

The necessary updating of the UNESCO Codes in Social Anthropology in the 21st century

La necesaria actualización de los Códigos UNESCO en Antropología Social en el siglo XXI

Klaus SCHRIEWER
Juan Ignacio RICO BECERRA
*University of Murcia **

Abstract: In this text we intend to highlight why it is essential to update the UNESCO Codes for Social Anthropology. To this end we carried out, in the first place, a retrospective review of the UNESCO Codes and its limitations, starting from the first draft of 1972 to the present. Then we expose the valuations of the Spanish anthropologists who have participated in our survey on the adequacy of the UNESCO Codes, and finally we present a proposal of the UNESCO Codes for Anthropology.

Key words: UNESCO nomenclature; survey among anthropologists; classification of scientific fields; anthropological field; discipline; sub-discipline.

Resumen: En este texto pretendemos poner de manifiesto por qué es imprescindible actualizar los Códigos UNESCO en Antropología Social. Para tal fin realizamos, en primer lugar, una revisión retrospectiva de los Códigos UNESCO partiendo del primer borrador de 1972 hasta la actualidad y de sus limitaciones. Después exponemos las valoraciones de los antropólogos/as españoles/as que han participado en nuestra encuesta sobre la adecuación de los Códigos UNESCO; y finalmente, elaboramos una propuesta de los Códigos UNESCO para Antropología.

Palabras clave: Códigos UNESCO; encuesta de antropólogos/as; clasificación de campos científicos; campo antropológico; disciplina; subdisciplina.

Received: 8th September 2018. Accepted: 10th October 2018.

Email: ks@um.es; juan.rico@um.es.

Translated by María Lourdes Pérez Martín. Email: lourdesperezmurcia@yahoo.es.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/rmu/355551>

1. INTRODUCTION

The document *Presente y futuro de la Antropología Social y Cultural española: A partir de las reflexiones sobre niveles de asociación científico-académica entre áreas de conocimiento* (Present and future of Spanish Social and Cultural Anthropology: From thoughts on levels of scientific-academic association between areas of knowledge), which heads the articles presented below, aims at stimulating the debate on the role of our discipline both in the academic world and in society and, with it, on the identity of Anthropology. This is not a reflection that had been absent from our discipline, as evidenced, for example, by the event on history and perspectives of Anthropology which took place in the last Congress of the Spanish Federation of Anthropology Associations (FAAEE) in Valencia,¹ Spain. But, nevertheless, we find of interest to keep on stressing some elements that we consider essential in order to tackle the new challenges that appear at present.

We decided to examine different aspects surrounding the proposed task: the so-called UNESCO Codes as an internationally applied framework for the definition of academic disciplines, and Anthropology codification process; the relationship between this and related disciplines in the academic set; and, finally, the valuation of anthropologists about the perspectives of our discipline. In this first article we deal with the definition of Anthropology offered by the «*International Standard Nomenclature for Fields of Science and Technology*», known as UNESCO Codes, which has a profound impact on Spanish academic life. Our purpose is to discuss on its adequacy and topicality as well as to present a first proposal for its updating.

To this end, as indicated above, we are going to start with a brief review of the origins of this nomenclature, the definition of the terms used and the application of the UNESCO Codes in Spain; in the second part, we offer the valuations of Spanish anthropologists who have participated in our survey on the adequacy of the UNESCO Codes; and in the third part, based on these contributions and previous reflections, we present a first proposal for the debate on a modification of the UNESCO Codes in Anthropology.

1 «La historia de la Antropología y la Etnología en España y el mundo Hispanoamericano» («The History of Anthropology and Ethnology in Spain and the Hispanic American World»), organised by Andrés Barrera González and Carmen Ortiz García on 6th September 2017 at the FAAEE Congress «Antropologías en transformación. Sentidos, compromisos y utopías» («Changing Anthropologies: senses, commitments and utopias»).

2. THE UNESCO CODES

The UNESCO Codes are undoubtedly an instrument which has had a strong impact on the structuring of the international academic world and, thus, on the Spanish one. It is used for many aspects of academic life. It is the case of education calls for teachers, the classification of the field in which doctoral theses are assigned or the systematization of activities for research groups, among others. In short, it is one of the main tools that are used when designing the academic world.

Taking into account, as we were saying, that these Codes have engineered the systematization of the academic sphere that we know today, we wonder whether the current organisation of the UNESCO Codes is still appropriate. It is known that many disciplines have evolved in the last decades thanks to the development of the disciplines, the introduction of new technologies and the socio-political changes. The issue then is whether the UNESCO Codes have been updated bearing in mind such variations. And it does not seem to have been the case, as shown, for example, by the valuation of Ruiz Martínez, Baños Moreno and Martínez Béjar: «The break with the scientific and technological reality is evident, since the new disciplines and branches that have emerged in recent years are not included in the classification».² Based on the above premise, in order to further investigate, we decided to review first the evolution of the UNESCO Codes.

The initiative to create a nomenclature of academic disciplines was born in the 1960s as a response to a globalization which is accelerating in these years. In a first document, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics announces that «*after some years perhaps the formulation of a recommendation for an international standard in this field*»³ will be achieved. The objective, linked to the Codes, is to create a tool for the production of comparative statistics to be used for management and policy in the area of science and technology. In 1972 UNESCO publishes a first draft which subsequently undergoes deep changes.⁴ A year later, in 1973, the pro-

2 RUIZ MARTÍNEZ, J. M.; BAÑOS MORENO, M. J., MARTÍNEZ BÉJAR, R.: «Nomenclatura Unesco. Evolución, alcance y reutilización en clave ontológica para la descripción de perfiles científicos», *El profesional de la información*, 23, n. 4, 2014, pp. 383-392, p. 384.

3 UNESCO: «*Problems Encountered in the Development of a Standard International Methodology of Science Statistics*», Meeting of the Advisory Panel on Science Statistics, UNESCO/CS/0666.SS-80/5. Paris: 1966, p. 4.

