set to be implemented starting in October 2020, aimed to define a code of research ethics and integrity for all research institutions in Slovakia. This initiative was part of the activities of the national project for Horizontal Support of Slovakia's Participation in the European Research Area (SK4ERA). Since January 2016, this project has been implemented by the Slovak Centre of Scientific and Technical Information (SCTI SR).

The amendment to the Act on State Support for Research and Development of 2022 mandated the Ministry of Education to develop a national ethical code. Following this, in August 2023, the Slovak government approved the strategic document titled "Long-term Plan of the Ministry of Education in Educational, Research, Development, Artistic, and Other Creative Activities for Higher Education Institutions for 2023–28". This plan includes measures for defining and promoting ethical rules throughout the academic environment. As a result, the *Code of Scientific Integrity and Ethics in Slovakia* (the "Code") was developed. The Ministry of Education has recently submitted the Code for interdepartmental review, with academic and scientific institutions, as well as the general public, being invited to contribute to its final form by October 5, 2023.[42,43]

The Code of Scientific Integrity and Ethics in Slovakia is a binding document for all science and research workers, as well as for all institutions (both public and private)

41 Source: https://www.minedu.sk/slovenske-vedecke-institucie-smeruju-k-upevneniu-vyskumnej-integrity/ [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

42 Source: https://www.minedu.sk/m-fedak-slovensko-bude-mat-po-prvykrat-zavazny-kodex-vedeckej-integrity-a-etiky/ [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

43 The Code is available at: https://www.slov-lex.sk/legislativne-procesy?p_p_id=processDetail_WAR_portletsel&p_p_lifecycle=2&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_cacheability=cacheLevelPage&p_p_col_id=column-2&p_p_col_count=1&_processDetail_WAR_portletsel_fileCooaddr=COO.2145.1000.3.5829325&_processDetail_WAR_portletsel_file=KODEX--pre-vedecku-integritu-a-etiku-na-Slovensku-do-MPK.docx&_processDetail_WAR_portletsel_action=getFile [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

conducting research and science in Slovakia, including international scientific and technological cooperation projects. In its preamble, the Code declares the following objective:

> "The mission of the Code is to contribute to the general and integral adherence to rigorous ethical standards, as well as to prevent unethical and dishonest conduct and behaviour in the fields of science, research, and development, thereby enhancing their quality and credibility in both domestic and international contexts. The Code complements the legal regulations of the Slovak Republic,[44] legally binding acts of the European Union, and international treaties and agreements".[45]

In section 3.1. "General Ethical Values, Principles, and Standards", the Code declares the freedom of scientific research, investigative, developmental, and academic activities as their fundamental value and essential prerequisite, which includes their independence from political, ideological, or religious influences, referencing the Bonn Declaration.

44 Particularly Act No. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions, as amended; Act No. 269/2018 Coll. on Ensuring the Quality of Higher Education and on the Amendment and Supplementation of Act No. 343/2015 Coll. on Public Procurement and on the Amendment and Supplementation of Certain Acts, as amended; Act No. 172/2005 Coll. on the Organisation of State Support for Research and Development and on the Amendment and Supplementation of Act No. 575/2001 Coll. on the Organisation of Government Activities and the Organisation of Central State Administration, as amended; Act No. 18/2018 Coll. on the Protection of Personal Data, as amended.

45 HE Framework Programme Regulation 2021/695, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/695/oj,HE Specific Programme Decision 2021/764, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32021D0764 [accessed Aug 11, 2024]. The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity - ALLEA, https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/; OECD Global Science Forum, Investigating Research Misconduct Allegations in International Collaborative Research Projects. A PRACTICAL GUIDE. April 2009, https://ukrio.org/news/spotlight-oecd-guide-for-investigating-misconduct-in-international-collaborative-research/ [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

The Code also stipulates (in section 3.2.2.) that the ethical requirements for ensuring scientific integrity in the research environment are upheld by research institutions, organisations, and universities primarily by (3.2.2.b) formulating clear rules and procedures for proper scientific and research practice, as well as for the appropriate and transparent handling of violations thereof, and (3.2.2.c) creating an environment that allows their staff to work according to the principles of proper scientific and research practice, to freely and openly discuss ethical dilemmas and unintentional mistakes in the execution of scientific and research activities without concerns about potential consequences or punishments (so-called "blame-free reporting").

Scientific researchers and university teachers (section 3.2.4) fulfil the ethical requirements for ensuring the integrity of research procedures by (3.2.4d) publishing the results and interpretation of research honestly, transparently, and accurately; (e) maintaining the confidentiality of data or findings in justified cases; (3.2.4f) describing the obtained results and the methodology used (including the use of external services, artificial intelligence, or automated tools) in a way that allows for the verification or replication of research. Institutions, among other things, (3.2.7a) ensure appropriate management, methods of obtaining, processing, and organising all data, metadata, protocols, software, and other research materials, including unpublished ones, as well as their secure storage for an appropriate period; (3.2.7d) inform participants in research about how their personal data will be protected, who will have access to it, for what purposes it will be used, how, when, and under what conditions it will be deleted; they process the consent of the affected person for the processing of personal data in

accordance with applicable legal regulations; (3.2.7g) respect legal regulations and rules related to data protection. (3.2.8d) All research partners are required to evaluate the feasibility, potential impact, and ethical implications of the research together before the research begins.

In section 4.2, the Code outlines various questionable scientific practices, including: a(i) insufficient or deliberately incorrect (manipulative) management of research data, which encompasses the acquisition, processing, storage, and provision of data that contravenes legal regulations, relevant professional recommendations, and generally accepted professional procedures and standards; a(ii) inadequately security or improper storage of primary data; c(v) failure to obtain the opinion of the relevant ethics committees on the proposal of a research or development project; e(v) false accusations or slander of a researcher regarding violations of methodological or ethical research rules.

A person accused of a violation has the right to respect and protection of their integrity, confidentiality, dignity, and rights, as well as the right to have the case resolved within a reasonable time frame. During the investigation period, the presumption of innocence applies (Article 5).

The Code represents the first nationwide guideline establishing basic standards of scientific ethics, integrity, and collaboration for both individual researchers and all research institutions in Slovakia. As such, it is an important milestone and a fundamental reference for professional ethics, to which all specialised ethical codes and guidelines should adhere.

ETHICAL CONTROVERSIES AND BREACHES OF RESEARCH CONDUCT IN ETHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Selected Cases of Ethnology and Anthropology in the 20th and 21st Centuries

Ethnology and social anthropology have been shaped by several ethical cases that illustrate the evolution of ethical standards within these disciplines. These cases frequently reveal significant ethical dilemmas and controversies, reflecting the challenges anthropologists face in their interactions with studied communities, including breaches of ethical standards and fundamental principles of scientific honesty, rigour, and integrity.

In the early days of anthropology, many ethnographers conducted research in colonial contexts, often with the support of colonial governments. These relationships gave rise to significant ethical issues, as anthropologists were sometimes seen as complicit in the colonial exploitation and domination of Indigenous populations. The work of early anthropologists such as Edward Burnett Tylor and James Frazer frequently lacked critical engagement with the colonial environments in which they operated, leading to ethical criticisms regarding the representation and treatment of the communities they studied.[46]

One of the best-known ethical case in modern social anthropology is associated with Bronisław Malinowski, a Polish-born British anthropologist, who is widely considered the father of modern ethnography. His groundbreaking fieldwork in the Trobriand Islands off the coast of Papua New Guinea transformed the methodology of cultural research in anthropology. By immersing himself in the daily lives of the Trobriand Islanders and actively participating in their routines, Malinowski obtained unparalleled insights into their social structures, economic systems, and religious practices.

Malinowski's portrayal of the Trobriand Islanders in his published works, such as *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*

46 For the colonial context of early anthropological works and ethical implications of their research practices, see, e.g., Stocking, 1968; Asad, Ed., 1973; etc.

(1922), influenced the shaping of Western perceptions of their society and culture. However, critics argued that his accounts were overly romanticised or that they simplified complex social structures and relationships. Despite his emphasis on cultural relativism, critics contend that Malinowski's work was still influenced by ethnocentric and colonialist perspectives (for a detailed analysis, see Young, 2004). His interpretations of Trobriand culture were filtered through his own cultural lens, potentially leading to biased and distorted representations (e.g., Clifford, 1988; Scheper-Hughes, 1995).

Malinowski's groundbreaking approach to participant observation also raised ethical questions about his impact on the community and the extent to which he was transparent about his research goals. His method of living among the Trobriand Islanders and participating in their daily activities raised concerns about the boundaries between the researcher and the "subjects". The questions addressed the extent to which the Trobriand Islanders understood the nature and purpose of Malinowski's research. The power dynamics inherent in the researcher-subject relationship led to criticisms that Malinowski might have exploited his "subjects" for the sake of scientific observation, without adequately addressing their rights or perspectives (e.g., Gough, 1968; Asad, Ed., 1973).

One of the most significant controversies arose from the posthumous publication of Malinowski's personal diaries. Published in 1967 as *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*, these diaries revealed Malinowski's private thoughts and feelings during his fieldwork. The entries contained candid and often derogatory remarks about the Trobriand Islanders, which starkly contrasted with the more respectful tone of his published ethnographic works. The diaries exposed

Malinowski's inner struggles, prejudices, and frustrations, raising questions about his genuine attitudes toward the people he studied. This revelation led to debates about the ethical implications of his fieldwork and the authenticity of his ethnographic accounts (e.g., Young, 2004), including the questioning the correctness or incorrectness of publishing Malinowski's private diary.

Building upon Malinowski's work, Franz Boas, a German-American anthropologist, often regarded as the father of American anthropology, championed the concept of *cultural relativism*, arguing that cultures should be understood on their own terms and anthropologists should avoid ethnocentric judgments (1920). Boas believed that anthropologists had a primary ethical responsibility to their "subjects" and to the integrity of their scientific work. He emphasised the importance of maintaining the trust and respect of studied communities and was critical of practices that he saw as exploitative or unethical.

Boas challenged the idea of *scientific racism* (fixed racial hierarchies) and argued that culture, not race, determines human behaviour. In this context, he emphasised the importance of understanding cultural contexts and criticised the ethnocentrism inherent in earlier anthropological studies (e.g., 1911; 1928). This principle challenged prevailing notions of cultural superiority and had profound effects on the ethical conduct of anthropological research.

However, Boas himself faced severe ethical dilemmas. In 1919, he publicly accused four anthropologists of using their academic positions as a cover for espionage during World War I. In a letter published in *The Nation*, Boas asserted that these anthropologists had betrayed the trust placed in them as scientists by engaging in espionage activities for the U.S. government. This led to his censure by the *American*

Anthropological Association (*AAA*), highlighting the tension between national loyalty and professional ethics.

The controversy raised important questions about the professional integrity of anthropologists and the potential conflicts between scientific research and national interests. Boas' stance highlighted the importance of maintaining a clear boundary between scientific inquiry and governmental or military activities. Boas' accusations led to significant backlash within the anthropological community. The *AAA* responded by formally censuring Boas. In 1919, the *AAA* passed a resolution condemning Boas' actions and removed him from its governing council. This censure was a rare and severe rebuke, reflecting the deep divisions and strong emotions within the discipline over the issue (for more see, e.g., Harrison, 1997; Browman, 2011).

The controversy is often examined within the broader historical context of World War I and the early development of anthropology as a professional discipline (Harrison, 1997). The Boas-*AAA* controversy underscored the importance of ethical standards in anthropology. It highlighted the potential conflicts between scientific integrity and national interests, prompting ongoing discussions about the ethical responsibilities of anthropologists. The incident emphasised the need for anthropologists to maintain professional integrity and avoid compromising their research for political purposes.

Another subject of significant ethical and methodological controversy is Margaret Mead's research in Samoa, particularly her book *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928). In her seminal work, Mead described Samoan adolescents as experiencing a more relaxed and permissive sexual culture compared to their Western counterparts. However, her findings were later heavily criticised and debated, especially

following the publication of Derek Freeman's critiques. Freeman argued that Mead's findings were fundamentally flawed and that she had been misled by her informants. He claimed that Samoan society was not as sexually permissive as Mead had reported (Freeman, 1983). In his follow-up work, Freeman provided further evidence and analysis to support his critique of Mead's research (1999).

The core of the controversy revolves around Mead's portrayal of Samoan adolescence and whether her findings were accurate or misrepresented. Freeman's critique suggested that Mead's conclusions were based on inaccurate information provided by her informants, while Mead's defenders argue that her work remains a valuable, though imperfect, contribution to anthropology. The debate has highlighted broader issues of methodological rigour, the reliability of informants, and the impact of researcher bias (for more see, e.g., Orans, 1996; Shankman, 2009). This case highlights the ethical challenges of interpretation, the potential biases of researchers, and the importance of critically evaluating fieldwork methods and data.

In the latter half of the 20th century, one of the most controversial cases is Napoleon Chagnon's work with the Yanomami people of the Amazon basin. The primary ethical issues concern his portrayal of the Yanomami, his research methods, and the long-term impacts of his work on the Yanomami community.

Chagnon's description of the Yanomami as a "fierce people" engaged in constant warfare (1968, 1974, 1992) was criticised for potentially exacerbating conflicts and misrepresenting the community. Critics argue that this portrayal was sensationalised and contributed to negative stereotypes, potentially aggravating violence and conflicts within and against the Yanomami community.

Chagnon has been accused of using intrusive methods and not obtaining proper informed consent from the Yanomami. His methods have been criticised for potentially causing harm to the community by disrupting their social structures and exposing them to external threats. Critics argue that Chagnon's work, particularly in collaboration with geneticist James Neel, involved unethical practices, such as introducing measles vaccines without proper consent or understanding of the implications. These actions allegedly had detrimental effects on the Yanomami population (for more see, e.g., Sahlins, 2000).

In his article "Yanomami Warfare: A Political History" published in *American Ethnologist*, Brian Ferguson (1995) criticised Chagnon's interpretation of Yanomami violence, arguing that external factors, such as contact with outsiders, played a significant role in shaping Yanomami warfare.

In his book *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon* (2001), Patrick Tierney critically examines the impact of Chagnon's work on the Yanomami. He accuses Chagnon and Neel of unethical practices and highlights the negative consequences of their research. David Stoll (2000) reviews the controversy, discussing the ethical implications of Chagnon's research methods and the accusations made by Tierney. Alice Dreger, in her article published in *Human Nature* in 2011, critically analyses the ethical and professional conflicts that arose within the *AAA* based on Tierney's accusations and the broader implications for the field of anthropology. The article delves into the debates over ethical standards, the responsibilities of anthropologists, and the impact of these controversies on the discipline. Based on lessons learned from Chagnon's case, Dreger concludes, that current anthropology is:

> "facing the challenging duty of protecting scholarship and scholars from baseless and sensationalistic charges in the era of the Internet and twenty-four-hour news cycles" (Dreger, 2011, p. 225).

In 2009, Chagnon successfully compelled the *AAA* to remove the Task Force report—which included allegation that he had paid his subjects to kill one another—from its website. Despite a 2005 membership vote to revoke the report's acceptance, the *AAA* had left it online without a clear indication that the membership had rescinded its endorsement. Chagnon also sought a formal apology from the *AAA* through his lawyer, but the leadership declined (Dreger, 2011, p. 243.) In 2013 (six years before his death), Chagnon published a book *Noble Savages: My Life Among Two Dangerous Tribes—The Yanomamö and the Anthropologists*.

