Since the collapses of the Soviet regime in 1991, Russian anthropology is on the way from historicization to socialization. Indeed Anthropology did promote its change openly, arguing definitively the end of the dogma of the unit and the homogeneity of the references, the methods and the concepts. To this assertion of the plurality of the points of view, also comes to be added the insurance, still fragile, that the Russian anthropology from now on left its "ivory tower" and wants to play a significant role in the development of the society. Due to a certain return of legitimacy of politics it will in particular be a question of specifying the conditions of stating and the realization of the rupture which underlies a disciplinary identity alternating between co-construction and confrontation. In this respect, this crisis of Russian anthropology, constitutes only another time and another context of its institutional, scientific and social legitimation. In many ways the question of the status is firmly linked to the current (re)construction of disciplinary identity.

Rupture: cement of the construction of the discipline

The anthropology which was held up at the beginning of the 1990 as the symbol of the defeat of the Soviet scientific model indeed seems to evoke an irreversibility of the end of the monopoly of the etnografija and an incommensurability of the methods and objects. But what happened actually? If a rupture does exist, it has to be mentioned that the rupture was done mainly under the features of a co-existence between people, institutions, objects and methods. For example, in a city like Saint-Petersburg, one may find many clues of this principle of coexistence which underlies the current process of legitimation. For example, within the University of State, beside the inalterable department of Ethnography and Anthropology of the Faculty of History, one finds since 1995 a department of philosophical Anthropology within the faculty of Philosophy. The Faculty of Sociology instituted as for it since 1992 a Department of Cultural anthropology and ethnic Sociology and created a degree in Social Anthropology. The recent Faculty of Ethnology of the European University of Saint-Petersburg proposes a doctoral training in ethnology, ethnography and physical anthropology and courses of Cultural anthropology. Lastly, the very prestigious Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography Peter the Great one proposes a doctoral training in Ethnography (Ethnology).

The choice of the etnologija term to transcribe the idea of sociocultural anthropology may be also interpreted as a strategy of conciliation of apparently contradictory interests. Indeed in one hand such a choice allows marking the rupture with the etnografija while supporting the coexistence of the old references. Indeed how to forget that during all the Soviet period, the use of the etnologija term in the majority of the official texts to translate that of sociocultural anthropology aimed at stigmatizing the logic of epistemological rupture and ideological confrontation. In fact, it was a way to define a place this discipline in the sphere of the absolute otherness.
It is not without a certain irony, that the Russian ethnologist Tat'jana Solovej points out that the etnografija became etnologija at the very moment when the empirical approach and the description became also less legitimate than the theoretical one. In the same way, the anthropologist Sergej Sokolovskij mentions the crystallization of the "Slavophiles" positions in anthropology because of the growing relevance of the Western literature and the revaluation of the Russian anthropological studies it supposed. For many of its detractors, the current Russian social anthropology/ethnology is characterized primarily by the importation of theories, methods and techniques of investigation whose adaptation to the Russian medium still remains to be tested and approved.

It seems indeed that one of the major difficulties that the promoters of sociocultural anthropology in Russia meet is related to the pregnancy of the heritage of the identity construction of Soviet anthropology as an opposite of Western anthropology. But this logic of confrontation was especially dominant on the level of the official speech, but on various levels and occasions, the sovetskaja etnografija was built as a true anthropology not only in response but also within a dialogue with the productions of worldwide anthropology.

The willing (or temptation) of application

The specific focus, may be just as a registered mark, but certainly quite relative of Soviet anthropology on the description and the retrospective scale, was often analyzed like a procedure of avoidance even sometimes of renouncement of the incentives of the "social order" which sometimes led the discipline until in extreme cases to the marginalisation. In some cases, we can recognize here a kind of academic guarantee of the protection of the studied persons, the expression of a principle of necessary discretion. Far from me to describe soviet anthropologist as a person who was not intending to promote himself as a true and sincere actor of the social life and construction of the studied people. But as it appeared later on when the Gorbatchevian USSR "discovered" its ethnic conflicts, we have to understand and admit that little by little, it takes shape a true history of a meeting missed between Soviet anthropology and the application.