4 UNESCO: *Provisional List of Scientific Disciplines*, UNESCO/NS/ROU/257, Paris: March 1972.

posal for the nomenclature⁵ that was afterwards applied in Spain was published. But it was not until 1988 when the definitive document named *Proyecto de Nomenclatura Internacional Normalizada relativa a la Ciencia y la Tecnología*⁶ (Draft of Normalized International Nomenclature related to Science and Technology) was published, which, with a few minor modifications, has been applied up to the present. We must emphasize for the discussion we deal with in here that UNESCO left the project in 1992, as declared by Ruiz Martínez, Baños Moreno and Martínez Béjar.⁷

In our country it was not until 1983 that, pursuant to Resolution of September 23rd 1983 (BOE October 14th), the 1973 proposal became the classification used by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology.⁸ On this basis, the Spanish Higher Council for Scientific Research has made public subsequent amendments according to Agreements carried out by its Governing Board through the resolutions of 28th March 1985, 25th March 1986 and 10th March 1988. We can say that the UNESCO Codes continue to influence our legislation. Thus, Royal Decree 1312/2007 lays down a system that reminds of UNESCO classification, albeit in a modified way.

As for the terms used, the terminological structure is as follows: fields, disciplines and subdisciplines.

1. **Fields.** They refer to the most general sections. They are coded with two digits and contain several disciplines.

2. **Disciplines.** They mean a general description of speciality groups in Science and Technology. They are coded sections with four digits. Although disciplines with crossed references, or within the same field, are different, they are deemed to have common characteristics.

3. **Subdisciplines:** These are the most specific entries in the nomenclature and represent the activities carried out within a discipline. They are coded with six digits. Also, they should correspond to the individual specialities in Science and Technology.

5 UNESCO: *Proposed International Standard Nomenclature for Fields of Science and Technology*. UNESCO NS/ROU/257 rev. 1, Paris: 17 December 1973.

6 UNESCO: *Proyecto de Nomenclatura Internacional Normalizada relativa a la Ciencia y la Tecnología*. UNESCO NS/ROU/257 rev. 1, Paris: 17 de diciembre 1988.

7 RUIZ MARTÍNEZ, J. M.; BAÑOS MORENO, M. J., MARTÍNEZ BÉJAR, R.: «Nomenclatura Unesco...», 2014, p. 385.

8 Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades del Gobierno de España: <<http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/portal/site/MICINN/menuitem.8ce192e94ba842bea3bc811001432ea0/?vgnextoid=363ac9487fb02210VgnVCM1000001d04140aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=28fb282978ea0210VgnVCM1000001034e20aRCRD>>.

These three levels have undergone several modifications of major interest for Anthropology discipline.

2.1. The fields

Regarding the fields, it should be noted that Anthropology has not been recognized as an own academic field at the start of preparing the nomenclature. The first draft of 1972 did not validate Anthropology as an own field. Neither did it in a first list at the beginning of the document, nor in a more detailed list that it included. It subordinated Anthropology as a four-digit discipline to the Sociology field (32). The 1973 proposal already contained a very deep change as it raised Anthropology to an own field (outside the scope of Sociology) and giving it the digits 51.

Beyond the classification with two digits indicated by the fields, the first draft distinguishes five areas similar to the branches that we know in the Spanish current system: Exact Sciences, Physical and Natural Sciences, Applied Sciences, Human and Social Sciences as well as an area called Generalities.⁹ Emphasize must be given to the fact that this first draft still presents Humanities and Social Sciences as a whole, although it excludes Philosophy as one of the so-called Generalities. It should be taken into account that subsequent versions of the UNESCO Codes do not explicitly mention the branches any longer, although they do organize fields according to decimals. If nowadays there are documents, in different Spanish universities, sorting the fields established by UNESCO according to the branches we use, they are interpretations of their own that may not be deducted from the UNESCO Codes.

The 1988 document categorizes Logic and Mathematics under decimal 1, and disciplines related to Natural Sciences in decimal group 2. In the group that begins with digit 3 applied disciplines appear, including those of health. In this document decimal 4 disappears, being a sign of the profound modifications that the system undergoes. It is from decimal 5 where disciplines that may potentially have a closer relationship with Anthropology appear. Under decimal 5 we find fields that, in our opinion, would belong to both Social Sciences and Humanities: Anthropology (51) appears together with Demography (52), Economic Sciences (53), Geography (54), History (55), Juridical Sciences and Law (56), Linguistics (57), Pedagogy (58) and Political Science (59). In the next field, starting with digit 6, Psychology (61), Sciences of Arts and Letters (62) and Sociology (63) are

9 UNESCO: *Provisional List of Scientific Disciplines...* 1972, p. 2.

included. The last field includes Ethics (71) and Philosophy (72). It is evident that those containing decimals 5, 6 and 7 do not follow a logic that currently corresponds in Spain to the applied branches; this perhaps happens due to a lack of differentiation between Humanities and Social Sciences. In fact, in Spain the possibility of incorporating them in both fields was subsequently opened. In other words, a possibility of integrating some of the disciplines in both branches at a time (Humanities and Social Sciences) has been opened. The same has happened with Social Anthropology and Human Geography.

2.2. The disciplines

The disciplines are established from classifications that are made from four digits. They create a network of disciplines within the fields. In the case of Anthropology, in the first draft of 1972, we can see that it is part of a discipline within the scope of Sociology (32) and classifies anthropological work under the name «*Cultural/social anthropology, ethnology*»¹⁰ with code 3208. The 1973 proposal, as we have already commented, raises Anthropology to an own field, what implies the definition of disciplines within this new field. These disciplines tagged with four digits are generated by dividing the anthropological disciplines of the previous draft into three, namely: Cultural Anthropology (5101), Ethnology and Ethnography (5102), and Social Anthropology (5103). Apart from these three disciplines, the category «Other Anthropological Specialities (specify)» is included under code 5199.¹¹ By recognizing its limitations in this way, it points out that the system is designed to undergo modifications. Likewise, reference is made to the discipline Physical Anthropology (2402), placed in the field of Life Sciences (24).