Another widely known case of misconduct in the late 20th century is associated with Mart Bax, an emeritus professor at Vrije Universiteit (VU) Amsterdam. In 2012, VU Amsterdam initiated an investigation into the work of this Dutch anthropologist, who was suspected of scientific fraud. The university began its investigation following the publication of the book *Ontspoorde Wetenschap* [Derailed Science] by science journalist Frank van Kolfschooten. In this book, van Kolfschooten raised questions about Bax's research on an alleged massacre at Medjugorje during the Bosnian War.[47] On September 9, 2013, a commission consisting of Prof. Michiel Baud (University of Amsterdam), Prof. Susan Legêne (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), and

47 See: https://retractionwatch.com/2013/09/23/dutch-anthropologist-mart-bax-faked-61-papers-says-university/ [accessed July 20, 2024].

Prof. Peter Pels (Leiden University) presented the report "Circumventing Reality: Report on the Anthropological Work of Professor Emeritus M. M. G. Bax", which they had drafted at the request of the VU Amsterdam in the Netherlands (Salemink and Verrips, 2020, p. 145).[48]

The investigation revealed that Bax had produced numerous publications and written about events in Medjugorje, Bosnia, that never occurred (e.g., Bax, 1995), as well as about places in the province of Noord-Brabant, the Netherlands, which did not exist.[49] This fictional "empirical" material underpinned Bax's theory of religious regimes and his academic career.

Interestingly, Bax refused to provide information and sources about these events and places to the investigating commission, claiming to protect his informants by using pseudonyms and inventing geographical names for his field sites. He argued that this was in line with the core ethical principle of "do not harm" in anthropology. As a result, it took a long time for the scientific community to realise that he was simply fabricating research.

The investigation committee concluded that, throughout his whole research career, Bax invented field sites, source material, informants, and research problems (see Margry, 2019 on this issue). The absence of historical evidence of a violent conflict between different Catholic groups in Medjugorje resulted in Bax being labelled as a "scientific confabulator" and fraud.[50] Some of his formerly

48 The final report *Circumventing Reality Report on the Anthropological Work of Professor Emeritus M. M. G. Bax* was published on September 9, 2013, at: https://research.vu.nl/files/3526313/Rapport%20Commissie%20Baud%20Engelse%20versie%20def.pdf [accessed July 20, 2024].

49 Based on *Retraction Watch page*, Bax produced at least 61 papers and invented awards and other parts of his CV, according to a university investigation (https://retractionwatch.com/2013/09/23/dutch-anthropologist-mart-bax-faked-61-papers-says-university/) [accessed July 20, 2024].

50 For a detailed description of the case see, e.g., Baud et al., 2013; Margry, 2019; Salemink and Verrips, 2020; etc.

published articles in scholarly journals were retracted (Bax, 2000a, b in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* and *Ethnos*) while many others did not (e.g., Bax, 1997).[51]

For modern ethnology and anthropology, the Bax case served as a lesson that the anonymisation and pseudo-anonymisation of informants and research locations for the purpose of protecting informants can lead researchers into the temptation to fabricate and falsify data to gain career advantages and attract the attention of the scientific community. The Bax case thus underscored the importance of upholding scientific integrity of researchers in the spirit of protecting science, maintaining the rigour of scientific procedures, and ensuring responsibility towards the academic community and institutions.

As the ethical controversies of the 20th and 21st centuries discussed here suggest, most of them stem from the assumptions anthropologists bring to the "field". When not limited to pure description or "thick description" (Geertz, 1973), they tend to—based on their anthropological training—*actively seek* recurring patterns amid a tangle of details, reactions, and interactions they encounter, focusing on recurring behavioural and cultural patterns. Anthropologists do this in good faith, believing their task is to capture, name, sort, and classify the reality they observe using analytical scientific tools, thereby simplifying the complexity of the communities they study into structured schemes. However, in this entirely relevant pursuit, they often fall into the trap of their own discipline, over-generalising, over-formalising, and exaggerating certain elements as core and dominant while silencing others.

51 The list of retracted articles is available at: https://retractionwatch.com/2020/05/07/it-took-a-long-time-for-the-scientific-community-to-realize-that-he-was-simply-making-things-up/ [accessed July 20, 2024].

As a result, the final depiction may easily contain elements of stylisation. The researcher can become trapped in a disciplinary pitfall, where any follow-up research, whether by themselves or by another researcher, might easily disprove or challenge their theory by highlighting previously unseen aspects and overlooking what were once considered dominant features, resulting in an entirely different picture. Setting aside "sensation seekers", who sometimes colour or even fabricate counter-facts, or "perpetual critics", who would criticise any research, even the position of the "humble and honest" critic is precarious—being threatened by the same disciplinary trap, as counter-arguments typically highlight and pinpoint specific facts while overlooking others.

However, it remains an indisputable fact that the said works would hardly be produced today, or, if they were, they would not be written in a manner that could harm or discredit the communities being studied. Based on these examples, the principle of non-harm, maintaining scientific integrity, and responsibility both to the studied community and the scientific community have become the central principles of modern and post-modern anthropology.

Ethical issues in Romani studies in Slovakia

The most significant ethical controversies in Slovak ethnology and anthropology relate to the research and publication of data concerning vulnerable, impoverished, and marginalised communities, especially those ethnically defined as "marginalised Roma communities" in Slovakia.

Both cases, during their respective periods of relevance, not only attracted significant media attention but also represent important milestones in the discussions on ethics and the mission of basic and applied scientific research. Their significance and impact extended beyond Slovakia's borders. Undoubtedly, the first case directly contributed to the formulation of the first ethical codes within anthropological studies in Slovakia (2013, 2017). The second case prompted social scientists in Slovakia and the Czech Republic to discuss the freedom of research, the specificities of anthropological research, and the need to formulate rights for the protection of researchers (and institutions) studying sensitive topics or conducting research in vulnerable communities. At the same time, it confirmed the urgent need to establish context-specific standards for such research.

In 2000, Slovak mass media reported on the controversy around the book *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma History], written by Arne B. Mann, a researcher at the Institute of Ethnology SAS.[52] Shortly after its release, the book faced censorship; the publishing house Kalligram was sued by an individual, leading to the book being pulled from distribution. The issue arose because the text referenced the surname of the complainant's long-deceased relatives, although the spelling differed from that of the complainant's own surname (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 222).

Rómsky dejepis is a brief, illustrated supplementary textbook designed for second-grade elementary school pupils. It aims to explain the history and contemporary realities of the Roma minority in an understandable way, thereby fostering ethnic tolerance in society. The author wrote this book in response to an initiative by the Ministry of Education. In 1994, the State Pedagogical Institute of the Slovak Republic received his manuscript, professionally reviewed

52 The case was described in detail in Kiliánová, 2001; Mann, 2001; and Zachar Podolinská and Popelková 2023, pp. 220–228. Here, a condensed summary of the case is offered because of its relevance to the topic of the publication.

it, and approved it in 1995 with a recommendation for publication (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 222).

In 1999, the publication of the manuscript in Slovakia was championed by P. Csáky, the Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights and Ethnic Groups. The book was released by the Kalligram publishing house at the end of that year. On December 10, 1999, coinciding with Human Rights Day, *Rómsky dejepis* was distributed at Bratislava Castle. The release of the book generated significant positive media attention at the turn of the millennium (Kiliánová, 2001; Mann, 2001).

In 2000, after a distant ancestor of a famous musician's Roma family contacted the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic to protest the book's publication, the Kalligram publishing house withdrew *Rómsky dejepis* from bookstore shelves. Despite the publisher redacting the surnames of two Roma families as requested by the complainant, by May 2000, he did not consent to the book's redistribution.

Additionally, P. Husár, the Government Plenipotentiary for Personal Data Protection in Information Systems, intervened. In November 2000, he summoned A. Mann for an interview and ruled that Mann needed to present written consents from all individuals mentioned in *Rómsky dejepis*, in accordance with Act No. 52/1998 Coll. on Personal Data Protection in Information Systems. This decision was made despite the law not specifying the form of consent required and Mann having oral consents from all mentioned individuals (Kiliánová, 2001). The author did not have consent from the complainant, as he was not mentioned in the publication and was completely unknown to the author (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 223).

At the end of 2000, the Institute of Ethnology SAS (IE SAS) became involved in the case as well. The then director of the Institute, G. Kiliánová, approached several colleagues from the SAS Science Section III (Social Science and Humanities). Together with the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the SAS Science Section III, Ľ. Falťan, Chairman of the Scientific Board of the Institute of History SAS in 1990s and 2000s, I. Kamenec, and Director of the SAS Institute of State and Law, J. Vozár, they drafted the "Opinion of the directors of scientific institutes on the issue of Act No. 52/1998 Coll. on Personal Data Protection in Information Systems and on its application" (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 223–224).

According to this opinion, endorsed by the majority of directors of the SAS Science Section III and several directors from other SAS organisations, the book should be considered a scientific or artistic text and thus should not have been subject to the provisions of the aforementioned Act (Kiliánová, 2001).

In February 2001, the opinion was submitted to the Press Agency of the Slovak Republic and forwarded to the Slovak Government's Legislative Council, the Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights and Nationalities, and the Government Plenipotentiary for Personal Data Protection in Information Systems.

In March 2000, P. Husár sent a letter to the SAS President, inquiring about the operation of personal data information systems within the IE SAS and asking whether A. Mann had worked on the book as part of his official duties. The President of SAS, Š. Luby, forwarded the letter to the director of IE SAS, G. Kiliánová.

In April 2001, P. Husár suspended his decision prohibiting the distribution of *Rómsky dejepis*, allowing the textbook to be distributed in bookstores once again. However, in July 2001, the political party "The Roma

Initiative of Slovakia" held a press conference to express its opposition to the book, claiming it "promotes racism and intolerance". The Slovak and Czech media reported these statements without criticism, while the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic distanced itself from the controversy.

In May 2001, P. Husár sent a letter to the Director of the IE SAS, posing the same questions as in his previous letter to the President of the SAS. After consulting with J. Vozár, the Director of the Institute of State and Law, the Director of the IE SAS responded by stating that:

> "The Institute of Ethnology SAS is not the operator of the personal data information system; the IE SAS administers scientific archives"; "the right to scientific research and publication is guaranteed by the Constitution of the Slovak Republic"; "the IE SAS staff member, A. Mann, wrote *Rómsky dejepis* upon request by the Ministry of Education of Slovak Republic", and "the IE SAS created the working conditions for him to complete the task" (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, pp. 224–225).

At a meeting on October 4, 2001, P. Husár personally informed G. Kiliánová that, according to the opinion he requested from the Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic, *Rómsky dejepis* could be interpreted as an "artistic text" under Act No. 52/1998 (as far as the text of Act did not include the term "scientific text"). He noted that he intended to inform the complainant that his office would no longer be dealing with the *Rómsky dejepis* case. However, regarding the personal data information system, the plenipotentiary clarified to the Director of the Institute that the IE SAS was indeed an operator of such a system due to its collection and management of personal data of its employees.

The case proceeded to court when the complainant sued the Kalligram publishing house, seeking substantial compensation. The complainant lost the lawsuit, during which it was revealed that the Government Plenipotentiary, P. Husár, was a close relative (brother-in-law) of the complainant (Zachar Podolinská and Popelková, 2023, p. 226).

The case attracted attention not only in the media but also within the academic community. The majority of directors from SAS Science III signed the initial appeal letter, indicating that the issue had broader significance and impacted multiple social science disciplines. Similarly, several colleagues from the Institute of Ethnology SAS responded promptly to the problem. In this context, the editors of the academic journal *Etnologické rozpravy*, Z. Beňušková and P. Salner, initiated a critical discussion on the case in the second issue of 2001.

In his short Foreword to the Discussion, Peter Salner raised three issues related to the cause: (1) scientific truth, (2) professional honour, and (3) the right to personal protection. Salner noted that:

> "…the reactions against the author of *Rómsky dejepis* are more than just attacks on Arne Mann personally. They target not only a colleague but also pose a threat to the entire academic discipline and the freedom of research as such" (Salner, 2001, p. 97).

Salner further expressed disappointment towards his colleagues for their "silence". He voiced concern, stating that "many of us are currently working with sensitive topics and could easily find ourselves in the same uncomfortable situations" (2001, p. 97).

Salner fully acknowledges that:

> "Ethnology is a work involving people. We discover and uncover facts that may be unpleasant for those concerned, and their publication can cause harm. Sometimes we are aware of this, while other times we are surprised by the rejection and bitter reactions to the disclosure of true data" (2001, p. 97).

Having previously participated in an international project of Yale University, conducted by using oral history methods to study Holocaust victims in Slovakia, Salner, in his brief introduction, takes an extraordinarily reflective approach to the necessity of applying a special researcher's approach when working with groups where attributed ethnicity can bring societal stigma or be associated with marginalisation, discrimination, or even persecution. In this context, he expressed the following opinion:

> "It seems that when we identify someone as of Jewish or Roma origin, we have simply fulfilled our duty by stating the truth. However, not every Jew wants to be identified as Jewish, nor does every Roma person identify as Roma. Many seek to integrate into the majority society, aspiring to become its members. They adopt the prevailing cultural or religious norms and values and raise their children in this spirit. Personally, I am convinced that individuals have the right to claim the identity (ethnic, confessional) they chose… (…) Yet, it suddenly appears in black and white that, despite all efforts, these people remain 'others'. They must confront the 'shame' or potential shock their children might experience when the family name appears in such a context in a work intended not just for a small circle of specialised experts, but for the general public" (Salner, 2001, pp. 97–98).

Salner has no doubts about the positive motivation of the author of *Rómsky dejepis*, his professional merits, scientific qualification, and his lifelong efforts to improve the image of the Roma and to help them without harming any individual. However, he concludes:

> "The very conflict between the author's good intentions and the creation of a 'contentious work' should compel the entire scholarly community to carefully consider answers to three contentious questions (…): (Where) are the boundaries of publishing truthful information?; Do we feel an obligation (or at least a need) to defend colleagues who are under external attack, and thereby defend the discipline (including ourselves)?; Are we aware of the sensitive information we are dealing with?" (Salner, 2001, p. 98).

Z. Beňušková, in her brief introduction to the discussion regarding the controversy, noted that the displeasure among the Roma community was partly due to the fact that such a publication was written by a non-Roma and that "the author did not consult with Roma leaders" (2001, p. 98). Beňušková concluded by pointing out that:

> "…this is not the first scholarly work to be placed on the 'undesirable' list at the initiative of the Roma. A similar fate befell the nine-part television series *Children of the Wind*,[53] which in Germany (and subsequently in some other countries) can only be broadcast in a five-part, significantly reduced version" (Beňušková, 2001, p. 98).

The discussion in *Etnologické rozpravy* continued with two texts by Arne B. Mann (2001, pp. 99–100) and G. Kiliánová, then Director of the IE SAS (2001, pp. 100–101). Mann's contribution was limited to providing a detailed chronology of the controversy (starting from 1993 until November 28, 2001). G. Kiliánová summarised the case from the perspective of IE SAS's involvement, concluding with the following observation:

> "The dispute over the *Rómsky dejepis* textbook revealed ambiguities in Act No. 52/1998 Coll. The first issue concerns the definition of an artistic (scientific) text, raising the question of whether the relevant law applies and whether the author is required to fulfil the conditions set by the law for the protection of personal data" (Kiliánová, 2001, p. 101).

Kiliánová also suggested that the issue of publishing sensitive data be revisited in a future discussion at a scientific forum (2001, p. 101).

In another contribution to the discussion, J. Podoba took a remarkably strict stance in favour of the author of the publication and against the affected Roma families, stating:

> "After all, anyone with even elementary knowledge of the history of music in Slovakia knows that XYZ[54] are a family of well-known Roma musicians. The national or ethnic identity that the close or distant relatives of the two bandleaders, whose names were redacted in the sixth chapter of the textbook, currently claim is of no concern to the author, the readers, or the publisher of the publication in question. It is more than clear that in the case of the relatives and namesakes of the two bandleaders, we are dealing with a textbook example of situational identity, which may change over the coming years and decades" (Podoba, 2001, p. 102).