Now a day, for the Russian anthropology, and on contrary to the last Soviet period, the relation with utilitarianism is much more crucial. Indeed, due to the large opening of all the fields of research with competition, including international, other disciplines of expertise (political economy, psychology and sociology) or generalizing (culturology). The affirmation of the end of the principle of "science for science" reinforces the idea according that anthropology cannot be developed apart from the constraints and needs of the Russian society. This surprising « come back » of the politics is largely open to the question of moral responsibility of the anthropologist towards its objects of studies and more precisely regarding the rights of the minorities and ecology. However, Russian anthropologists also have now to face to q current context of negotiation with the standards imposed by the institutions granting research.

In a recent article the anthropologist Sergej Sokolovskij was interested in the degree of popularity of anthropology in Russia. This reveals that the discretion of Russian anthropology is such that it comes very close to anonymity. Due to the traditional representation of the anthropologist as a specialist of an exotic population, many students willing to study social aspects of Russian society have to define themselves as sociologists. Moreover, this investigation enumerates the efforts still remaining to be deployed as regards valorisation, of conquest of a larger audience (with through in particular of the school). Thus strong of their
experiment in the organization of the censuses, of their constant preoccupation with an improvement of the techniques of observation and analysis, the Russian anthropologists seek to collect the attention of the decision makers anxious to solve the problems arising from the establishment of foreign companies.

**Linking anthropology to Russian society**

How are the methods of the inscription by its utility of anthropology in the current Russian society? In this respect, the book directed in 1992 by Kiril V Tchistov is particularly symptomatic of a "reconnection" of Russian anthropology with society. Entirely financed by a consortium of maritime conveyors of the Baltic, this study affirmed the role of anthropological expertise by combining respect of balance between ecology and conservation of the ethnic groups.

Today, Russian anthropology is confronted with an intense negotiation of the conditions of its contribution and of its collaboration to the passage of a policy of nationalities to a "ethnocultural" policy (see the recent proposal of Jurij Luzkov to recreate a ministry for nationalities) Even if we do have to take account of the diversity of points of view and approaches, in that case currently the dominant problem in Russia seems to relate to the conditions for application of the anthropological categories to a voluntarist policy of national unit declined around the concept of multiculturalism. In this respect, the promotion of the indigenous condition (korennizacia) carried by a certain number of Russian anthropologists quite naturally involves them to conceive in priority the inscription in the society like an implication in favour of "their" society, their group, or their etnos according to a still alive terminology. That is why, may be too conscious of the potential dangers of such a point of view a small group of anthropologists, in particular Valerij Tishkov, proposes to reinvest, not without being aware, as I hope, of the potential risks of incomprehension and inherent shift of this kind of process, the concept of eurasism as anthropological model of the development of the Russian society, according to which each cultural component of the Russian Federation is considered as an irreducible part of the so called Eurasia. Quoting with regret the consequences of the political instrumentalisation of the "ethnonationalism" and the scandal of the discriminations made to the immigrants, Tishkov calls in fact to a more assumed responsibility of anthropology. But how to make this linking possible?

Anthropologist belonging to the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography Pierre the Large one of Saint-Petersburg, Nikolaj Girenko during many years was strongly implied within the Group of defence of the rights of the national minorities of the Union of the Scientists of Saint-Petersburg. Murdered in June 2004. The work and life of Girenko offer a perfect illustration of how the recourse of the right of the minorities is on the way to become a point of meeting privileged between the judicial power and the social anthropology.

In a context where the political promotion of the multiculturalism, the anthropologist Nikolaj Girenko particularly used to defend the idea that an effective application of the legislation in this field presupposes the introduction of significant changes into the analytical apparatus used by the courts. In fact, Nikolaj Girenko was sincerely convinced that all the conceptualization of the ethnicity had to be re-examined and corrected by Russian anthropologists themselves. The future of Russian anthropology was strongly linked to its capacity to insure and develop its own anthropological critics of ethnicity.