It may be inferred from the 1972 UNESCO document that the differentiation fixed was prepared from categories of the academic American world where a distinction between British and American tradition was made. Therefore, it does not reflect the debate conducted in those times in continental Europe; nor the division between both anthropologies which characterizes anthropological work in Europe.¹² We must wonder whether it is appropriate to keep the distinction between the three anthropological disciplines, especially if we have to specify different subdisciplines in each of them. The dilemma that arises can be shown

10 UNESCO: *Provisional List of Scientific Disciplines...* 1972, p. 17.

11 UNESCO: *Proposed International Standard Nomenclature...* 1973, p. 16.

12 SCHIPPERS, Th.: «A history of paradoxes. Anthropologies of Europe», in Vermeulen, H.; Álvarez Roldán, A. (eds.): *Fieldworks and Footnotes. Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, London: Routledge, 1995, pp. 234 - 246.

by an example: Would the subdiscipline Urban Anthropology or Anthropology of Migration be part of Cultural Anthropology, Ethnology and Ethnography or Social Anthropology? And this would lead us to another deeper questioning: is it possible to systematize anthropological work through these three alleged disciplines? With that in mind, the review of the subdisciplines increases doubts.

2.3. The subdisciplines

The list of subdisciplines tagged with six digits affords the most detailed description of anthropological activity that we find in the UNESCO Codes. It allows us to review in detail whether and to what extent, anthropological activity is reflected. The design of subdisciplines has also undergone several changes that allow us to find out how a suitable systematics has been attempted to create.

The first draft of 1972¹³ gives us a long list with nineteen subdisciplines which in a very generic way tries to comprise anthropological work and reflects the issues tackled in the 1970s. It is clear that the description is inspired by anthropological tradition linked to the study of the so-called simple societies, non European. Attention should also be drawn to the fact that subsequent versions do not include all subdisciplines collected by this draft, or they are moved to another field. This is the case, as we will explain later, of Medical Anthropology, which appears in this first list (see code 3208.11 below), and which in the following classification will be placed in the field Life Sciences, within the discipline Physical Anthropology under code 2402.07.

3208	<u>Cultural/social anthropology, ethnology</u>
3208.01	Accultural and social change
3208.02	Cultural and social evolution
3208.03	Cultural processes
3208.04	Culture and personality; psychological anthropology
3208.05	Culture history and distribution studies
3208.06	Ethnic and race relations
3208.07	Ethnohistory
3208.08	Folklore and literature
3208.09	Kinship and family systems
3208.10	Language and culture
3208.11	Medical anthropology
3208.12	Music and dance
3208.13	Peasants/village studies
3208.14	Primate behaviour and ethology
3208.15	Religion/ideology
3208.16	Social structure and organization
3208.17	Socialization
3208.18	Technology/material culture
3208.19	Urban studies
3208.99	Other (specify)

Picture 1: Anthropological subdisciplines of 1972 draft.

13 UNESCO: *Provisional List of Scientific Disciplines...* 1972.

The proposal of the UNESCO Codes which is presented one year later (1973)¹⁴ contains a deep modification and specification in comparison with the first one (1972). And it is included without any modifications in the 1988 document.¹⁵ It enumerates thirty anthropological subdisciplines and divides them into the three anthropological disciplines: Cultural Anthropology, Ethnology and Ethnography, and Social Anthropology. The result is a system that seems somewhat artificial and does not correspond to current reality in Spain. The one under the name Social Anthropology, used in Spain and that comprises the whole anthropological work, is aimed at the study of the following issues: Chiefdom and Royalty (5103.01), Descent, family and kinship (5103.02), Nomadism (5103.03), Slavery and bondage (5103.04) and War (5103.05). In addition, as always, there is a field called «Other (specify)» which bears code 5103.99.

5103	<u>Social anthropology</u>
5103.01	Chiefdom, royalty
5103.02	Descent, family, kinship
5103.03	Nomadism
5103.04	Slavery, bondage
5103.05	War (see 6304.03)
5103.99	Other (specify)

Picture 2: Subdisciplines of Social Anthropology in the proposals of 1973 and 1988.

It is obvious that these subdisciplines refer almost entirely to the study of so-called simple societies and do not have much to do with the tasks to which anthropologists are currently engaged. Very similar is the approach of the eleven subdisciplines that constitute the discipline Ethnology and Ethnography. Thus, subdisciplines such as Hunting, Fishing, and especially Barter and Exchange, show that a traditional vision of Anthropology is maintained.

14 UNESCO: *Proposed International Standard Nomenclature...* 1973.

15 UNESCO: *Proyecto de Nomenclatura Internacional Normalizada...* 1988.

5102	<u>Ethnography and Ethnology</u>
5102.01	Agriculture
5102.02	Arms
5102.03	Barter
5102.04	Exchange
5102.05	Habitat
5102.06	Handicraft
5102.07	Hunting
5102.08	Fishing
5102.09	Foraging
5102.10	Metallurgy
5102.11	Stockraising
5102.99	Other (specify)

Picture 3: Subdisciplines of Ethnology and Ethnography in the proposals of 1973 and 1988.

The third discipline mentioned in the document, Cultural Anthropology, is made up of fourteen subdisciplines that in some cases are very general, such as Religion or Symbolism and, therefore, they have more correspondence with current fields. Nevertheless, this relationship is also characterized by a traditional vision as it is oriented to topics such as Adornment, Clothing, Dances, etc., that although being part of the objects of anthropological study, do not occupy a prominent position as suggested here.

5101	<u>Cultural anthropology</u>
5101.01	Adornment
5101.02	Clothing
5101.03	Dances, feasts (see 6203.02)
5101.04	Ethno-musicology
5101.05	Ethnolinguistics
5101.06	Museology
5101.07	Myths
5101.08	Magic
5101.09	Poems, stories
5101.10	Religion (see 5403.04, 5506.20, 5601, 5906.05, 6301.10, 7102.05 and 7204.04)
5101.11	Sorcery
5101.12	Symbolism (see 6308.03)
5101.13	Traditional medicine (see 3209.04)
5101.14	Tradition
5101.99	Other (specify)

Picture 4: Subdisciplines of Cultural Anthropology in the proposals of 1973 and 1988.