Podoba continues in a very contradictory manner, acknowledging in the same breath that:

> "…unfortunately, we have become accustomed to the fact that certain ethnonyms are used

53 Film by Martin Slivka, produced under Slovak-German coproduction.

54 The name of the family is anonymized.

> as insults in political life, even on the parliamentary floor [*Cigáni*/Gypsies]" (Podoba, 2001, p. 103).

However, he showed no understanding for the right not to have one's ethnicity attributed to one's family name in a primary school textbook:

> "The stance of the relatives of the bandleaders mentioned and subsequently redacted in the discussed textbook is essentially an open expression of racism" (Podoba, 2001, p. 103).

In his text, Podoba also critically responded to the passivity of the professional community in the controversy, not only criticising individual experts but also "interest associations, societies, and scientific institutions and organisations" (2001, p. 104).

In this context, Podoba predicts that, in Slovakia, we will witness an increase in a

> "…more educated and financially secure urban Roma population and their political activism, which will change the situation and bring new features to society, introducing new, hitherto unknown, and for many, utterly unforeseen problems" (Podoba, 2001, p. 105).

It is not entirely clear what solution to the "Roma problem" the author had in mind in the following passage, and due to its sensitive and controversial content, it is quoted in full, even though it is a lengthy text:

> "Especially if some variant of affirmative action is enforced, which we will undoubtedly be pushed into by the political structures, intellectual elites, and non-governmental sector of the European Union. Thus, there will be a significant increase not only in the number of university-educated Roma (or even true-born Slovaks with darker pigmentation, considered Gypsies by the majority), but also in the quantitative representation of these citizens in key positions in state administration, the police and military, education, culture, the economy, and so on. If someone naively thought that the emergence of such an urban and more-or-less educated class would solve the Roma question, or that these people would resolve their problems arising from the dramatic change in their social status/rank and unsettled or unclear identity within their own community, then the discussed controversy will likely quickly disabuse them of this illusion. The Roma question will only gain a new quality, one that can no longer be continually avoided" (Podoba, 2001, p. 105).

This shows that even an author well-versed in Anglo-Saxon literature and anthropological texts, who has openly and critically expressed concerns about the lagging trends in ethnology and anthropology in Slovakia—among other things, in this text, he refers to Slovakia as a "small, sleepy provincial country" (Podoba, 2001, p. 105)—, had difficulty recognising the basic principle of Western non-harming anthropology concerning the researcher's responsibility

not only to avoid harm but also to prevent and foresee any potential harm to the individuals or communities being studied. In this regard, he clearly preferred the role of a social scientist striving for the "analysis, understanding, and subsequent identification of fundamental conflict and conflict-generating situations and problems in society" (2001, p. 105). He reiterated similar views in a continued discussion a year later (Podoba, 2002), warning Slovak ethnology against the Western anthropology trend favouring "political correctness", meaning that data harvesting and "saying the truth" are superior to the emotional discomfort of interlocutors.

In the last contribution to the discussion, E. Krekovičová (2001, pp. 107–108) noted that stereotypes exist on "both sides" and emphasised the need for improved communication to address the "Roma issue". While she acknowledges that we socially construct the world—implying that that ethnicity and identity are not something to be born with, but socially learned—she surprisingly concludes that, regarding "the first censored book in Slovakia after 1989":

> "I think there is nothing to discuss, and all the problems that have arisen and continue to arise around the work are essentially and, in the outlined contexts, truly only marginal" (Krekovičová, 2001, p. 108).

More than two decades later, a prominent figure in Romani studies, Prof. E. Marushiakova, who reviewed this publication, responded in a manner similar to P. Salner. With her permission, I quote from our professional correspondence:

> "Arne [Mann] underestimated (or did not understand, or was unaware of) the phenomenon that Veselin [Popov] and I once long ago called 'preferred ethnic identity'—when a given community rejects its original ethnicity and adopts another, or invents a completely new one… In such a case, mentioning a specific name in a textbook, in the context of a rejected identity, the consequences were logical" (E. Marushiakova, email from August 2, 2024).

This case highlighted the ethical dilemmas involved in field research and the writing of expert and scientific texts. To address these challenges, the Institute of Ethnology of SAS had to develop effective mechanisms in the 2010s to ensure the protection not only of the interlocutors but also of its researchers and the relevant organisations and institutions.

The *Rómsky dejepis* case has highlighted several important issues for discussion: (1) legal vacuum and misinterpretation of legal requirements concerning the publication of personal data in scientific and artistic texts; (2) a lack of awareness concerning the obligation to manage personal data in the context of the employment of persons; (3) nepotism; (4) "cancel culture"; and (5) underestimation of the issue of preferred and unwanted ethnicity.

The case also underscores the urgent need for proper documentation of informants' consent, not just for field research but also for the publication of personal data (full names and surnames). Additionally, it reveals that there are different rules for anonymisation in historical research, where personal data is often already publicly accessible and

disclosed in numerous official historical documents, making it difficult to erase the names of historical persons.

The controversy highlighted the susceptibility of researchers and institutions to politicisation, hidden forms of nepotism, and the exploitation of legislative gaps for personal and financial gain. Especially in the field of research on sensitive topics, there emerged the necessity to discuss procedures for collecting, managing, and disseminating data. This is essential to uphold the principles of social sciences and humanities disciplines in addressing socially sensitive topics without compromising their scientific and personal integrity.

In this regard, it was the first confrontation in Slovakia between an ethnologist and his employer with the official requirements of the existing legal system concerning the collection, management, and dissemination of personal data. This confrontation revealed both the weaknesses of the legal system, which did not consider properly the specifics of "scientific research" and "scientific texts", and the legal unpreparedness of the Institution conducting qualitative research and collecting and publishing informants' personal data.

In the 2000s, the Institution lacked internal standardised procedure for collecting personal data during field research in place; researchers did not have any authorisation forms or informed consent forms for conducting research. Additionally, there was no Ethical Committee at the Institute to consult and approve the ethical design of field research. This situation highlighted a broader delay in the development and implementation of ethical standards for ethnological and anthropological research in Slovakia.

As noted earlier, the first ethical codes within specialised scientific societies emerged only in the 2010s

(EC SASA in 2013; EC ESS in 2017). The first version of the *Ethical Code of SAS* (EC SAS) was approved in 2015.[55]

The IESA SAS Ethical Committee, established in the late 2010s, was one of the first of its kind within the SAS.[56] Its role includes preparing and approving documents necessary for the creation of (or documents that are part of) the ethical design of scientific research project proposals carried out in the workplace (informed consent and others). Upon request, the Committee reviews and approves the ethical design of scientific research projects conducted at the Institute, offers assistance with *ad hoc* ethical issues that may arise in the course of scientific research projects, and addresses employee concerns related to violations of fundamental ethical rules of scientific work. Additionally, the Committee assesses the ethical design of doctoral projects.[57]

The first versions of informed consent forms within the institution were drafted in 2018–9 in connection with the enforcement of Act No. 18/2018 Coll. on the Protection of Personal Data, and Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council (GDPR, 2016).

By formulating and approving ethical codes in Slovakia in 2013 and 2017, the position of Western "non-harming" anthropology was finally introduced to Slovak ethnology and anthropology.

However, paradoxically, in 2017, the "calm waters" of ethnology and anthropology in Slovakia were once again stirred in an unprecedented way by another controversy in the field of Romani studies.

55 The updated versions and amendments are available on the website of the Ethical Committee of SAS: https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=sas-commission&folder_no=141 [accessed July 20, 2024].
56 In the Congress Centre of SAS at Smolenice Castle in March 2019.
57 For more, see: https://uesa.sav.sk/organisacna-struktura/eticka-komisia/ [accessed July 20, 2024].

The case, which garnered international attention, concerned the accusation and sentencing of a Canadian anthropologist (born in Czechoslovakia,[58] of Dutch citizenship), Professor David Scheffel, who had spent several years in Romani settlements in Eastern Slovakia.

According to his Slovak colleague and co-author of several publications on Roma in Slovakia, A. Mušinka:

> "Scheffel arrived in Prešov in 1993 with his students from Canada and the USA. They travelled across Europe. They wished to experience what every cultural anthropologist needs to experience: the culture shock. That is, to immerse themselves in a culture that they did not know". "Subsequently, he had the opportunity to visit the settlement of Svinia through an organised bus excursion". "This visit led to the initiation of the first major community project in a Roma settlement in Slovakia in 1998, carried out by Professor Scheffel and his students and funded directly by the Canadian government".[59]

According to *Denník N*, Scheffel arrived in Slovakia in 1992. He initiated a project in the Roma settlement in the village of Svinia near Prešov,[60] about which he learned from the prominent writer Elena Lacková. From 1998 onwards, he visited the village annually, spending over two years there

58 Source: https://www.tyzden.sk/casopis/7250/budu-tu-osady-pre-bielych/ [accessed Aug 9, 2024].
59 Source: https://dennikn.sk/2626265/romista-musinka-najvyznamnejsia-romka-elena-lackova-sa-dostala-v-roku-1964-z-osady-na-karlovu-univerzitu/ [accessed Aug 11, 2024].
60 For more, see: https://www.tyzden.sk/casopis/7250/budu-tu-osady-pre-bielych/ [accessed Aug 9, 2024].

in total.[61] In 2005, he published the book *Svinia in Black and White* (Scheffel, 2005), which was translated into Slovak in 2009 (Scheffel, 2009). In 2012, he was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Prešov.[62]

In November 2017, he faced accusations of sexual abuse, illegal possession of weapons, arms trafficking, production and possession of child pornography, participation in a child pornographic performance, and endangering the moral upbringing of youth.[63] On February 24, 2021, the Regional Court of Prešov sentenced D. Scheffel to seven years in prison on charges of sexual exploitation, moral corruption of juveniles, and illegal possession of a firearm. The key witness was alleged to have been "sold" by her mother to Scheffel in the course of his research on prostitution in segregated Romani communities. The verdict of the regional court was final, leaving no possibility for appeal.[64]

Scheffel, who had travelled to Slovakia to conduct research in the Romani settlements of Svinia (Prešov district) and Jarovnice (Sabinov district) in Eastern Slovakia, was arrested by police in November 2017. Regarding his prosecution and imprisonment in Slovakia, Scheffel told *Denník N*:

> "I came to Slovakia from Canada voluntarily at the beginning of November [2017] after contacting the police by phone. The police assured me that I was not being prosecuted,

61 Source: https://dennikn.sk/1166108/kanadsky-antropolog-je-u-nas-od-novembra-vo-vysetrovacej-vazbe-pre-udajnu-detsku-pornografiu-z-romskych-osad/ [accessed Aug 9, 2024].
62 Source: http://www.tvnoviny.sk/domace/1894742_uznavany-profesor-ma-na-krku-zavazne-obvinenia-romovia-v-osadach-ho-velmi-dobre-poznaju [accessed Aug 9, 2024].
63 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/slovenski-vedci-sokujucom-vyskume-kolegu-toto-myslia-fotkach-nahymi-detmi [accessed Aug 11, 2024].
64 Source: https://tvnoviny.sk/domace/clanok/128706-kanadsky-profesor-prisiel-na-slovensko-robit-vyskum-do-osad-teraz-spoznal-trest-za-sexualne-zneuzivanie?campaignsrc=tn_clipboard [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

they just wanted to question me on the matter. After arriving in the Czech Republic and then Slovakia, I called the investigating police officer two more times, and we arranged to meet at my home in Veľký Šariš. It was only later that I learned that I had been prosecuted since November 6 and that, according to Article 206 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the police were obliged to notify me of the charges immediately. This did not happen until November 8–9 during my telephone conversations with the police officer. That is why I am talking about a trap. On November 10, instead of an informative conversation, I was ambushed at my home in Veľký Šariš by eight policemen who woke me up at around 6.30 a.m. with a search warrant. The search lasted more than three hours. I have been in custody ever since".[65, 66]

He was initially remanded in custody by the court but was later released on bail after depositing thirty thousand euros and being fitted with an electronic monitoring bracelet.

65 In this context, the author of the book feels it necessary to make an important "meta" commentary. The quotations from media and other sources in this text were translated to English via AI software ChatGPT. However, the abovementioned excerpt from Scheffel's statement was refused by AI to be translated, and was deleted from the chat explaining that possible harming context was detected. The application informed me: "We have established universal policies applicable to all our services, as well as specific policies for builders who use ChatGPT or our API to create applications for themselves or others. Violating our policies could result in action against your account, up to suspension or termination. We also work to make our models safer and more useful, by training them to refuse harmful instructions and reduce their tendency to produce harmful content" (https://openai.com/policies/usage-policies/, version from January 10, 2024) [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

66 Source: https://dennikn.sk/1166108/kanadsky-antropolog-je-u-nas-od-novembra-vo-vysetrovacej-vazbe-pre-udajnu-detsku-pornografiu-z-romskych-osad/[accessed Aug 2, 2024].

However, he was sent back to prison a few days later.[67] The reason was the police suspected that he had attempted to contact the victims and influence their testimony against him.[68]

The prosecution accused Scheffel of luring girls from Roma settlements to his flat under the pretext of financial reward, where he allegedly sexually harassed them and took nude photographs of them. During his first arrest, the police said that they have found numerous photos of naked underage girls in various poses, as well as a gun in his home in Veľký Šariš (Prešov region).

In a letter to *Denník N*, Scheffel stated:

"The impetus was a criminal complaint filed by an 11-year-old girl from Jarovnice together with her father, whom I know only from formal conversations on the subject of prostitutes in Roma settlements. I have been conducting this research since 2014. The girl accused me of buying her from her mother for the purpose of sexual abuse and then taking pictures of her private parts".[69]

During the investigation, it turned out that the girl's mother did not know the researcher. As for the accusation, Scheffel contended the accusation was likely a result of a dispute between the girl's father, who lived in Svinia and knew Scheffel, and the girl's mother from Jarovnice, over the

67 Source: https://www.cas.sk/clanok/843789/kanadsky-profesor-skoncil-v-presove-na-sude-tvrdi-ze-skumal-detsku-prostituciu-sudia-ho-za-zneuzivanie/ [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

68 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/sexualne-zneuzivanie-deti-antropologom-sud-rozhodol-tvrdom-treste-pre-profesora [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

69 Source: https://dennikn.sk/1166108/kanadsky-antropolog-je-u-nas-od-novembra-vo-vysetrovacej-vazbe-pre-udajnu-detsku-pornografiu-z-romskych-osad/ [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

custody of the daughter, who wanted to leave the mother, and thus, it was necessary to look for reasons to defend this against the custody.[70]

Back in summer 2018, an expert in psychology evaluated the testimonies of several Roma girls, who claimed Scheffel had touched them and had taken nude photos of them. The expert claimed that the testimonies were trustworthy.[71] In his letter from prison (Scheffel, 2018), Scheffel highlighted the backwardness of Slovak society, which until recently was agrarian, is now intolerant of foreigners, migrants, asylum seekers, and Muslims, and where university degrees are obtained through "dubious channels". Regarding the judicial expert, he remarked:

> "Court-appointed experts with psychology degrees haven't heard of Margaret Mead and do not understand what cultural anthropology is about".