The list of subdisciplines that the Codes allocate to each of anthropological disciplines is arbitrary. We can ask why the decision to link Agriculture with Ethnology and not with Social Anthropology is taken, or why Museology is linked to Cultural Anthropology and not to Ethnology. As we previously commented, is it in fact possible to clearly differentiate the three disciplines? Would it not be more appropriate to distinguish anthropological disciplines in a different way?

In addition, the anthropological areas that in the 1970s and 1980s emerged in a discipline that sought to open up to new conditions and meet the challenges of societies in an increasingly globalized world are completely lacking. For example, there is a lack of a subdiscipline that includes Industrial Anthropology and, by extension, it is necessary to incorporate an approach aimed at economic culture of industrial societies, driven in our environment by researchers such as Esteve Fabregat with his work *Antropología industrial*.¹⁶ Another case is Urban Anthropology which, although it is present in the 1972 proposal, disappears later on. And it is a field that, due to rural exodus processes in the whole world and transformations in cities, has gained importance in anthropological work.¹⁷ It seems that in the 15 years between the first proposal presented in 1973 and the final version of 1988, anthropologists lost interest and/or did not have the ability to influence an adaptation of the codes.

Likewise we must not overlook Physical Anthropology either, that has been included in another field (2402), specifically, Life Sciences. Because of this, most of the topics that it brings together are far from Anthropology, such as Anthropological genetics, Anthropometry, Forensic Anthropology, Osteology or Primate Somatology and Racial Biology. Others, however, would be part of our discipline: Anthropological archives, Ethnology, Nutritional habits, Museology and Medical Anthropology.

It is significant that UNESCO abandoned the project in 1992, which is why the UNESCO Codes have not been updated since then. This fully affects a discipline as dynamic and changing as Social Anthropology has been over the past almost 30 years. That is the reason why we believe it is important to return to the definition contained in the UNESCO Codes; and not only because of its

16 ESTEVA FABREGAT, C.: *Antropología Industrial*, Barcelona: Anthropos, 1984.

17 FOX, R. G.: *Urban anthropology: Cities in their cultural settings*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977. HANNERZ, U.: *Exploring the city: Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1980, (in Spanish: *Exploración de la ciudad. Hacia una antropología urbana*, Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993).

influence on Spanish academic world and Spanish legislation but also because it may be a tool to stimulate reflection. Furthermore, it could motivate UNESCO to take up the project again. Therefore, we present below the comments that we have gathered from colleagues in Anthropology as a first approach of the valuation of the UNESCO Codes in our discipline.

3. THE UNESCO CODES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE ANTHROPOLOGISTS SURVEYED

First of all, as we already did in the brief introductory text heading all articles linked with the focus of the issue number of the journal *Revista Murciana de Antropología (Present and future of Spanish Social and Cultural Anthropology: From thoughts on levels of scientific-academic association between areas of knowledge)*, we would like to express our most sincere gratitude to the colleagues who from different parts of Spanish geography have participated in the small questionnaire that we sent to them in order to sound out the matter in hand. We particularly asked them to value the descriptors of the discipline in the UNESCO Codes¹⁸ and, if deemed appropriate, point out the modifications to be made.

As described below, the answers to the questionnaire are basically based on three aspects:

1. The gap in the UNESCO Codes.
2. The misalignment of the UNESCO Codes with regards to the contents that they intend to classify.
3. The need to rebuild the UNESCO Codes.

We will review them in this order based on the comments of the participants.

3.1. The gap in the UNESCO Codes

Concerning the gap in the UNESCO Codes, the position of the respondents is unanimous. Andrés Barrera González warns clearly and concisely: «This UNESCO classification is, at the very least, to put it mildly, antiquated and inconsistent». As well as Antonio Miguel Nogués Pedregal: «Very old, classical and traditional. Absolutely outdated» and Enrique Perdiguero: «Well, the truth is that I think that it is a quite overcome classification as it is very linked to classical fields of Anthropology».

¹⁸ They were referred to see Annex 1 of the document attached to them (*Presente y futuro de la Antropología social...*).

Even the Codes are described as nineteenth-century by some of them, such as Albert Moncusí Ferré: «The descriptors refer to the classical model of Anthropology, especially with regard to issues of social and political structure». (...) In short, the classification suffers from a nineteenth-century colonial vision», Juan Antonio Flores Martos: «The descriptors in the UNESCO Codes on our discipline, Anthropology, are completely outdated, dismembered and are inspired by a reality of Anthropology from the late 19th century. Social (and Cultural) Anthropology, or just Anthropology, should be rid of not very operational and nineteenth-century partializations and watertight compartments (beyond the usefulness that they had for encyclopaedic and museographic knowledge), or as corresponding to the codes of the UDC classifications in the libraries. They were meaningful and had logic, and even effectiveness, in the development of the discipline in the past, but they lack sense and utility at present», or Ángel Díaz de Rada: «They give an image of anthropology as a discipline of an exoticized otherness and of a kind of nineteenth-century museography that would not even represent the discipline being developed in times of Marcel Mauss' "Ethnography", or Murdock's *Human Relation Area Files* –objectual design currents of the discipline with little validity in our times, although much more elaborate than that arbitrary list laid out in the UNESCO Codes». It is remarkable what Flores Martos mentions as for the sense and value that the Codes could have for museums and libraries in the past, or what Díaz de Rada points out when he suggests that the UNESCO Codes are less valid than the «objectual discipline currents» (ibid.) resulting from Marcel Mauss and George Peter Murdock's works. In both cases the idea of current obsolescence in the Codes is reinforced.

David Florido del Corral links the UNESCO Codes with the interests of Anthropology in the 1940s and 1960s of the past century, primarily with topics pigeonholed around primitive societies and those related to otherness: «I believe that the descriptors are based on a theoretical and practical model of anthropology that makes no sense today. It is clearly oriented towards the kind of work which was carried out before the crisis of anthropology's object and method, from the 1940s to the 1960s, as it reflects a classification that considers anthropology as a discipline aimed at the work of the so-called 'primitive societies' and, methodologically, at the data collection of certain disconnected items, especially on dimensions of social life representing 'otherness' compared to modern Western societies (myths, magic, poems and stories, symbolism, arms, barter, hunting, foraging, chieftdom and royalty, etc.)».

Carmen Gregorio Gil joins the approach that we explain in the working document sent to them: «I mostly agree with what it is proposed in the document, since I consider important to modify the descriptors of the discipline, particularly UNESCO code 5103 in order to adapt them to the deep changes undergone by the discipline as well as to the problems and research areas of contemporary social anthropology»; as Manuel Moreno also does: «I fully agree with what it is stated in the document ‘*Present and future...*’ as the description of the work areas is limited and somewhat obsolete in relation to the disciplinary changes produced, as a result, at a time, of the changes in society».

3.2. The misalignment of the UNESCO Codes with regards to the contents that they intend to classify

Although some comments on this issue were already made when the gap in the UNESCO Codes was tackled in the previous section, we now collect answers more directly connected with the misalignment of the contents in the Codes. It is recurrent to refer to the fact that there are still uncovered fields as opposed to others which are in disuse, creating a not very useful and imprecise classification. As Andrés Barrera González points out: «It combines, when preparing their classifications, somewhat arbitrarily and partially, different terms or criteria referred to names of disciplines, subdisciplines, areas of knowledge, fields of study with research topics (i.e. ‘chiefdom and royalty’, ‘barter’, resulting in a confusing and inconsistent picture. The scientific-academic foundation and rigour of these categorizations or classifications is very questionable, if not null». Afterwards, Barrera adds another comment that we consider key, in fact it has motivated the work they have in their hands. He puts it this way: «Indeed, such confusions and inconsistencies are noted, to a greater or lesser extent, in most of the classifications for academic and administrative purposes¹⁹ that are handled in Spain, from those of ANEP, to those of ANECA... to those of ACAP that you mention in your work for the University of Murcia». Albert Moncusí Ferré also moves in this direction, stressing the lack of alignment of categories that are anthropological *per*

19 Barrera González underlines «for academic and scientific purposes» in the answers of the questionnaire that he has sent to us.

N. T.: ANEP, Agencia Nacional de Evaluación y Prospectiva (National Agency for Evaluation and Prospective), ANECA, Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (National Agency for Evaluation of Quality and Accreditation), ACAP, Agencia de Calidad, Acreditación y Prospectiva de las Universidades de Madrid (Agency for Quality, Accreditation and Prospective of Madrid Universities).

se: «Thus, it seems difficult to fit the categories and differentiations of gender, generation, ethnic group/nation and class, migratory movements and also associative structures and social movements and, in general, the analysis of all matters relating to modern States. There are also no references to new technologies or to the body construction, although the latter could fit into ‘medical Anthropology’. In the last part of his statement it seems relevant to us how, given the difficulty in classifying topics, in particular, «body construction», he suggests the possibility of including it in a subdiscipline with which it may be related (‘medical Anthropology’). We understand that this is another sign of the limitations of the current UNESCO Codes.

Enrique Perdiguero draws attention to two very important issues that we also reflect in the first paragraph of this article. We refer, on the one hand, to the misalignment between the subdisciplines of Social Anthropology versus Physical Anthropology, and on the other hand, to the separation of Social Anthropology with Ethnology and Ethnography. Concerning the first issue, Perdiguero writes down: «Social Anthropology appears especially underdeveloped. Compare, for example, the enlarged itemisation of the fields of Physical Anthropology with that of Social Anthropology. It is today paradoxical that Medical Anthropology is in the first field and not in the second». And as for the second matter: «It is also not clear why, from a current approach, Social Anthropology must be separated from ethnographic and ethnologic studies. It is obvious that this classification reflects a reality of truly outdated anthropological research and that includes some national traditions and not others».

Carlos Diz Reboredo also mentions Physical Anthropology, when tackling the matter concerning the Codes of Social Anthropology, but, oddly, to «put it aside»: «It seems evident, leaving aside what refers to physical anthropology...» what it also suggests the existing problem between Social and Physical Anthropology, that Perdiguero previously claimed. Then, Diz Reboredo notes: «that many of these codes have been designed for a very specific Social Anthropology (in time and space). Many of these codes refer us to questions that have traditionally been addressed in terms of ‘folklore’, perfectly valid but increasingly cut off from the areas of contemporary anthropology». In this final part of his reflection, he opens the door to another subject which we consider relevant, the approach of the codes of Social Anthropology in terms of ‘folklore’, generating a gap with the themes that Anthropology currently deals with.

In short, we could summarize what concerns the misalignments of the contents that the UNESCO Codes intend to classify with what was said by Ángel Díaz de Rada: «These codes in no way provide a description of objects pertinent for contemporary social and cultural anthropology (or even in the past

forty years)», and Manuel Moreno Preciado: «The fields delimited correspond to topics that have either lost interest (sovereignty, royalty, slavery...) or have taken on new dimensions (family, kinship, nomadism...).».

3.3. The need to rebuild the UNESCO Codes

In several parts of this article we insist that the UNESCO Codes are an essential tool in the Spanish academic field, despite their many shortcomings, as we are revealing. This should certainly invite their enhancement, but another option also viable is to stop using them. Although most of the answers go in the first direction (the UNESCO Codes must be rebuilt), there are also voices that do not preclude the possibility of abandoning them. Ángel Díaz de Rada suggests: «In my opinion, UNESCO should review this codification in its entirety. But a simpler solution would be for our institutions to stop using this absurd instrument as a classification device». Surely this last reflection has been made due to the constant difficulties of its applicability in everyday academic work: «When I have had to use those codes (for example, in indexing the doctoral theses that I have directed) have been useless. So either I have used the most general descriptor ('Social Anthropology' or 'Ethnography') or I have resorted to the hotchpotch 'Other'» (ibid.).

As we were saying, most of the respondents point to make profound changes in the UNESCO classification. For instance, Enrique Perdiguero explains: «Honestly, I think that a generic reorganisation for the whole classification should be contemplated». This coincides with David Florido's answer which is in favour of simplifying the classification by encompassing topics: «I understand that the majority of these items are replaceable, and may be included in others of greater scope, expressing the different dimensions of social life, valid for any type of society: symbolic systems, economic systems, systems of power relations, systems of social organisation. This is the only way to express the possibility of comparability between lifestyles of close and distant societies».