In the same letter addressed to the academic audience, Scheffel noted that he had come to study Slovakia's so-called "unadaptables" (i.e. Roma) because: "I am interested in patterns of resistance to 'white rule' that reinforce their status as dangerous 'others' but at the same time provide them with a measure of empowerment". Regarding the specific topic of his research in the part of his letter entitled "3. Roma and sex", he states:

> "My work with the Slovak 'unadaptables' includes research of their reproductive and sexual practices—sui generis as well as their employment as 'weapons of the weak' in the confrontation with the mainstream society. I am particularly interested in 'nature' explanations of underage motherhood, cohabitations of cousins (including cousin marriage) and juvenile prostitution—all 'pathologies' associated with Roma". Scheffel further states that unlike other scholars and organisations which view these phenomena as problematic, he concentrates "on their role as identity makers and a source of 'agency' in a hostile social environment".

The case also attracted foreign media attention.[72] Regarding potential support to Scheffel from the Canadian side, the *Kamloops This Week* (*KTW*) published the following statement:

> "The Canadian government has said there is nothing it can do because Scheffel does not have Canadian citizenship. He came to the country as a teenager alongside his sister and parents in 1968 when, in response to reform movements in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union sent troops into the country. In 1993, the country split into two—the Czech Republic and Slovakia."

70 Source: https://dennikn.sk/1166108/kanadsky-antropolog-je-u-nas-od-novembra-vo-vysetrovacej-vazbe-pre-udajnu-detsku-pornografiu-z-romskych-osad/ [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

71 Source: https://spectator.sme.sk/c/22148979/canadian-professor-david-scheffel-accused-of-sexual-abuse-gets-7-years-in-slovak-prison.html [accessed Aug 5, 2024].

72 For instance, *Kamloops This Week*: http://www.kamloopsthisweek.com/news/thompson-rivers-university-professor-in-jail-in-slovakia-1.23262600, http://www.kamloopsthisweek.com/news/the-scheffel-file-tru-professor-tells-of-trip-from-tru-to-cold-prison-cells-of-slovakia-1.23303764, or CBC news: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/david-scheffel-tru-slovakia-arrest-bail-1.4855270 [accessed Aug 15, 2024].

Scheffel lived in Canada for decades but has Dutch citizenship. *KTW* contacted Global Affairs Canada three times asking if it intends to intercede; according to its response, the Dutch are responsible for any action.[73] *KTW* also published Scheffel's reaction:

> "Following my imprisonment, my family and I appealed to the Dutch embassy in Slovakia to provide whatever support it could", Scheffel said. "So far, I have had one visit from the Dutch honorary consul in Prešov, who warned me that Dutch authorities cannot interfere in the conduct of the Slovak judiciary".

In May 2018, the web page http://www.justicefordavidscheffel.com/ was launched to inform both the lay and academic audience about the Scheffel case. The web (which is not functional anymore) published Scheffel's regular statements from prison.

In June 11, 2018, Chris Hann, Doctor Emeritus from the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, on behalf of the "Visegrád Anthropologists' Network", expressed concerns

> "about the predicament of our respected colleague David Scheffel (Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, BC, Canada). It is clear from the information available to us https://www.justicefordavidscheffel.com/ that the procedures being followed, and the conditions in which he is being held in custody in Slovakia, fall short of EU standards. We urge that David Scheffel be given the opportunity to clear his name in a transparent process as rapidly as possible.[74]

In July, the *Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies* (*ASEEES*) and the *Canadian Anthropology Society* expressed concern about the circumstances of Scheffel's arrest.[75]

In October 2018, the *CBC* published a statement according to which Scheffel as well as his family and friends believe his imprisonment is a punishment for his work. Ivan Somlayi, who helped develop a six-year social service delivery project with Scheffel in 1997, declared:

> "This involves research that can upset and embarrass people who then can turn against you, and I think that's what happened. [It's] the type of work, unfortunately, that would bring enemies".[76]

The case attracted significant media attention. Scheffel finally managed to secure a well-known and politically prominent lawyer, Slovakia's former Deputy Prime Minister, Daniel Lipšic, as his defence attorney.[77] Since court hearings are not publicly available, we provide at least quotations from the statements of the accused and of his defence attorney from a media source:

73 Source: http://www.kamloopsthisweek.com/news/the-scheffel-file-tru-professor-tells-of-trip-from-tru-to-cold-prison-cells-of-slovakia-1.23303764 [accessed Aug 15, 2024].

74 The statement has been published on the website of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, source: http://www.eth.mpg.de/4817274/news_2018_06_11_01 [accessed Aug 12, 2024].

75 Source: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/david-scheffel-tru-slovakia-arrest-bail-1.4855270 [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

76 Source: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/david-scheffel-tru-slovakia-arrest-bail-1.4855270 [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

77 Source: https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/b-c-university-professor-gets-seven-year-sentence-in-slovakia [accessed Aug 5, 2024].

> “The anthropologist has maintained his innocence throughout, stating that the photographs found by the police were related to his research on child prostitution, sexual pathology, incest, and early sexual life of children in the settlements. ‘I consider the accusation to be fabricated, the photos found are not pornographic in nature’, he defended himself. According to his defence lawyer Daniel Lipšic, the injured girls did not confirm that Scheffel had sexually molested them and objected to the way the interrogation of the minors was conducted without the presence of the accused’s defence lawyer, which is a key legal issue. ‘At the main hearing, they denied all of their pre-trial statements and claimed that they had been pressured to testify in this way. The circumstances under which the act was alleged to have been committed defy elementary logic—when you have multiple people in your home, the consent of legal persons, you make audio recordings, [it is questionable] if anyone of average intelligence would sexually abuse girls one by one in such a situation. That seems very unlikely to me’.”[78]

After serving two-thirds of his sentence, Scheffel requested parole in September 2021 and was subsequently released. At the same time, the Senate imposed a ban on leaving the Slovak Republic and a four-year probationary

78 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/sexualne-zneuzivanie-deti-antropologom-sud-rozhodol-tvrdom-treste-pre-profesora [accessed Aug 5, 2024].

period, with two years of electronic monitoring via a bracelet.[79] Here, a significant development occurred in the case when the witnesses retracted their pre-trail statements and accusations of sexual harassment.[80]

From the very beginning, the case attracted significant media attention, prompting journalists to seek statements from two employees of the IESA SAS, V. Bahna and T. Hrustič. Although their responses were neutral and the colleagues did not take evaluative positions on the guilt or innocence of the Canadian anthropologist, the media representatives placed their statements in a context that was more condemnatory, suggesting that the topic did not require taking photographs from the field (V. Bahna) and emphasising the need for methodological and ethical design in research on socially sensitive topics (T. Hrustič).[81]

During the process of interrogation, hearings, and trials, D. Scheffel denied all accusations and maintained that all his activities were related to his scientific research. He insisted that the photos found by the police were not pornographic and were used for anthropological research focused on the study of sexual pathology in settlements, Roma prostitution, incest, and the early sexual life of children.[82] In this context, Scheffel’s attorney, D. Lipšic, presented at the court a photo of a naked young girl from Tahiti, taken by Milan Rastislav Štefánik, a prominent Slovak politician, in the early the 20th century.[83] He used this example to prove that taking

79 Source: https://tvnoviny.sk/domace/clanok/852111-prisiel-k-nam-robit-vyskum-skoncil-vo-vazeni-za-zneuzivanie-davida-scheffela-prepustia-na-slobodu [accessed Aug 5, 2024].
80 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/gal/krimi/kanadskeho-profesora-stihaju-sexualne-zlociny-obrovsky-zvrat-uprimna-spoved-svedkyn/3. The link also contains videos with young women who, back in 2017, accused Scheffel of sexual harassment [accessed Aug 5, 2024].
81 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/slovenski-vedci-sokujucom-vyskume-kolegu-toto-myslia-fotkach-nahymi-detmi [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
82 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/slovenski-vedci-sokujucom-vyskume-kolegu-toto-myslia-fotkach-nahymi-detmi [accessed Aug 2, 2024].
83 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/zneuzival-deti-robl-iba-vedecky-vyskum-profesorovi-ma-pomoct-ako-dokaz-storocna-fotka [accessed Aug 2, 2024].

photos of naked bodies can have various reasons—such as aesthetic, scientific, or other documentation—that are not necessarily indicative of any moral deviation on the part of the author of the photograph.[84]

While in investigative custody and later in prison, Scheffel frequently communicated with the anthropological community in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, as well as relevant authorities abroad. According to a petition initiated by a colleague of him and co-author of several publications, Alexander Mušinka:

> "His [Scheffel's] methods were approved and continuously monitored by the research ethics committee of his home university in Canada and confirmed as appropriate by an ad-hoc expert in social anthropology, who also testified to Prof. Scheffel's academic reputation. Despite this and a huge corpus of field data accepted as evidence, the district court and subsequently also the regional court accused Prof. Scheffel of serious methodological shortcomings and misrepresentation of the social reality experienced by his informants" (*Scheffel–Sentencing Petition*, 2021).

The various documents and reports circulating within the given academic community[85] included three handwritten letters he wrote from prison—*Letter from Prison*, May 14, 2021 (Scheffel, 2021a); *Letter from Prison*, June 2, 2022 (Scheffel, 2022a) and *Letter from Prison*, August 29, 2022 (Scheffel, 2022b) along with a draft study titled "The Gypsy *šlapka*[86] in Eastern Slovakia" (2021b).[87] In these texts, he explained his motivation to begin studying child prostitution within marginalised Roma settlements in Slovakia as follows:

> "Disregarding for a moment the work published during the socialist era, it is perplexing how few scholars have addressed the postulated deviance of Romani sexuality (Scheffel, 2005; Máthé, 2007). This is why I was intrigued by an invitation issued in the spring of 2013 by three former sex workers to embark on a study of juvenile prostitution that thrived in their community. I accepted the offer and, aided by my original contacts and additional local assistants, spent several months during the next four years conducting nearly two hundred interviews with girls and young women who introduced themselves as *šlapky*" (Scheffel, 2021b, p. 1).

In the same text, he shed light on the methodology used with regard to recruiting interlocutors and anonymising locations.

84 See also: https://www.cas.sk/clanok/1024394/antropologa-scheffela-odsudili-v-presove-na-7-rokov-za-sexualne-zneuzivanie-profesora-nezachranila-ani-stefanikova-kraska/?fbclid=IwAR2mW4Uc8UPevC3dPOnStupwYiVS_SfdlP6ptpld1WXqAvqqKZnXFqmeZyO [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

85 One of them was Newsfeed Tool for automatic sending of informative emails of the *Czech Association for Social Anthropology* (*CASA*) via Google Platform. Members of CASA, being with touch with imprisoned Scheffel, kept informed fellows from *CASA*, *SASA* (*Slovak Association for Social Anthropology*) and *EASA* (*European Anthropology for Social Anthropology*) (email from *CASA* Newsfeed tool from September 1, 2022 entitled "Report of David Zdenek Scheffel from a Slovak prison").

86 *Šlapka* (sg.), *šlapky*, (pl.)—Slovak derogatory term for sex street worker(s).

87 The manuscripts of Scheffel's letters from prison (May 14, 2021; June 2, 2022; August 29, 2022) and the draft study "The Gypsy *šlapka* in Eastern Slovakia" has been distributed to the members of the *CASA* channel <casachannel@googlegroups.com>.

> "The bulk of the 150 informants came from two neighbouring settlements which I refer to as Zubany and Mirov", admitting that the quality of the data collected might be compromised, particularly in "Zubany", where he hired Romani assistants to recruit participants for his research, and that "motivated by the prospect of a small fee which I paid to each participant, some informants from Zubany may have been coached by their peers or even by my assistants to present fictionalised biographies" (Scheffel, 2021b, p. 2.).

The legal development of the case took a turn in 2024. Both key witnesses, now 21-year-old A. B. and 18-year-old B. C.[88], admitted that they had previously given false testimony under coercion. One of them stated that they had been at Scheffel's home,

> "but only because there was no hot water in the settlement, and he allowed them to take a shower, gave them clean clothes, and money. When the accused asked them if he had ever done anything bad to them, if he had ever had sex with them, or if he had done anything against their will, or if he had ever committed violence against them, they answered: 'No'."[89]

It is not the purpose of this text to reach any conclusion on whether Scheffel, sentenced to prison in Slovakia, was guilty or not in legal terms. We also do not have access to all the internal documents distributed to the email addresses of the members of *CASA*, *SASA*, and other platforms and social media discussions. However, the case highlights the urgent need to clarify the ethical issues connected with conducting qualitative research, particularly on sensitive topics (like child sexuality) among multi-vulnerable research groups (e.g., Romani marginalised communities).

The necessity for special legal protection of anthropological research and the right for effective defence for researchers was widely discussed within the academic community. In this context, it undoubtedly remains a question whether Scheffel actually had an approved ethical design for this highly sensitive research and whether the research was part of a foreign research project. In any case, every ethically correct anthropological research, if conducted abroad, must also adhere to the ethical guidelines of the country in which it is carried out. In this regard, Scheffel would have undoubtedly been aided in his defence if he could have reported that an Ethics Committee of a Slovak entity authorised to conduct research had reviewed and approved his research design.

In the document *Scheffel—Sentencing Petition* (March 2021), which circulated among anthropologist and Romani studies circles, the initiators of the Petition blamed the court from accusing Scheffel of "serious shortcomings and misrepresentations of the social reality experienced by his informants". The authors of the Petition claimed that Scheffel's

> "methods were approved and continuously monitored by research ethics committee of his home university in Canada and confirmed

88 Fictional personal initials.
89 Source: https://www1.pluska.sk/krimi/pripad-kanadskeho-profesora-stihaneho-sexualne-delikty-obrovsky-zvrat-sude [accessed Aug 11, 2024].

> as appropriate by an ad-hoc expert in social anthropology, who also testified to Prof. Scheffel's academic reputation".

However, the name of the expert and the supportive statement from the TRU Ethics Boards were never disclosed to the academic audience. In his initial statement entitled *Public Statement Regarding David Scheffel's Arrest and Incarceration in Slovakia*, dated May 2018, Scheffel declared that he began his research in 2015. He also admitted that:

> "I was involved in interviews with mostly juvenile Romani sex workers in numerous communities near Prešov. I had obtained approval from the ethics board of my university—Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, BC—for this research".

However, in his draft "The Gypsy *šlapka* in Eastern Slovakia" (Scheffel, 2021b), he notes that he was motivated to begin his research upon the invitation of three former sex workers from the Romani community. Given that it was a draft scientific text, it should have certainly included a detailed section on research ethics and its approval procedure. However, in this 2021 text, Scheffel does not refer to any research project or university affiliation with Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, nor does he mention any approved ethical or methodological design. He speaks of a "personal invitation" and a prompt from the community that he responded to (2021b, p. 1). Similarly, in the study he published together with A. Mušinka in *Anthropology Today* (Scheffel and Mušinka, 2019), for which he used data on child prostitution and child motherhood, he did not refer to any specific project or university overseeing the research.[90] The methodology, research ethics, and approval by any Board of Ethics are not mentioned in any part of the text.

The Scheffel case highlighted numerous ethical controversies related to his research design and research methodology, since the precondition for sensitive research regarding the anonymisation of the localities was breached, as well as the right of informants for protection. The case also led to significant polarisation within the communities under study, thereby violating the fundamental ethical principle of "avoiding harm" as outlined in ethical codes.

According to Jorgensen (1971), anthropologists should:

> "respect the right to private personality, the need for consent and confidentiality, conditions under which confidentiality may not be desired, the dangers of truth, the validity of research reports as an ethical consideration, and the effects of the researcher on the host community" (1971, p. 321).

He also mentioned the necessity to prevent conducting clandestine research referred to as "anthropologist" (Jorgensen, 1971, p. 321).