Carlos Diz Reboredo, also opting for an upgrade of the current Codes, suggests, unlike Florido del Corral, to propose new codes more adapted to the reality of the anthropological discipline. But he underlines the impossibility of giving a code to each subdiscipline. These are his words: «Accordingly, I do not think that there are too many, as fortunately there are today many anthropologies which are thought, lived and made. However, in order to update the fields and parameters—in terms of UNESCO Codes—I believe that one of the battles should be precisely in redefining, or rather, in adding a set of codes more connected with

what it is currently being done in the discipline. Obviously, it will be impossible to have a Code for each of the subdisciplines or for each of the current fields, but at least we could propose new codes for some of them. Issues as different as those related to studies of the body and sexualities, gender, memory, political anthropology, migrations, social movements, science and technology, just mentioning some examples, should be reflected in a wider and more diverse range of codes».

One of the respondents, Juan Antonio Flores Martos, opens his comments defending the separation of Physical and Biological Anthropology in order to create a single category, Anthropology. He says: «From my own experience as an anthropologist in the past 20 years, I would propose a single category, differentiated from physical or biological Anthropology, which could be called «ANTHROPOLOGY».²⁰ Afterwards, he suggests that, from this broad category, specific codes are generated: «and for which those subcodes, which have to do directly with current research, could be rescued –in addition, other more specific subcodes or codes which do not appear in the UNESCO classification should be incorporated». Then, he proposes a list of those codes providing some clarifications in capital letters: «Among the recoverable codes would be 240206 Ethnology,_240207 Medical Anthropology,_240208 Nutritional Habits,_5101 Cultural Anthropology,_510103 Dances, Feasts (see 6203.06) (I DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE AVERSION TO USING CATEGORY «*RITUALS*»),_510104 Ethnomusicology (see 6203.06),_510105 Ethnolinguistics,_510106 Museology,_510107 Myths,_510108 Magic,_510109 Poems, stories (THIS COULD BE CALLED «*INDIGENOUS LITERATURES*»), 510110 Religion (see 5403.04, 5506.21, 5601, 5906.05, 6301.10, 7102.05 y 7204.04), 510111 Sorcery,_510112 Symbolism (see 6308.03),_510113 Traditional Medicine (see 3209.04),_510114 Tradition,_5102 Ethnography and Ethnology,_5103 Social Anthropology_510302 Descent, Family and Kinship (THAT NOW COULD BE CALLED «*FAMILY AND PARENTALITIES*»),²¹_5199 Other Anthropological Specialities (specify)». Finally, Flores Martos explains the purpose of his classification: «What I propose is that this «hotchpotch» of UNESCO nomenclature and Codes –5199 Other Anthropological Specialities (specify)– is a priority and necessary to expand it with all those subdisciplines and perspectives of analysis that Anthropology has generated in the last 40-50 years: Applied Anthropology (which unaccountably

20 Flores Martos, in addition to capital letters, writes ANTHROPOLOGY in bold.

21 All capital letters appearing in this verbatim text are written so by Flores Martos.

does not appear in the UNESCO Codes), Anthropology of the Body, Anthropology of Violence, Economic Anthropology, Anthropology of Migrations, Health and Interculturality, etc.».

Additionally, as Carmen Gregorio Gil suggests (and we subscribe), the need to rebuild the UNESCO Codes not only facilitates the clarification of contents of our own discipline but also it is necessary to «establish the related areas (that) would help us a lot in the different evaluation processes, as well as in the defense of the profession of anthropologist and in the shaping of curricula (basic and optional subjects)».

As it can be inferred from the document *Present and future of Spanish Social and Cultural Anthropology: From thoughts on levels of scientific-academic association between areas of knowledge*, before knowing the different points of view of the respondents (which we have presented in this section), our purpose was to make a proposal of classification of the UNESCO Codes that would improve the current one. The above reflections, even with different approaches that we echo, reinforce our concern for such a task. And we explain it in the following lines.

4. FIRST PROPOSALS FOR THE REARRANGEMENT OF THE UNESCO CODES

As it was seen in the second part, there is a unanimous valuation among the participants of the survey that describes the UNESCO Codes as outdated. They also express very firmly and frankly the need to prepare a reform of the nomenclature.

A project with this purpose cannot start from scratch, it needs to begin from the consideration that Social Anthropology is a holistic and open discipline, as described by Carmelo Lisón Tolosana: «Establishing rigid boundaries is the antithesis of our discipline. The manifestations of the human, always changing, do not allow it».²² This open nature, and perhaps somewhat dispersed, is also noted in the reflection made by Celeste Jiménez and Francisco Checa on the first 30 years of the journal *Gazeta de Antropología* when, as for the topics addressed by the journal, they pointed out that: «this lack of common points, although it certainly confers a heteroclitite and perhaps too dispersed nature to the journal, it has made possible, nevertheless, from another perspective, some of its virtues: va-

22 LISÓN TOLOSANA, C. (coord.): *Antropología: Horizontes teóricos*, Granada: Comares, 1998, p. 1.

riety of topics dealt with in the articles, openness, that sensation of full freedom and the lack of censorship or restrictions that both authors and editors have felt, and which those who publish in it continue to enjoy».²³

As stated in this quote, Anthropology is perceived as a discipline in continuous search of new possibilities. It is part of its identity and is one of its essential characteristics. However, a nomenclature requires the areas of the discipline to be determined, although it must of course always be a system open to the pertinent changes.

In order to carry out the work of reviewing the nomenclature and propose the modifications we consider necessary, we use some reflections made by Spanish anthropologists on the character and future of our discipline. We refer especially to the exhaustive compilation of anthropological publications presented by Joan Prat in 1999. It contains an order system that (as Jesús Sanz points out in a review of the research groups in the field of Social Anthropology)²⁴ is a useful starting tool for a task of this kind.²⁵ We also use several introductory or reflective works on our discipline that are organised in a similar way to that of Joan Prat and Ángel Martínez,²⁶ and Carmelo Lisón Tolosana.²⁷

The categories used by Joan Prat in *Investigadores e investigados* are clear and evident. His way of ordering the anthropological work is based, in most cases, on the distinction of «Anthropologies of...». Probably Prat has reproduced a format used, in tacit agreement, by Spanish anthropologists over recent decades.