Sexuality, moral norms, and vulnerable individuals or communities presents a unique challenge, necessitating a balance between respecting indigenous knowledge systems and adhering to global ethical norms. The ethical designs of

90 His name is mentioned in connection with the statement: "The principal author's research into Romani participation in municipal politics was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada" (Scheffel and Mušinka, 2019, p. 17).

such research must identify the forms and circumstances for obtaining informed consent, define the procedures for secure anonymisation of interlocutors and localities and for safeguarding participants, researches, and involved institutions. Under these conditions, informed consent processes should be culturally sensitive and considerate of the participants' and communities' worldviews.

According to researchers, who conduct ethnomedical anthropological research in Romani communities and cope with sensitive topics and potentially conflicting situations, such research necessitates particularly sensitive ethical consideration due to the historical marginalisation and unique cultural aspects of these communities.

Miranda et al. (2019) claim that ensuring the ethical integrity of sensitive research in Romani communities involves acknowledging and respecting the social, economic, and cultural contexts. Researchers should actively involve community members in the research process, fostering a partnership that leverages local knowledge and promote shared decision-making. According to Roman et al. (2012), the process of informed consent must be adapted to cultural norms, which may include considerations for collective decision-making practices within Roma communities. Researchers must be attentive to cultural nuances in communication and consent, ensuring that participation is voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the research purpose and procedures. According to Condon et al. (2019), while conducting research in Romani communities, ethical dilemmas may arise when balancing community traditions with mainstream moral and cultural norms and forms of behaviour. Therefore, researchers must engage with community leaders and members to identify acceptable practices that align with both ethical research standards and community values.

As Jokinen et al. (2020) insist, conducting sensitive research in vulnerable communities requires maintaining the privacy and confidentiality of research participants as imperative. In this regard, researchers must implement rigorous data management protocols that protect sensitive information and comply with ethical standards and regulations, particularly those pertaining to vulnerable populations.

The Scheffel case made it urgent in Slovakia to postulate context-based ethical guidelines for research on sensitive topics conducted in vulnerable communities and research groups. Ethics committees and institutional review boards also play crucial roles in overseeing research protocols to ensure that they meet ethical standards, especially when vulnerable populations are involved.

The two cases of ethical controversies that occurred in Slovakia in the field of Romani studies in the 21st century serve as a lesson for future generations of researchers, particularly those conducting research in Roma settlements. These cases highlight that, in such contexts, a written or oral form of informed consent, an approved ethical research design from the relevant university or academy, and the anonymisation or pseudo-anonymisation of locations and informants are not sufficient.

To protect both researchers and informants, it is essential to take all necessary measures to ensure that at no point during the research, the fragile trust between informants and the researcher is compromised. There should be no suspicion regarding the purpose of data collection or its use, nor any feelings of being treated disrespectfully. This also applies to attributing (non-preferred) ethnicity or religiosity, or to any evaluative stance by the researcher on matters of opinion, religion, ethnicity, gender, political,

or professional identification. The issue of compensating research assistance, as well as the matter of gifts and reciprocal services, remains open. Participatory research methods and empowering informants to carry out scientific goals within various phases of research projects and studies pose extraordinary ethical challenges. These context-specific standards undoubtedly need to be refined through sensitive and open discussion, not only within Romani studies but also through wider discussions on professional ethics in ethnology and social anthropology.

CURRENT CHALLENGES IN ETHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The development of ethnology and anthropology in the 20th and 21st centuries led to the formation of scientific societies and associations that brought together individuals and institutions in these fields. These societies and associates formulated universal ethical codes as a foundational set of moral guidelines.

However, the progress in methodology, the disciplines as such, and the evolution of the field of human rights showed that the diverse and complex nature of human societies often makes these universal codes insufficient for specific cultural contexts. This shortcoming has led to a call for more adaptable, context-specific ethics that can accommodate the distinct cultural, social, and technological landscapes encountered by social scientists. Over time, these codes have evolved to address more complex ethical considerations involving, for instance, digital data and interactions in virtual spaces, which necessitate a re-evaluation of traditional ethical norms (e.g., Albro, 2015; Lane, 2016).

Towards Context Specific Ethical Guidelines and Sensitive, Reflexive Approaches

Adopting context-specific ethics profoundly impacts the relationships between anthropologists/ethnologists and the communities they study. This approach fosters trust and respect by aligning research practices with the cultural values and expectations of participants. Such alignment helps prevent potential conflicts and misunderstandings that may arise from imposing unsuitable ethical standards.

The current trends in ethnology and anthropology are moving away from non-specific ethical codes towards the formulation of ethical guidelines that embrace ethical pluralism while respecting the diversity and complexity of

human societies. The future of ethical anthropology and ethnology depends on their ability to adapt to evolving moral landscapes and promote an ethical awareness that transcends academic and cultural boundaries.

As the field of ethnology and anthropology navigates through complex ethical terrains, it is imperative to continuously refine ethical designs to ensure the respectful and responsible integration of traditional knowledge into general discourses. These ethical considerations form the backbone of a research paradigm that is both culturally sensitive and scientifically robust. The ongoing discourse will undoubtedly shape the future trajectory of ethnological and anthropological research, with a keen eye on preserving its ethical integrity.

Today, anthropologists face dilemmas such as navigating *informed consent* in contexts where cultural norms conflict with academic ethical standards, addressing issues of confidentiality and data ownership, and considering the ethical implications of anthropological research that influences local communities, politics and social structures (e.g., Campbell, 1970; Bruce, 2000).

Anonymisation in current ethnology and anthropology goes beyond the mere concealment of identities; it involves understanding the implications of disclosure within social structures and belief systems. The task is to protect the identities of interlocutors and localities while maintaining the integrity and usefulness of the data (Bickford and Nisker, 2015). The protection of researchers and institutions is as crucial as the protection of study participants. This includes addressing the ethical dilemmas researchers face when studying controversial subjects and ensuring that the institutions' reputation for ethical research is upheld (Simpson, 2011).

Ethical frameworks must also address new challenges, such as striking a balance between the *open-access requirements* of funding bodies, like those in the EU, and the need to uphold confidentiality and respect for participants (Pels, 2018).

The EU's push for Open Science and *FAIR Data* presents challenges for anthropologists, who must balance transparency with participant protection. These challenges are especially significant when data anonymisation might compromise research integrity or participant safety (Bickford and Nisker, 2015). Finding an equilibrium between ethical rigour and the demands of Open Science is a critical frontier for anthropology, a discipline committed to both ethical excellence and public accountability. The push for Open Science and Fair Data, particularly in the context of EU grants, must be reconciled with the ethical need to protect interlocutors and communities. This includes debates around the anonymisation of sensitive cultural data and the rights to knowledge dissemination (Anyinam, 1995).

Anthropological and ethnological research is thus challenged not only by the speed of technological and social change and the evolution of research methods, trying to capture and encapsulate the rapidly evolving world, but also by the pressures, expectations, and demands of decision-makers and donors, the wider public, as well as the complex system of national and international legislations.

Post-GDPR Ethnology and Anthropology

Undoubtedly, the introduction of the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) significantly influenced the evolution of research conduct in the 2010s. This regulation aimed to increase transparency in data processing and to enhance the rights of data subjects.

Within the social sciences, and particularly in anthropology, concerns have been raised about how the new legislation would affect ethnographic fieldwork. For instance, on the very date the law came into effect, the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London hosted a workshop entitled "Is Anthropology Legal?", inviting both researchers and data managers to discuss the future of anthropology in the GDPR era (Yuill, 2018). This event highlighted the profound changes in informant consent, data archiving and management, and the process of data anonymisation.

In her report from this workshop, Cassandra Yuill highlighted a key contradiction between the process for consent in ethnography and in the GDPR because:

> "the former is fluid and negotiated and renegotiated as fieldwork progresses and evolves…" whereas "under the GDPR, clear and affirmative consent must be obtained for every research activity with a signature gained on the dotted line of a long form" (Yuill, 2018, p. 37).

In this context, the participants of the SOAS workshop also noted that anthropologists are not able to obtain consent for research activities that they do not yet know about, or that during the participative observation or in the field there are situations in which it is difficult to process clear, affirmative consent. Another serious issue affected by the GDPR is the requirement to store outputs of our anthropological research in archives, including field notes. Anthropologists are normally hesitant to deposit their work into archives due to the obligation to maintain the anonymity of their interlocutors.

The SOAS workshop highlighted three major areas of data management: informed consent, protection of identities, and regulation of access in line with the creed of making data "as open as possible, as closed as necessary" (Yuill, 2018, p. 38).

The GDPR also broadened the definition of anonymity, or "un-naming" in anthropology, clearly stating that "both direct and indirect data that can lead to identification fall within the realm of personal data" (Yuil, 2018, p. 39). In this regard,

> "codification with a master key will not suffice—this is called pseudoanonymisation—the key must be destroyed in order to complete anonymity". However, as was argued at the SOAS workshop—"once the master key is destroyed, so is the individual's identity in the research, which can never be reclaimed by that person or family members" (Yuill, 2018, p. 39).

The major argument against removing all direct or indirect personal data from research reports was that doing so contradicts the fundamental mission of our discipline, which is to write about people, their lives, personal experiences, etc.

In this regard, Nancy Scheper-Hughe' conclusion in favour of "naming" is mentioned:

> "I have come to see that the time-honoured practice of bestowing anonymity of 'our' communities and informants fools few and protects no one—save, perhaps, the anthropologist's own skin. And I fear that the practice makes rogues of us all—too free with our pens, with the government of our

> tongues, and with our loose tradition and interpretations of village life" (Shepper-Hughes, 2000, p. 128).

According to Yuill (2018, p. 39), "naming" creates the possibility for more robust fieldwork and the reporting of findings, and it enhances the ethical conduct of researcher who cannot falsify data.

At the SOAS workshop, the participants proposed that anthropologists be more "judicious" with anonymisation, because:

> "total anonymisation of participants and places diminishes co-production in research and the dissemination of research, in that we cannot co-produce with those who have been permanently un-named" (Yuill, 2018, pp. 39–40).

Data management in anthropology and the recent demand for data accountability by funding agencies, universities, international journals, and other academic institutions were also discussed in *Forum* (2018) in *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 26(3) published by the *European Association of Social Anthropologists*. It was noted that many ethnographic researchers feel uncomfortable with the forms of current trends in data governance which:

> "tend to define 'data' as already commodified units of analysis, alienated from the social relations of research by contractual forms of informed consent and anonymisation, and by ownership claims by researchers and employers" (Pels, 2018, p. 391).

In this context, Peter Pels noted the reinforcement of neoliberal regimes' ethnocentric definitions of research sovereignty (2018, p. 391), the global introduction of which turned ethical codifications and new regimes of data management into a monitoring mechanism similar to audits:

> "'Audit culture' fuelled anthropologists' suspicions that Institutional Review Boards and Ethical Reviews in Anglophone anthropology seemed to worry more about the reputation of universities than about actual ethical conduct towards research participants. In its worst guises, neoliberal ethics served merely as a badge of good conduct, with sovereignty about ethical judgement monopolised by top-down standards set in review procedures that both determined access to and modified research" (Pels, 2018, p. 392).

Peter Pels, the author of the first contribution to *Forum* (2018, pp. 391–396), argues that "anthropologists occupy a special position in social science: field research turns them into their own research instruments" (2018, p. 393). Thus, "depersonalisation" is highly problematic given that during the research process, anthropologists share time and space with their informants, leading to the co-production of data and knowledge (2018, p. 393). Pels also addresses epistemological awareness, arguing that:

> "On the model of learning a strange language and culture, this not only requires recognising that researcher and research participants occupy the same time-space,

> but also that they can only understand each other by intersubjective interchange (or 'transactional validity') and, therefore, through the changes they provoke in each other by mutual learning (or 'transformational validity'). In anthropology and ethnography… methods and ethics are mutually supportive, congruent, and sometimes even identical. They rest on the same epistemological foundation of a process of mutual learning that builds social relationship on varying degrees of trust" (Pels, 2018, p. 393).

According to Pels, this co-production of data requires that researcher have the ethical duty to control how research materials "go public" (2018, p. 395). Here, social scientists question the problem of seeing "data" as commodities that can be freely distributed to third parties because "they have been alienated from their relations of production", as well as the presumption that our research material can be easily encapsulated into the "data" concept and commodified in the further process of data management (2018, pp. 395–396).

In his contribution to *Forum* (2018, pp. 397–401), Igor Boog as a member of the six-scholars committee, which was requested to report to the Executive Board of the Institute for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology of Leiden University, noted the following on data management policy:

> "The co-production of data [in ethnography and anthropology] implies that data are rarely fully owned by either researcher, researched or a third party. The first duty of anthropologists and ethnographers towards science is therefore to recognise this joint production and joint ownership of data. All forms and norms of managing data depend on it" (Boog et al., 2018, p. 397).

Because of the collaborative nature of our research, data cannot be fully "owned" by researcher, the researched, or the researcher's employers or sponsors (Boog et al., 2018, pp. 397–398). However, individual researchers should be held responsible for "integrity, preservation, and protection of the data gathered during a specific research project" (p. 398). Researchers also "have ethical responsibility to take precautions that raw data and collected materials will not be used for unauthorised ends" (p. 398). In this context:

> "The contractual gesture of a consent form signed in advance cannot cover all contingencies of the process of transformation of knowledge that researcher, research participants and audience undergo as the research proceeds towards publication of its results" (Boog et al., 2018, p. 398).[91]

The authors of the contribution confided that in the internet era, our data are gathered, produced, stored, circulated, and shared digitally through third-party online services. This can create additional concerns, as anthropologists must adhere to ethical rules for sharing online collections of data, such as those established, for example, by the *Association of Internet Researchers*.

91 Boog et al. admit, that in certain cases the anthropologist can do clandestine or secret research and obtain data without prior informant consent, or without sufficient informant consent if it is necessary because of the great scientific or social relevance reason (2018, p. 398).

Further to the above, the committee concluded that ethnographers should add the following clauses to their research proposal:

> "– the data gathered during ethnographic fieldwork are held in the custody and possession of individual researchers, who protect the interests of people studied, unless otherwise stipulated;
> – the data can only be shared with third parties after they have been processed to safeguard the privacy and cultural property of research participants, depending on the ethical judgement of the researcher, unless otherwise stipulated;
> – the data are stored and preserved by individual researchers until their retirement from actual research reporting, when they will be destroyed or returned to (heirs of) the research participants, unless otherwise stipulated;
> – third parties have no right to demand access to raw ethnographic research data except in the strictest confidentiality, unless otherwise stipulated" (Boog et al., 2018, p. 400).

In their contribution in *Forum*, M. Sleeboom-Faulkner and B. Simpson (2018) turned attention to the research ethics and data management based on their research experiences from UK. They pointed out that protocol-based research similar to medical sciences is not fitting with methodology and epistemology of social sciences

(2018, pp. 403–404). H. Dilger, M. Schönhunth and A. van Poser (2018, pp. 404–406) briefly outlined the situation of the evolution of ethics governance in Germany, where in 2017, the *German Anthropologic Association* (*GAA*) created a working group for the preparation of ethical guidelines for local ethics committees for assessment of anthropological proposals in order to establish "epistemological standards of the discipline" (Dilger et al., 2018, pp. 404–405). At the same time, the authors remind that:

> "The GAA, however, emphasises that such formalised ethical reviews shall remain an exception within the discipline as an over-regulation of research ethics assessments may run counter to the core standards of ethnographic research with regard to the principles of reflexivity and methodological flexibility" (Dilger et al., 2018, p. 405).

Dilger et al. also noted that the current forms of governance are more and more transnational, therefore, the authors call for a joint anthropology action in this regard (2018, p. 405).