If this is the formula to apply, we question the following:

How can we include these anthropological fields in UNESCO nomenclature?

What areas of «Anthropology of...» can we distinguish?

Concerning the first, the anthropological disciplines will need to be examined, or in other words, it will be necessary to ask ourselves if it would be appro-

23 JIMÉNEZ DE MADARIAGA, C.; CHECA OLMOS, F.: «Treinta años de Antropología en España. Memoria desde la Gazeta», *Gazeta de Antropología*, 2012, 28 (3), p. 9.

24 SANZ ABAD, J.: «Panorámica general de los grupos de investigación en Antropología Social en el Estado español», *Revista de Antropología Social*, 2011, 20, 9-29.

25 PRAT, J. (coord.): *Investigadores e investigados. Literatura antropológica en España desde 1954*, Tarragona: Institut Tarragonès d'Antropologia (Arxiu d'Etnografia De Catalunya), 1999.

26 PRAT, J.; MARTÍNEZ, Á. (eds.): *Ensayo de antropología cultural. Homenaje a Claudio Esteve-Fabregat*, Barcelona: Ariel, 1996.

27 LISÓN TOLOSANA, C. (coord.): *Introducción a la antropología social y cultural. Teoría, método y práctica*, Madrid: Akal, 2007.

priate to consider Cultural Anthropology, Ethnology and Ethnography, and Social Anthropology as the three disciplines that make up the area of Anthropology. Moreover, if they really differ because of their diverse contents and traditions, why has Folklore not been established as an own discipline, given that since the 19th century it is so considered? By the way, Folklore appears in the UNESCO Codes as a subdiscipline of Cultural Sociology.

As we have pointed out, we believe that the differentiation between the three anthropological disciplines of the codes is an artificial distinction that does not reflect the reality of anthropological work. Due to this and other inconsistencies, our intention is to present a proposal for modification that distinguishes the anthropological disciplines that are based on their different objects –the branches of anthropological work that we know as «Anthropology of...». To this end, we suggest including these branches as anthropological disciplines in the UNESCO Codes.

In regards to the other matter (What areas of «Anthropology of...» can we distinguish?) we use, in a first reflection, the areas established by Joan Prat (1999), a total of sixty-six. For example: Political Anthropology, Economic Anthropology, Urban Anthropology, Symbolic Anthropology...; where he also includes: Handicraft, Material Culture, etc. That is why, we wonder if such a large number is manageable when working with them. This led us to make an exercise of grouping anthropological disciplines that include some of the «Anthropologies of...».

With our proposal we intend to start a first regrouping of different anthropological areas that make up a total of ten disciplines. To this end, we have chosen ten out of sixty-six areas (laid down by Prat) and we have defined them as anthropological disciplines (with four digits), while the rest (more than fifty) appear as subdisciplines (with six digits). The disciplines are mostly those appearing in introductory works as the most relevant fields within Anthropology. This task has led us to prepare the following list, where we also add in footnotes how these areas are called in other reference works:

5101 COGNITIVE AND SYMBOLIC ANTHROPOLOGY:

Cognitive anthropology.²⁸

Anthropology of communication.

Linguistic anthropology.

28 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Cognitive domains.

Anthropology of religion.²⁹

Symbolic anthropology.³⁰

Visual anthropology.

Ideology.³¹

Language, Speaking.

5102 ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE BODY AND MEDICINE:

Anthropology of nutrition.³²

Anthropology of the body.

Anthropology of sport.³³

Anthropology of health and medicine.³⁴

Anthropology of death.

Psychological anthropology.

Anthropology of sexuality.³⁵

5103 ANTHROPOLOGY OF SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION:³⁶

Friendship, Associationism, Sociability.³⁷

Anthropology of ages.³⁸

Anthropology of gender.³⁹

Indigenism.

Anthropology of marginalization and social deviance.⁴⁰

Anthropology of kinship and family.⁴¹

29 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Religion and Belief. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Religions.

30 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Rite, myth, symbol. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Symbols.

31 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Ideologies.

32 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

33 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Anthropology of Sport and Leisure.

34 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Medical Anthropology. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Anthropology of Health.

35 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

36 This designation of a field does not appear in Prat (1999) but it is inspired by PRAT, MARTÍNEZ (1996). LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Socio-cultural transformations and family changes.

37 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Friends and neighbours.

38 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

39 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Gender and Anthropology. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

40 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Anthropology of marginalization.

41 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Relatives and related as well as Anthropology and transformations of the family.

5104 ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY:⁴²Industrial anthropology (corporate ...).⁴³Anthropology of fishing and maritime.⁴⁴

Anthropology of work.

Anthropology of tourism.⁴⁵

Handicraft.

Peasantry, rural society, agriculture.⁴⁶

Pastoral culture.

Communal resources.

5105 ANTHROPOLOGY OF EDUCATION⁴⁷

5106 ANTHROPOLOGY OF SPACE AND TERRITORY:

Ecologic anthropology.⁴⁸

Anthropology of space and territory.

Urban anthropology.⁴⁹

5107 ANTHROPOLOGY OF MIGRATION AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS:

Anthropology of migration.⁵⁰

Ethnicity, groups and ethnic minorities, interethnic relations.

Interculturality.

5108 POLITICAL ANTHROPOLOGY:⁵¹

Juridical anthropology and of the law.

Political anthropology.

42 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007) applies the same name. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Economy, culture and social change.

43 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Workers as well as Anthropology of the company and also Business anthropology.

44 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Fishermen.

45 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

46 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Peasants.

47 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007) as well as PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

48 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Ecology and culture.

49 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007) as well as PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

50 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Migration, society and culture. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Anthropology of migrations.

51 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007) applies the same name.

Community studies.

Identity (cultural identity, collective identities, ethnic identities...).

Nationalism.

Social organisation.

Change (economic, social, cultural).⁵²

5109 METHODOLOGY, EPISTEMOLOGY, ANTROPOLOGICAL THEORY:

Applied anthropology.⁵³

Anthropology of speech.

Hermeneutical anthropology.⁵⁴

Anthropology of history.

Bibliographies and documentary sources.

Comparative studies.⁵⁵

History of anthropology.

Life stories.

Methodology, Epistemology and anthropological Theory

5110 CULTURAL AND ETHNOLOGIC HERITAGE:⁵⁶

Anthropology of art.

Anthropology of music.

Material culture.

Popular culture.

Traditional culture.

Feasts.⁵⁷

Folklore.

Literature, oral literature, narrative.⁵⁸

Museology and museography.

Ethnologic and cultural heritage.

Oral tradition.

52 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Changes.

53 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007) applies the same name.

54 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Interpretive turn and reflexivity.

55 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Comparison between cultures.

56 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Cultural heritage; PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Anthropology and heritage.

57 PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996) apply the same name.

58 LISÓN TOLOSANA (2007): Literature and anthropology. PRAT and MARTÍNEZ (1996): Narratives.

On the basis of what we have seen, our first attempt to organise the anthropological work in disciplines and subdisciplines intends to follow the philosophy of the UNESCO Codes (using four and six digits). Taking into account the difficulty of creating a system of anthropological disciplines, we are aware of the ambiguities that the proposed list contains. Therefore, if we refer, for example, to *Anthropology of death* we will note that it is placed in the discipline *Anthropology of the body and medicine*, but it could be in *Cognitive and symbolic Anthropology* as this contains *Anthropology of religion* and it is closely linked to the previous field. Another example that shows the difficulty of creating a coherent system is to place *Ecologic anthropology*. We have included it in the discipline *Anthropology of space and territory*, but in many cases anthropologists define it as a part of *Economic Anthropology*. In addition, we have confined ourselves to order the sixty-six fields already mentioned by Prat in 1999. In our survey other new fields have emerged, on which incorporation a debate is necessary, such as Anthropology of violence or the Anthropology dealing with (new) technologies (by the way, already mentioned by Jesús Sanz Abad in 2011).⁵⁹ These examples show that there is no classification that includes all points of view and approaches of the topics to be ordered, as well as the need to keep on continuing the debate. With all of this, we hope that our proposal is an excuse to encourage disciplinary reflection. In fact, the making up of the «list» is a minor issue in comparison with the main idea of the proposal, consisting of the collection of anthropological areas recognised in our discipline and their use for a reform of the UNESCO Codes.

It is the tacitly structuration of Anthropology in the different areas (anthropological disciplines) that we pointed out, and with it, the collective intellectual property that we defend here to promote a common project. That is why we understand that a reorganisation of the UNESCO Codes is necessary and is somehow urgent, given –and we insist on this– that it is still one of the basic tools in Spanish academic life for the definition of posts, the description of doctoral theses or the assignment to research groups.

59 SANZ ABAD, J.: «Panorámica general de los grupos de investigación en Antropología Social en el Estado español», *Revista de Antropología Social*, 2011, 20, pp. 9-29, here p. 20.

LITERATURE

- JIMÉNEZ DE MADARIAGA, Celeste & CHECA OLMOS, Francisco (2012): «Treinta años de Antropología en España. Memoria desde la Gazeta», *Gazeta de Antropología*, 2012, 28 (3).
- ESTEVA FABREGAT, Claudio: *Antropología Industrial*, Barcelona: Anthropos, 1984.
- FOX, Richard Gabriel: *Urban anthropology: Cities in their cultural settings*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- HANNERZ, Ulf: *Exploring the city: Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1980. (In Spanish: *Exploración de la ciudad. Hacia una antropología urbana*, Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993).
- LISÓN TOLOSANA, Carmelo (coord.): *Antropología: Horizontes teóricos*, Granada: Comares, 1998.
- LISÓN TOLOSANA, Carmelo (coord.): *Introducción a la antropología social y cultural, Teoría, método y práctica*, Madrid: Akal, 2007.
- Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades del Gobierno de España: <<http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/portal/site/MICINN/menuitem.8ce192e94ba842bea3bc811001432ea0/?vgnnextoid=363ac9487fb02210VgnVCM100001d04140aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=28fb282978ea0210VgnVCM1000001034e20aRCRD>>.
- RUIZ MARTÍNEZ, Juana María; BAÑOS MORENO, María José & MARTÍNEZ BÉJAR, Rodrigo: «Nomenclatura Unesco. Evolución, alcance y reutilización en clave ontológica para la descripción de perfiles científicos», *El profesional de la información*, 23, n. 4, 2014, pp. 383-392
- PRAT, Joan (coord.): *Investigadores e investigados. Literatura antropológica en España desde 1954*, Tarragona: Institut Tarragonès d'Antropologia (*Arxiu d'Etnografia de Catalunya*), 1999.
- PRAT, Joan & Martínez, Ángel (eds.): *Ensayo de antropología cultural. Homenaje a Claudio Esteva-Fabregat*, Barcelona: Ariel, 1996.
- SANZ ABAD, Jesús: «Panorámica general de los grupos de investigación en Antropología Social en el Estado español», *Revista de Antropología Social*, 20, 2011, pp. 9-29.
- UNESCO: *Problems Encountered in the Development of a Standard International Methodology of Science Statistics*, Meeting of the Adversory Panel of Science Statistics, UNESCO/CS/0666.SS-80/5, Paris, 6 June 1966.
- UNESCO: *Provisional List of Scientific Disciplines*, UNESCO/NS/ROU/257, Paris, March 1972.

UNESCO: *Proposed International Standard Nomenclature for Fields of Science and Technology*, UNESCO NS/ROU/257 rev. 1, Paris, 17 December 1973.

UNESCO: *Proyecto de Nomenclatura Internacional Normalizada relativa a la Ciencia y la Tecnología*, UNESCO NS/ROU/257 rev. 1, Paris, 17 de diciembre 1988.