R. C. A. Castillo (2018, pp. 406–407) appeals to restructure formal education in order to include ethics as an integral part of pedagogy; according to her:

> "the key is the ethical researcher, not the ethics governance regime" (Castillo, 2018, p. 406).

Castillo also points out that, despite the social sciences being pushed into the "formalisation" of ethics according to the biomedical paradigm, we

> "…can subvert 'formalisation' as it is currently defined and implemented, make it responsive to the needs, particularities and complexities of our discipline, innovate the process so that it primarily equips researchers with the ability to make ethical decisions and actions, and insist that these are our discipline's responsive, 'formalised' ethics procedures" (Castillo, 2018, p. 406).

The final contribution in the *Forum* by H. Richards-Rissetto (2018, pp. 409–411) discusses the ethics of data management in anthropology and archaeology, particularly the process of co-production of data in cultural heritage studies. The author is challenging the ownership of the data in the case of cultural heritage (tangible and intangible), pointing that data and knowledge are in many cases issues of complicated negotiations:

> "Cultural heritage is both tangible and intangible and as archaeologists we enter into negotiations and relationships with many stakeholders such as local communities, cultural, academic and commercial organisations, and government agencies. I concur with others in this Forum that a key concern for anthropology is ethical co-production of data and knowledge. Who, if anyone, owns the data we collect? Do we, or community members, governments, academic institutions, own these data?" (Richards-Rissetto, 2018, p. 410).

While agreeing with Castillo that we need to restructure education by integrating ethics into the pedagogical curriculum, he also states that:

> "…we can more ethically co-produce data with the communities whose heritage we collect and study by including them in the research process, not only as consultants but as designers of research strategy from the start. Community members should be involved in decision making on data collection, processing and dissemination" (Richards-Rissetto, 2018, p. 410).

Besides many inspiring and up-to-date discussions on current challenges in research ethics and integrity in the social sciences, contemporary researchers have access to a wealth of useful and high-quality publications that address these challenges and assist in navigating the complex ethical and methodological issues within the fields of ethnology and anthropology.

For those engaged in "critical research", the *Palgrave Handbook of Ethics in Critical Research* (MacLeod et al., 2018) is available. The handbook explores the growing tensions with the prevailing model of ethical clearance, which is increasingly scrutinised, particularly within critical research. Drawing from diverse field experiences across various contexts and topics, the contributors to this collection share how they coped with unexpected dilemmas and contradictions that reshaped their understanding of ethics. The book emphasises that ethics is an ongoing, context-dependent challenge, occasionally requiring a departure from traditional ethical frameworks. It is structured into four sections which guide readers through the intricacies

of ethical practice: (a) navigating institutional systems, including Ethics Committees; (b) managing blurred boundaries in research; (c) addressing the politics of voice, anonymity, and confidentiality; and (d) exploring power dynamics when researching different social strata. The handbook is a valuable source for social science researchers using critical methodologies, guiding them through the complexities of ethical research while respecting moral integrity.

A similarly useful guide is *The Oxford Handbook of Research Ethics*. This handbook discusses the practice and institutional context of research involving human subjects, key concepts and principles of research ethics, offering cutting-edge critical overviews of central ethical principles and requirements for conducting research. The book addresses a range of research areas and methods, including novel designs such as *multi-arm platform trials* [92], etc. It also delves into participatory research, addressing ethical questions that arise with research concerning certain populations, including Indigenous people, racial and ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities, etc. (Iltis and Makay, 2020).

92 "Multi-arm platform trials" are emerging as useful tools for studying various interventions and social programmes across different communities. Although these trials are more commonly used in clinical and health research, they offer unique benefits in anthropological studies by allowing multiple approaches or interventions to be assessed in real-time across varied social settings.

CONCLUSION

The kick-off theoretical volume, which provides an overview of the evolution of ethical codes in ethnology and social anthropology, reflects the discipline's ongoing commitment to ethical rigour and social responsibility. As anthropologists continue engaging with diverse communities and navigate complex ethical landscapes, these codes offer crucial guidelines to ensure that research practices are respectful, responsible, and beneficial. For contemporary anthropologists, it is standard practice to demonstrate respect and understanding for the local norms and rules of the hosting communities (e.g., Kuper, 1973; Darnell, 2021). This includes offering insights, understanding local contexts, and reflexive anthropological interpretations of findings in the process of publication.

A sample of ethical controversies, dilemmas, and even cases of breaching of scientific rigour and basic ethical standards in anthropology over the 20th and 21st centuries has highlighted the importance of ethical reflexivity, encouraging anthropologists and ethnologists to critically examine their own biases and the impact of their research on the communities they study. It has also underscored the need for clear ethical guidelines and standards to protect research participants and ensure the integrity of ethnological and anthropological work (e.g., Clifford, 1988).

The first decade of the 21st century reflected the trends in discussions about ethics in ethnology and anthropology. Social scientists also reflected the highlights of this decade, which were undoubtedly *decolonisation* (e.g., Asad, Ed., 1973; James, 1973; Said, 1978; Harrison, Ed., 1997; Smith, 1999; Bolles, 2023); or reflections on various forms of colonialism present in social science research in the Second and Third World countries. The discussion included phenomena such as *woke culture* or *cancel culture* (e.g., Clark, 2020;

Norris, 2021; Demsar et al., 2023), which can take forms of "blaming culture". In the field of ethic and minority studies, accusations of racism can contribute to authorial self-censorship or silence on problematic aspects of the studied phenomena (e.g., Williams, 2016).

At the close of the 2010s, ethnology and social anthropology are confronted with the challenges of implementing GDPR regulations. In the qualitative field, a so-called post-GDPR ethnology has emerged, where scholars critically reflect on the introduction of stringent ethical protocols into anthropological research, which are typically characteristic of medical research (e.g., Hoeyer, 2005; Castillo, 2018; Sleeboom–Faulkner and Simpson, 2018). Similarly, they criticise the formalisation of ethical standards and the adoption of increasingly extensive ethical guidelines that qualitative researchers must adhere to. Many point to the so-called *audit culture* (Pels, 2018), in which the ethics committees of various institutions, responsible for approving ethical designs, tend to prioritise the protection of the institutions themselves and often assess ethical designs in challenging environments unfavourably.

The volume elucidated that the key instrument of "non-harming anthropology"—informed consent—in many cases fails to capture the complexity and intimacy of fieldwork situations, much like anonymising locations or interlocutors often proves insufficient and, at times, even "harmful", as it can hinder the verification and further use of research findings. There are also instances where interlocutors or communities insist on the publication of full names of individuals or localities. To develop an ethical research design that is both sensitive and up-to-date—while avoiding the numerous challenges tied to qualitative research (e.g., Sriram et al., Eds., 2009; Aldridge, 2014)—we must

engage with current debates on ethical research conduct and scientific integrity, and learn from best practices in contemporary ethnology and anthropology worldwide.

Informed consent must be adapted to cultural norms, including considerations for collective decision-making processes or value systems of local communities. Researchers need to be attuned to cultural subtleties in communication and consent, ensuring that *participation* is both voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the research's purpose and methods (Roman et al., 2012).

Research involving ethnic and minority communities presents unique challenges, requiring a careful balance between respecting indigenous knowledge systems and adhering to global ethical standards (e.g., Adams, 1981). Under these conditions, informed consent processes should be *culturally sensitive*, taking into account the worldviews of both the participants and the communities involved.

Furthermore, researchers should actively engage community members in the research process, fostering partnerships that integrate local knowledge and promote shared decision-making (Miranda et al., 2019).

Social scientists have highlighted that the process of generating data occurs through co-production (Pels, 2018). Research participants cannot simply be excluded from the post-research process by signing informed consent, as subsequent depersonalisation (e.g., anonymising participants, using pseudonyms, or obscuring locations) is often imperfect and tends to protect institutions more than the individuals involved.

Even though there is significant pressure to depersonalise data and anonymise information, which most of us are either voluntarily or less voluntarily compelled to apply during post-processing, it may be time to reflect on whom these practices serve, their purpose, and whether

they align with the essence of our disciplines. If ethnology and anthropology are about people and societies, then our primary focus is on specific individuals, personal human stories, and trajectories. These should not be rewritten or censored, as doing so compromises not only the identity of the stories but also the identity of the people and communities themselves. It could also constitute a violation of scientific integrity.

Those dilemmas are vividly debated in so-called post-GDPR anthropology (Yuill, 2018), which is shifting toward the *deformalisation* of ethics and the defense of the *unique nature* of qualitative research (e.g., Castillo, 2018; Sleeboom–Faulkner and Simpson, 2018). Our aim should be not only to refine our approaches to constructing ethical frameworks for research but also to critically reflect on the limitations of the methods we employ, including participatory and empowering designs.

In this regard, it can be stated that alongside the growing need for the development and use of increasingly sensitive ethical research designs, the pressure for their formalisation is also increasing, along with the bureaucracy associated with their implementation. Additionally, we are witnessing the *monetisation* of research (the requirement to adhere to formal ethical rules to secure funding) and the *commodification* of research data (trading depersonalised data or providing it to third parties). This creates significant problems, especially in the social sciences and humanities.

Since it is likely impossible to completely eliminate the impact of our work—whether negative or positive—that can arise from our mere presence and interactions with people in the community, it is all the more important to honestly reflect on these impacts and to strive to mitigate potential negative consequences in advance. The path forward, which

involves sensitising the researcher, taking responsibility for research data throughout its entire lifecycle, and critically reflecting on inevitable mistakes that cannot be fully addressed by even the most detailed or context-specific ethical codes. In many situations, the researchers can rely only on their own internal *procedural monologue* guided by their *internal moral compass*.

Our sensitivity to the effects of our research on the communities we study and the individuals who share with us their deep, intimate, and in many times, even painful personal experiences, is growing. We recognise that the level of understanding of informed consent, which underpins the validity of much of our research, is both culturally and individually contingent. No amount of education or ethical guidelines, whatever context-specific they be, can fully address the fact that the core of our research is intersubjective, interactive, and dependent on situational contexts. The nature of our research is collaborative: during the research process, we pass through a *transformation process* rooted in mutual trust and understanding, we co-create not only knowledge and data but also emotional and psychical bonds and attachment. This creates ground for our individual responsibility not just for "data management", but also for our co-authors and co-creators, who have placed their complete trust in both our research and us.

We sincerely reflect on the fact that we can never be entirely "pure" or detached researchers. We remain human, we interact with interlocutors, we may unwillingly hurt, touch, or even cause harm, make communicative or situational missteps. We are also vulnerable, and we are not always able to defend ourselves effectively at the intersections of various actors, expectations, and obligations by which we are bound or on which we depend.

In this context, only sincere and open discussions aimed at investing all effort possible into conducting research in a professional as well as ethical, reflexive and sensitive way, hand in hand with a constant tuning of ethical codes, procedures, and protocols, will help us to stay true to the core mission of our disciplines and understand the complex ways in which diverse human communities and groups express themselves in an increasingly complex and interconnected world. Ultimately, our efforts contribute to a deeper understanding of humanity and the world we co-create.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author acknowledges the use of OpenAI ChatGPT for conducting the initial literature search on ethical codes in Anglophone anthropology, as well as for translating quotations from media reports, discussions, and articles originally published in Slovak, Czech, or Russian language (OpenAI. (2024). ChatGPT [Large language model].

The author is particularly grateful to the reviewers of the book, Elena Marushiakova, Zuzana Beňušková, and Alexandra Bitušíková, for their brilliant insights, recommendations, and meticulous reading of the first and second versions of the manuscript. My special thanks also go to Hana Hlôšková and Katarína Popelková for their consultations and useful guidance on ethics during the era of socialist ethnography in Slovakia.

FUNDING

This book was produced as an employee work within the author's job responsibilities and during her working hours, funded by the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of Slovak Academy of Sciences. It was created as part of the project APVV-22-0389 (RELIROMA), *Research on Religiosity, Spirituality, and Non-Religiosity among Roma in Slovakia*, during the preparatory phase of the methodological and ethical design of the research project and its subsequent implementation. Investigating the sensitive topics of religion and non-religion within the environment of vulnerable groups and communities required extensive preparation, including summarising controversies related to ethics violations in Romani studies in Slovakia, as well as a broader contextualisation of past and current approaches to research ethics and integrity in Slovakia and worldwide.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

REFERENCES

AAA Statement on Ethics. Principles of Professional Responsibility. https://americananthro.org/about/policies/statement-on-ethics/ [accessed Aug 19, 2024].

Adams, R. (1981). Ethical principles in anthropological research: one or many? *Human organisation, 40*(2), 155–160. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17730/HUMO.40.2.Y6158W6OMU500882.

Albro, R. (2015). Anthropological research, ethics of. In J. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 734–739). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Aldridge, J. (2014). Working with vulnerable groups in social research: dilemmas by default and design. *Qualitative Research, 14*(1), 112–130. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112455041.

AoIR (2002) *Ethical decision-making and Internet research. Recommendations from the AoIR ethics working committee*. Ess, Ch. and the AoIR ethics working committee. Approved by AoIR, November 27, 2002. www.aoir.org/reports/ethics.pdf ([accessed Aug 19, 2024].

AoIR (2012). *Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Committee*. Markham, A., Buchanan, E., AoIR Ethics Committee and AoIR general membership. Approved by the Ethics Working Committee, August, 2012. Endorsed by the AoIR Executive Committee, September, 2012. https://aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].

Anyinam, C. (1995). Ecology and ethnomedicine: Exploring links between current environmental crisis and Indigenous medical practices. *Social Science & Medicine, 40*(3), 321–329.

Apáthyová-Rusnáková, Z. (1999). Znakový systém – sonda do charakteru ľudovej kultúry. (Na materiáli kostolného zasadacieho poriadku). *Etnologické rozpravy, VI*(1), 38–67.

Asad, T. (Ed.) (1973). *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities Press.

EG ASA. *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice* (March 1999). Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth. https://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml [accessed Aug 19, 2024].

Baud, M., Legêne, S., & Pels, P. (2013). *Circumventing Reality: Report on the Anthropological Work of Professor Emeritus M. M. G. Bax*, September 9, 2013. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit. https://research.vu.nl/files/3526313/Rapport%20Commissie%20Baud%20Engelse%20versie%20def.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].

Beňušková, Z. (2001). Diskusia o knihe. *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 98.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu (2010). *Pravidla umění: vznik a struktura literárního pole*. Brno: Host.

Bolles, L. A. (2023). Ethnography at its edges. Decolonizing Anthropology:

An Ongoing Process. *American Ethnologist, 50*(3), 519–522. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.13199.
Bax, M. (1995). *Medjugorje: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Rural Bosnia*. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
Bax, M. (1997). Mass Graves, Stagnating Identification, and Violence: A Case Study in the Local Sources of "The War" in Bosnia Hercegovina. *Anthropological Quarterly, 70*(1), 11–19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/3317798.
Bax, M. (2000a). RETRACTED ARTICLE: Planned Policy or Primitive Balkanism? A Local Contribution to the Ethnography of the War in Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Ethnos, 65*(3), 317–340. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00141840050198018.
Bax, M. (2000b). Warlords, priests and the politics of ethnic cleansing: a case-study from rural Bosnia Herzegovina. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 23*(1),16–36.
Bickford, J. & Nisker, J. (2015). Ethics in Action: Anonymization as a Participant's Concern and a Participant's Practice. *Human Studies, 38*(3), 385–407.
Bitušíková, A. (2002). Etika v etnológii. *Etnologické rozpravy, IX*(2), 91–101.
Boas, F. (1911). The Mind of Primitive Man. New York: The Macmillan Company.
Boas, F. (1920). The Methods of Ethnology. *American Anthropologist, 22*(4), 311–321. https://archive.org/stream/jstor-660328/660328_djvu.txt [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Boas, F. (1928). *Anthropology and modern life*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. https://dn790004.ca.archive.org/0/items/anthropologymode00boas/anthropologymode00boas.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Bogatyrev, P. [Bogatyriov, P. G.] (1935). Funkčno-štrukturálna metóda a iné metódy etnografie a folkloristiky. *Slovenské pohľady, 51*, 550–558.
Boog, I., Florusbosch, J., Kripe, Z., Minter, T., Pels, P., & Postma, M. (2018). Data management for anthropology and ethnography: a position paper. *Forum. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 397–400. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.
Botík, J. (1987). Encyklopédia národopisu Slovenska. Projekt komplexného syntetizujúceho diela slovenskej etnografie a folkloristiky. *Slovenský národopis, 35*(1), 5–21.
Botík, J., & Slavkovský, P. (Eds.) (1995). *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska, 1, 2*. Bratislava: VEDA.
Browman, D. L. (2011). Spying by American Archaeologists in World War I. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology, 21*(2), 10–17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/bha.2123.
Bruce, S. (2000). The Ethical Dilemmas of Anthropological Research: The Case of the Urban Poor. *Anthropological Forum, 10*(2), 217–227.
Campbell, J. (1997). *The Mythic Dimension: Selected Essays, 1959-1987*. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco.
Castillo, R. C. A. (2018). Subverting "formalised" ethics through mainstreaming critical research ethics and responsive review process. *Forum. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 405–406. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.
CE AAA. *Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association*. Approved February, 2009. https://americananthro.org/wp-content/uploads/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009-1.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
CE CES. *Code of Ethics of the Czech Ethnological Society*. https://www.narodopisnaspolecnost.cz/index.php/about/ethical-code [accessed Sept 15, 2024].
Cervinkova, H. (2012). Postcolonialism, postsocialism and the anthropology of east-central Europe. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 48*(2), 155–163. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2012.658246.
Chagnon, N. A. (1968). *Yanomamö: The Fierce People*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. https://etnolinguistica.wdfiles.com/local--files/biblio%3Achagnon-1968-yanomamo/Chagnon_1968_YanomamoTheFiercePeople.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Chagnon, N. A. (1974). *Studying the Yanomamö*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Chagnon, N. A. (1992). *Yanomamo—The Last Days of Eden*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. https://archive.org/details/yanomamolastdays0000chag/page/n3/mode/2up [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Chagnon, N. A. (2013). *Noble Savages: My Life Among Two Dangerous Tribes—The Yanomamö and the Anthropologists*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Cichová, K. (2024). Etické otázky vo výskume v medicínskom prostredí, ktorého súčasťou sú deti. In M. Kinczer, T. Zachar Podolinská (Eds.), *Etické dilemy v súčasnej etnológii, I*. (pp. 10–35). Bratislava: ÚESA SAV, v. v. i. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443450.
Clark, M. D. (2020). DRAG THEM: A brief etymology of so-called "cancel culture". *Communication and the Public, 5*(3-4), 88–92. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2057047320961562.
Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9x0h.
Condon, L., Bedford, H., Ireland, L., Kerr, S., Mytton, J., Richardson, Z., & Jackson, C. (2019). Engaging Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller Communities in Research: Maximizing Opportunities and Overcoming Challenges. *Qualitative Health Research, 29*(9), 1324–1333. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318813558.
Čegiň, J. (2023). *Prečo na tom, čo je „woke", záleží: Cancel culture máme aj na Slovensku* (blog of *Denník N*; November 23, 2023). https://dennikn.sk/blog/3691979/preco-na-tom-co-je-woke-zalezi-cancel-culture-mame-aj-na-slovensku/ [accessed Aug 22, 2024].

Copyright Act (2015) *Zákon č. 185/2015Z. z. (Autorský zákon)*. https://www.slov-lex.sk/pravne-predpisy/SK/ZZ/2015/185/20230201 [accessed Aug 22, 2024].
Darnell, R. (2021). *The History of Anthropology: A Critical Window on the Discipline in North America*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Danglová, O. (2004). Dekolektivizácia a stratégie prežitia v postsocialistických poľnohospodárskych družstvách. *Slovenský národopis, 52*(2), 122–139.
Danglová, O. et al. (2005). *Vidiek v procese transformácie. Výsledky výskumu jedného západoslovenského regiónu*. Bratislava: Zing Print.
Danglová, O. (2006). *Slovenský vidiek. Bariéry a perspektívy rozvoja*. Bratislava: Zing Print.
De Koning, M., Meyer, B., Moors, A., & Pels, P. (2019). Guidelines for Anthropological Research: Data Management, Ethics, and Integrity. *Ethnography, 20*(2), 170–174.
Demsar, V., Ferraro, C., Nguyen, J., & Sands, S. (2023). Calling for Cancellation: Understanding How Markets Are Shaped to Realign with Prevailing Societal Values. *Journal of Macromarketing, 43*(3), 322–350. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467231168874.
Dilger, H., Schönhuth, M., & van Poser, A. (2018). Research ethics governance from below: a call for joint anthropological action. *Forum. Social Anthropology/ Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 397–400. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.
Dreger, A. (2011). Darkness's Descent on the American Anthropological Association: A Cautionary Tale. *Human Nature, 22*(3), 225–46. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-011-9103-y.
Diskusia o etike v etnologickom výskume (2002). *Etnologické rozpravy, IX*(2), 91–99.
Duarte, J. L., Crawford, J. T., Stern, C., Haidt, J., Jussim, L., & Tetlock, P. E. (2015). Political diversity will improve social psychological science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 38*, 1–54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x14000430.
EC CAS. *Etický kodex vědecko-výzkumné činnosti v Akademii věd České republiky*. https://www.avcr.cz/cs/o-nas/pravni-predpisy/Eticky-kodex-vedeckovyzkumne-cinnosti-v-Akademii-ved-Ceske-republiky/ [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
EC CASA. *Etický kodex České asociace pro sociální antropologii*. http://www.casaonline.cz/?page_id=7 [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
EC ESS. *Etický kódex Národopisnej spoločnosti Slovenska* (2017). http://www.nss.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/EtickyKodexNSS.pdf [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
EC FSES CU (2014). *Etický kódex FSEV UK. Vnútorný predpis č. 5/2014.* https://fses.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fsev/o_fakulte/legislativa/2014_2015/vp_2014_5_Eticky_kodex_FSEV_UK_rev_07_04.pdf.
EC SAS (2015). *Etický kódex SAV.* (All versions with amendments: https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=sas-commission&folder_no=141) [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
EC SASA. *Etický kódex Slovenskej asociácie sociálnej antropológie SASA*. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1AR-B2uuycz K17xuWaWCohy2Oc4YlucLO/edit [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
EG CASA. *Etické směrnice České asociace pro sociální antropologii*. http://www.casaonline.cz/?page_id=9 [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
GDPR (2016). *General Data Protection Regulation*. https://gdpr-info.eu/ [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
Filová, B. (1960). K niektorým metodologickým otázkam národopisnej vedy. *Slovenský národopis, 8*(2), 177–188.
Filová, B., & Kovačevičová, S. (Eds.) (1990). *Etnografický atlas Slovenska*. Bratislava: VEDA.
Ferguson, B. (1995). *Yanomami Warfare: A Political History*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
Freeman, D. (1983). *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth*. Australian National University: Open Research Depository. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/items/5406b99d-3f8e-44ef-a9a0-213f65bd2f74 [accessed Aug 19, 2024].
Freeman, D. (1999). *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead: A Historical Analysis of Her Samoan Research*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
Гаген-Торн Н. И. (1971). Ленинградская этнографическая школа в двадцатые годы (у истоков советской этнографии). *Советская этнография*, № 2, 134–145. [Gagen-Torn, N. I. (1971). Leningrad Ethnographic School in the 1920s (at the origins of Soviet ethnography). *Soviet Ethnography, 2*, 134–145.]
Gough, K. (1968). Anthropology and Imperialism. *Monthly Review*, April, *19*(11), 12–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14452/MR-019-11-1968-04_2.
Harrison, F. V. (Ed.) (1997). *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation. American Anthropological Association*. Arlington, Virginia: Association of Black Anthropologists, American Anthropological Association.
Harrison, J. L. (1997). *The Professionalization of Anthropology: A Perspective on the Development of British Social Anthropology 1886–1951*. Vancouver, CA: University of British Columbia Press.
Hoeyer, K., Dahlager, L., & Lynöe, N. (2005). Conflicting notions of research ethics. The mutually challenging traditions of social scientists and medical researchers. *Social science & medicine, 61*(8), 1741–1749. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2005.03.026.
Hlôšková, H. (2021). *Andrej Melicherčík – osobnosť v dobe, doba v osobnosti.* Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV, Marenčin PT, spol. s. r. o. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788056909171.

Horváthová, E. (1964). *Cigáni na Slovensku: Historicko-etnografický náčrt*. Bratislava: VEDA.

Horváthová, E. (1973a). Hlavné smery a činnosť Národopisného ústavu SAV od založenia Slovenskej akadémie vied. *Slovenský národopis, 21*(2), 169–181.

Horváthová, E. (1973b). Teoretické otázky súčasnej etnografie. *Slovenský národopis, 21*(3), 311–318.

Hudek, A. (2014). Slovenská akadémia vied a umení v rokoch 1945-1952. Prerod SAVU do Slovenskej akadémie vied. In D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* (pp. 69–86). Bratislava: VEDA.

Iltis, A. S., & MacKay, D. (Eds.) (2020). *The Oxford Handbook of Research Ethics, Oxford Handbooks*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190947750.001.0001.

James, W. (1973). The Anthropologist as Reluctant Imperialist. In T. Asad (Ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (pp. 41–69). London and New York: Ithaca Press and Humanities Press.

Jiřikovská, V., & Mišurec, Z. et al. (1991). Příspěvek k vývoji české etnografie a folkloristiky a Národopisné společnosti československé při ČSAV po únoru 1948. Zpráva pracovní skupiny NSČ pro valné shromáždění v Boskovicích v říjnu 1990. *Národopisný věstník československý, VIII*(50), 5–35. https://www.digitalniknihovna.cz/knav/view/uuid:6c7ede2e-5b77-423e-af28-fe55897a7c2f?article=uuid:3f73b911-3f89-421d-a1be-fdad992104f4 [accessed Aug 21, 2024].

Jorgensen, J. (1971). On Ethics and Anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 12*(3), 321–334. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1086/201209.

Jokinen, A.; Stolt, M., & Suhonen, R. (2020). Ethical issues related to eHealth: An integrative review. *Nursing Ethics, 28*, 253–271. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733020945765.

Kandert, J. (1974). Kmotrovství v horehronské vesnici. *Slovenský národopis, 22*(2), 136–141.

Kandert, J. (1976). Skutečný a ideální obraz rodiny v jedné horehronské vesnici. *Slovenský národopis, 24*(3), 464–471.

Kandert, J. (1982). Vesničtí specialisté. *Slovenský národopis, 30*(4), 633–637.

Kandert, J. (2004). *Každodenní život vesničanů středního Slovenska v 60. až 80. letech 20. století*. Praha: Karolinum.

Kiliánová, G. (2001). Rómsky dejepis – chronológia udalostí. Pokračovanie z pohľadu Ústavu etnológie SAV. *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 100–101.

Kiliánová, G. (2010). Terénny výskum a otázky etiky. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta, 58*(2), 97–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2298/GEI1002094K.

Kiliánová, G., Köstlin, K., & Stoličná, R. (Eds.) (2004). *Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Reflections and Trends*. Etnologické štúdie 9 and Veröffentlichungen Europäische Ethnologie 24. Bratislava – Wien: Ústav etnológie SAV – Institut für Europäische Ethnologie, Universität Wien.

Kiliánová, G., & Popelková, K. (2010). Zavádzanie marxistickej etnografie v národopise na Slovensku: zmena vedeckého myslenia. *Slovenský národopis, 58*(4), 410–424.

Kinczer, M. (2024). Etnografický výskum so staršími dospelými s poruchami kognitívnych funkcií na Slovensku: vybrané etické otázky a informovaný súhlas. In M. Kinczer, T. Zachar Podolinská (Eds.), *Etické dilemy v súčasnej etnológii, I*. (pp. 36–60). Bratislava: ÚESA SAV, v. v. i. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443450.

Kinczer, M., & Zachar Podolinská, T. (Eds.) (2024). *Etické dilemy v súčasnej etnológii, I*. Bratislava: ÚESA SAV, v. v. i. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443450.

Kołodziejczyk, D., & Șandru, C. (Eds.)(2016). *Postcolonial Perspectives on Postcommunism in Central and Eastern Europe*. Oxon–New York: Routledge.

Kováč, M., & Podolinská, T. (2001). *Lacandónci: poslední praví Mayovia*. Bratislava: Chronos.

Kováč, M., & Zachar Podolinská, T. (2017). Maya Female Taboo: Menstruation and Pregnancy in Lacandon Daily Life. *Contributions in New World Archaeology, 11* (special issue), 143–148.

Kosová, M. (1973). Magické usmrcovanie protivníka na diaľku (Rozbor úkonu imitačnej mágie). *Slovenský národopis, 21*(4), 543–554.

Krekovičová, E. (2001). Obrusovanie mytologických bariér (k diskusii o publikácii Rómsky dejepis). *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 107–108.

Kuper, A. (1973). *Anthropologists and anthropology. The British school 1922–1972*. London: Allen Lane.

Kušner, P. I. (1953). Referát profesora Lomonosovy university Pavla Ivanoviče Kušnera na ethnografické konferenci v Liblicích 21. 10. 1953. Ethnografické studium současného vesnického způsobu života v SSSR. *Český lid, 6*(40), 245–251.

Kužel, S. (2003). Neformální ekonomické aktivity a paternalizmus mezi slovenskými vesničany a Romy. *Slovenský národopis, 51*(4), 469–480.

Lane, J. (2016). Big data and anthropology: concerns for data collection in a new research context. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford, 3*(1), 74–88.

Leščák, M. (1972). Výskum súčasného stavu folklóru na Slovensku – Metódy, problémy, ciele. *Slovenský národopis, 20*(1), 185–194.

Macleod, C. I., Marx, J., Phindezwa Mnyaka, G., & Treharne, J. (Eds.) (2018). *The Palgrave Handbook of Ethics in Critical Research*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74721-7.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Malinowski, B. (1967). *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. (Translated by N. Guterman.) New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Mann, A. B. (2000). *Rómsky dejepis*. Bratislava: Kalligram.
Mann, A. B. (2001). Rómsky dejepis – chronológia udalostí. *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 99–100.
Margry, P. (2019). On Scholarly Misconduct and Fraud, and What We Can Learn from It. *Ethnologia Europaea, 49*(2), 133–144. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1646.
Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1986). *Collected Works*, 2nd Ed., Vol. 22. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Máthé, R. (2007). Niektoré charakteristiky sexuality Rómov. *Sexuológia/Sexology, 7*(2), 44–47.
Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of Age in Samoa. A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. New York: William Morrow.
Melicherčík, A. (1945). *Teória národopisu*. Liptovský Mikuláš: Tranoscius.
Miranda, D., García-Ramírez, M., Balcazar, F., & Suarez-Balcazar, Y. (2019). A Community-Based Participatory Action Research for Roma Health Justice in a Deprived District in Spain. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(19), 3722. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16193722.
Moore, D. C. (2001). Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique. *PMLA, 116*(1), 111–128.
Nagy, G. T. (2021). Postcolonialism in Central Europe (A linguistic perspective). *Hungarian Studies, 34*(1), 47–59.
Nahodil, O. (1950. *Sovětský národopis a jeho pokroková úloha*. Praha: Orbis.
Nahodil, O., & Kramařík, J. (1951a). *J. V. Stalin a národopisná věda*. Praha: Orbis.
Nahodil, O., & Kramařík J. (1951b). Práce J. V. Stalina o marxismu v jazykovědě a některé otázky současné ethnografie. *Český lid, 38*(1), 1–12.
Norris, P. (2021). Cancel Culture: Myth or Reality? *Political Studies Review, 71*(1), 145–174. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/003232172110370.
Orans, M. (1996). *Not Even Wrong: Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Pels, P. (1998). The Anthropology of the State: Critique and Prospects. In V. Das, A. Kleinman, M. Lock, M. Ramphele, P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Anthropology and the Global Assembly Line* (pp. 17–41). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Pels, P. (1999). Professions of Duplexity: A Prehistory of Ethical Codes in Anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 40*(1), 101–136.
Pels, P. (2018). Data management in anthropology: the next phase in ethics governance? *Forum. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 391–396. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.
Personal Data Protection (2018). *Zákon č. 18/20188 Z. z. o ochrane osobných údajov*. https://www.slov-lex.sk/pravne-predpisy/SK/ZZ/2018/18/ [accessed Aug 22, 2024].

Petráňová, L. (2017). Vyloučen z KSČ a tím ze všeho, takřka i ze života. Otakar Nahodil na Filozofické fakultě UK v Praze. *Národopisný věstník, 34*[76](1), 5–24.
Pew Research Center (May 19, 2021). *Americans and "Cancel Culture": Where Some See Calls for Accountability, Others See Censorship, Punishment*. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/05/19/americans-and-cancel-culture-where-some-see-calls-for-accountability-others-see-censorship-punishment/ [accessed Aug 22, 2024].
Podoba, J. (2001). Kauza Rómsky dejepis a akademická obec. *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 102–106.
Podoba, J. (2002). Na okraj diskusie o využívaní informačných etnografických prameňov. *Etnologické rozpravy, IX*(2), 85–91.
Podoba, J. (2007a). Josef Kandert: Každodenní život vesničanů středního Slovenska v šedesátých až osmdesátých letech 20. století. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review, 43*(1), 235–237.
Podoba, J. (2007b). Sociálna antropológia v stredovýchodnej Európe: intelektuálna výzva alebo anachronizmus? *Sociologický Časopis/Czech Sociological Review, 43*(1), 175–182. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41132486 [accessed Sep 8, 2024].
Podolák, J. (1955). Desať rokov slovenského národopisu (1945–1955). *Slovenský národopis, 3*(4), 421–450.
Podolinská, T., & Kováč, M. (2001). Daughters of Luna. Ritual Status of Women in the Mayas-Lacandons Society. *Slovenský národopis, 49*(4), 479–494.
Pranda, A. (1972). Hlavné okruhy vedeckých problémov sovietskej etnografie. *Národopisné aktuality, 4*, 253–270.
Pucherová, D., & Gáfrik, R. (2012). Postkolonializmus a literatúra strednej a východnej Európy. *World literature studies, 21*(3-4), 2–6.
Richards-Rissetto, H. (2018). Ethics of data management: an anthropological archaelology perspective. *Forum. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 409–411. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.
Resoluce III. celostátní konference ethnografů. *Český lid, 40*(6), 244–245.
Rodham K., & Gavin J. (2006). The ethics of using the internet to collect qualitative research data. *Research Ethics Review, 2*(3), 92–97.
Roman, G., Enache, A., Parvu, A., Gramma, R., Moisă, Ș., Dumitraș, S., & Ioan, B. (2013). Ethical issues in communication of diagnosis and end-of-life decision-making process in some of the Romanian Roma communities. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 16*, 483–497. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-012-9425-5.
Royal Historical Society Statement on Ethics. (October 2020). https://files.royalhistsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/18102348/Royal-Historical-Society-Statements-on-Ethics-October-2020.pdf [accessed Aug 22, 2024].

Rustamova, L. R., & Ivanova, D. G. (2023). Cancel culture towards Russia and howto deal with it. *RUDN Journal of Political Science, 25*(2), 434–444. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2023-25-2-434-444.

Rzepka, A., Fazlagić, J., & Ahamed, I. (2023). Measuring woke culture in universities: a diagnostic approach. *Journal of Modern Science, 54*(5), 488–509. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13166/jms/176387.

Sádaba, T., & Herrero, M. (2020). Cancel Culture in the Academia: The Hispanic Perspective. *methaodos. revista de ciencias sociales, 10*(2), 312–321. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.17502/mrcs.v10i2.594.

SACHRP (2013). *Considerations and Recommendations Concerning Internet Research and Human Subjects Research Regulations*. https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/ohrp/sachrp/mtgings/2013%20March%20Mtg/internet_research.pdf [accessed Sep 8, 2024].

Sahlins, M. (2000). *Jungle fever*. The Washington Post, December, 9. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/entertainment/books/2000/12/10/jungle-fever/e8b757ae-b365-4632-8f04-3d9e61371ed7/ [accessed Sep 8, 2024].

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Salner, P. (2001). Diskusia o knihe. *Etnologické rozpravy, VIII*(2), 97–98.

Salner, P. (2006). Človek – téma – Ústav etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied alebo Hľadanie seba a témy na ostrove pozitívnej deviácie. *Etnologické rozpravy, XIII*(1), 105–109.

Salemink, O., & Verrips, J. (2020). More Thoughts on Scholarly Misconduct, and What We Can Learn from It: A Critical Response to Peter Jan Margry's Article about the Bax Affair. *Ethnologia Europaea, 49*(2), 145–155. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.3025.

Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995). The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 36*(3), 409–420.

Scheffel, D. Z. (1992). Antropologická etika ve východní Evropě. *Národopisný věstník Československý, 51*(9), 3–10.

Шеффель, Д. З. (1993). Антропология и этика в Восточной Европе. *Этнографическое обозрение,* № 6., 21–28. [Scheffel, Z. D. (1993). Anthropology and Ethics in Eastern Europe. *Ethnographic Review, 6*, 21–28.]

Scheffel, Z. D. (2005). *Svinia in Black and White: Slovak Roma and their Neighbours* (Teaching Culture: UTP Ethnographies for the Classroom). Toronto: University of Toronto.

Scheffel, Z. D. (2009). *Svinia v čiernobielom: Slovenskí Rómovia a ich susedia*. Prešov: Centrum antropologických výskumov.

Scheffel, Z. D. (2018). *Letter from prison*, September 10, 2018 (scan of the manuscript distributed via *CASA* info-channel).

Scheffel, Z. D. (2019). The Slovak "Gypsy Fringe" as a Semi-Colonial Entity. In D. Schorkowitz, J. Chávez, I. Schröder (Eds.), *Shifting Forms of Continental Colonialism* (pp. 197–226). Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scheffel, Z. D. (2021a). *Letter from Prison*, May 14, 2021 manuscript circulated via *CASA* info-channel, in 2021).

Scheffel, Z. D. (2021b). *The Gypsy šlapka in Eastern Slovakia* (manuscript circulated via *CASA* info-channel, in 2021).

Scheffel, Z. D. (2022a). *Letter from Prison*, June 2, 2022.

Scheffel, Z. D. (2022b). *Letter from Prison*, August 29, 2022.

Scheffel, D., & Mušinka, A. (2019). Third-Class Slovak Roma and Inclusion: Bricoleurs vs. Social Engineers. *Anthropology Today, 35*(1), 17–21.

Scheffel—Sentencing Petition (2021). Initiators and core signatories: I. G. Somlay, S. La Tosky, A. Mušinka, JUDr. P. Kubina (March 2021, text circulated via GLS Romani studies and anthropological circles).

Serdziuk, B. (2024). Marian Devotion in Post-Communist Belarus: Ethical Issues in Field and Desk Research. In M. Kinczer, T. Zachar Podolinská (Eds.), *Etické dilemy v súčasnej etnológii, I*. (pp. 98–123). Bratislava: ÚESA SAV, v. v. i. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443450.

Shankman, P. (2009). *The Trashing of Margaret Mead: Anatomy of an Anthropological Controversy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sriram, C. L., King, J. C., Mertus J. A., et al. (Eds.) (2009). *Surviving Field Research: Working in Violent and Difficult Situations*. London and New York: Routledge.

Simpson, B. (2011). Ethical moments: future directions for ethical review and ethnography. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 17*, 377–393. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9655.2011.01685.X.

Sleeboom-Faulkner, M., & Simpson, B. (2018) From protocol-based to exploratory research. *Forum. Social Anthropology/ Anthropologie Sociale, 26*(3), 404–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526.

Slavkovský, P. (2006). Vedecké syntézy druhej polovice 20. storočia – výzvy a limity. (Etnografický atlas Slovenska, Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska, Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry). *Etnologické rozpravy, XIII*(1), 16–29.

Slavkovský, P. (2009). *Svet na odchode. Tradičná agrárna kultúra Slovákov v strednej a južnej Európe*. Bratislava: VEDA. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2009.9788022410861.

Slavkovský, P. (2012). *Slovenská etnografia (kompendium dejín vedného odboru)*. Bratislava: VEDA. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2012.9788022412797.

Slavkovský, P. (Ed.) (2006). Ján Mjartan: Z minulosti Národopisného ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied. *Etnologické rozpravy, XIII*(2), 214–257.

Slivková, N. (2024). Etické dilemy v kvalitatívnom výskume na internete a pri skúmaní citlivých tém. In M. Kinczer, T. Zachar Podolinská (Eds.), *Etické dilemy v súčasnej etnológii, I*. (pp. 62–123). Bratislava: ÚESA SAV, v. v. i. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443450.

Skalníková, O. (1952). II. národopisná konference. *Český lid, 39*(1/2), 1–2.
Skalníková, O. (1953). Třetí celostátní ethnografická konference. *Český lid, 40*(6), 241–243.
Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books; Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities. Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA). https://appliedanthro.org/annual-meeting/information-logistics/meeting-instructions/statement-of-ethics-professional-responsibilities/ [accessed Aug 13, 2024].
Stocking, G. W. (1968). *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. New York: Free Press.
Stoll, D. (2000). Napoleon Chagnon, Blood, and Madness. *Anthropology Today, 16*(2), 3–8.
Šotola, J., Rodríguez Polo, M., & Škobla, D. (2018). Slovak Roma beyond Anthropological Escapism and Exotic Otherness. Concept of "Whiteness" and the Structure of Everyday Life. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology, 66*(4), 487–500. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26363/SN.2018.4.07.
Štofaník, J. (2017). Budovateľskí národopisci? Etnografia robotníctva a štúdium religiosity. *Český lid, 104*(1), 71–79.
Tierney, P. (2001). *Darkness in El Dorado: How scientists and journalists devastated the Amazon*. New York: W. W. Norton.
Traversa, M., Tian, Y., & Wright, S. C. (2023). Cancel culture can be collectively validating for groups experiencing harm. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1181872. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181872.
Tolstov, S. P. (1951). Význam prác J. V. Stalina o otázkach jazykovedy pre vývin sovietskej etnografie. *Národopisný sborník SAVU, 10*, 25–51.
Tokarev, S. A. (1951). Engels a súčasná etnografia. *Národopisný sborník SAVU, 10*, 71–88.
van Kolfschooten, F. (2012). *Ontspoorde Wetenschap: Over Fraude, Plagiaat en Academische Mores*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Balans.
Vrzgulová, M. (Ed.) (2020). *Dvojrozhovor. O pamäti, etnológii a meste. Bratislava*: ÚESA SAV, Marenčin, P. T.
Všetičková, N. (2015). *Otakar Nahodil a sovětizace národopisu v 50. letech 20. století* (Diplomová práca, Západočeská univerzita v Plzni, Fakulta filozofická). https://dspace5.zcu.cz/bitstream/11025/19256/1/DP_Vsetickova.pdf [accessed Aug 13, 2024].
Williams, J. (2016). *Academic Freedom in an Age of Conformity: Confronting the Fear of Knowledge*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Wood, E. J. (2006). The ethical challenges of field research in conflict zones. *Qualitative Sociology, 29*(3), 373–386.
Yuill, C. (2018). "Is Anthropology Legal?". Anthropology and the EU General Data Protection Regulation. *Anthropology in Action, 25*(2, Summer 2018), 36–41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3167/aia.2018.250205.
Young, M. W. (2004). Malinowski: *Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884–1920*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Zajonc, J. (2002). Ochrana osobných práv v etnologickom bádaní. *Etnologické rozpravy, IX*(2), 101–103.
Zajonc, J. (2016). I. Kapitola. Národopisné pracovisko v Slovenskej akadémii vied a umení (1946–1953). In G. Kiliánová, J. Zajonc, *70. rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovesnkej akadémie vied: Kontinuity a diskontinuity jednej inštitúcie* (pp. 21–54). Bratislava: VEDA, ÚEt SAV.
Zachar Podolinská, T. (2021). Dobové paradigmy v kontexte dejín Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV (1946–1989): od generácie zakladateľov po generáciu budovateľov. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology, 69*(1), 137–165. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/se-2021-0008.
Zachar Podolinská, T., & Popelková, K. (2023). *Story of Cohesion. On the History of an Academic Institution*. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology, SAS. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2023.9788022420228.
Žižek, S. (2020). Woke Capitalism: How Big Business Stole the Left's Clothes. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 28*(3), 302–320. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12245.
I. celostátní národopisná konference (1949). *Český lid, 36*(1–2), 44–45.

ETHNOLOGICAL STUDIES 59

ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY – THE CASE OF SLOVAKIA (LATE 20th AND 21st CENTURIES)

Language proofs: Judita Takáčová, 2024
Design and layout: © Matúš Hnát, 2024

Published by the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS as Ethnological Studies publication no. 59, 1st edition. www.uesa.sav.sk

The publication was supported by the APVV-22-0389 project (RELIROMA): Research on Religiosity, Spirituality, and Non-religiosity among the Roma in Slovakia.

The publication was supported by Academia Ethnographica & Anthropologica (AEA) at IESA SAS, through the SAS support for scientific societies in 2024.

ISBN 978-80-974434-7-4
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/2024.9788097443474

The publication offers the first comprehensive overview of the fundamental features shaping ethical norms in ethnology and social anthropology in Slovakia during the latter half of the 20th century and the early 21st century in the context of global developments. The author correctly anticipated that the time had come to critically reflect not only on the previous decades—when the ethical awareness of ethnologists and social anthropologists in Slovakia was just beginning to awaken, and they were starting to develop their ethical postulates based on foreign models—but also to evaluate the results achieved.

Zuzana Beňušková

The publication presents, for the first time, a comprehensive overview of the development of research ethics in ethnography, ethnology, and social/cultural anthropology in Slovakia, set within a broad historical and global context. It enhances understanding of how these disciplines and their methodologies function across various groups and environments. It is highly recommended reading for anyone interested in the ethical dimensions of ethnological and anthropological research.

Alexandra Bitušíková

The publication is a unique exploration of the pressing issue of ethical research and its associated risks. From the perspective of a Slovak scholar, the book offers a captivating journey through time, tracing the evolution of ethical norms, written codes, and ethical commissions. Its release is particularly timely, as we need to cultivate reflexivity and sensitivity in the current generation of social scientists and contribute to the discussion on ethical research conduct in Slovakia and worldwide. The book serves as a fascinating and helpful compendium, providing essential guidance in navigating the intricate and evolving landscape of ethical challenges in ethnology and social anthropology in the 20th and 21st centuries.

Elena Marushiakova

ISBN 978-80-974434-7-4

Institute of Ethnology
and Social Anthropology
Slovak Academy of Sciences