

European Science Foundation
Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (SCSS)
Standing Committee for the Humanities (SCH)

An Exploratory Workshop (EW03-164)

TOWARDS AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF EUROPE
Studying Europe Using Anthropology's Methodology: A Multi-university
Teaching Course and Research Programme

Litomyšl, Czech Republic
1-5 September 2004

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

Convened by:
Andrés Barrera González, Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Martine Segalen, Université de Nanterre-Paris X
Peter Skalník, Univerzita Pardubice

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

Table of contents:

- a) Executive Summary
- b) Scientific Content of the Event
- c) Assessment of Results
- d) Statistical Information on Participants
- e) ANNEXES:
 - Annex 1. The Final Programme
 - Annex 2. Final List of Participants
 - Annex 3. Publication of Proceedings. Volume on Teaching
 - Annex 4. Publication of Proceedings. Volume on Research
 - Annex 5. A report for the EASA Newsletter
 - Annex 6. A Europeanist Network within EASA
 - Annex 7. A COST Action proposal. Abstract
 - Annex 8. Table: Participants in the workshop by country, gender and age

a) Executive summary

During the first week in September 2004 thirty two anthropologists from all corners of Europe (nineteen different countries) met in the town of Litomyšl, eastern Bohemia¹. They were convened there by Andrés Barrera, Martine Segalen and Peter Skalník to take part in one of the ‘exploratory workshops’ sponsored by the European Science Foundation. The theme of the workshop is identified by a long title, which is descriptive of its aims and contents: *Towards an Anthropology of Europe. Studying Europe Using Anthropology’s Methodology. A Multi-university Teaching Course and Research Programme.*

The initiative to hold this meeting is related to long standing pursuits by a network of universities collaborating in organizing student and teacher exchanges under Erasmus/Socrates, intensive programmes and research seminars, and conference workshops. However, the forwarding of a proposal to the ESF is more directly linked to efforts aiming at setting up a coordinated course and concurrent research agenda on *The Anthropology of Europe*, by a number of scholars teaching in Departments of Anthropology around Europe. The overall aim of such pursuits being: “to open avenues for a more comprehensive and systematic account of the anthropological, ethnological and cognate literature produced about local, regional and national societies in Europe; a task that will make possible (along the way) to work out a coordinated long-term research programme”, as it is stated in the original proposal.

Twenty eight papers, on a wide range of topics, were presented during the three full days that the workshop lasted for. The presentations and subsequent discussion on each individual paper were grouped in five ‘working sessions’ arranged under three main headings:

¹ The venue of the workshop is a beautiful historic town, Litomyšl (birthplace of composer Bedrich Smetana), in the valley of the river Loučna, a tributary of the Elbe, by the Maria Theresa highway that links Prague to Vienna. Therefore, a town historically and geographically at the heart of Europe.

- a) *Towards an Anthropology of Europe: the teaching dimension;*
- b) *Towards an Anthropology of Europe: the research dimension; and*
- c) *Cooperation in Teaching and Research in the European Arena.*

The working sessions leading up to ‘concluding debates’ where issues of more general concern were reconsidered and discussed in an open debate, with contributions from all participants in the workshop. There were three such ‘open debates’ scheduled as culmination of the corresponding working sessions, each one of them framed in a few guiding questions suggested by the convenors (see: Workshop Programme given as Annex 1 to the Report). Whereas the Closing Session on Saturday afternoon was dedicated to making concrete decisions aiming at maintaining and furthering collaboration among the persons and institutions involved in the project. There was also an Inaugural Lecture delivered by professor Martine Segalen, which marked the opening of the meeting on Wednesday evening. Thus, it was a tight and intensive schedule, that prompted vigorous and passionate scholarly debate all through. The debate at times overflowing into the leisure parts of the workshop, which were also fully enjoyable, thanks to the generosity and care of our local hosts.

More detailed reference to the papers presented, and the most important issues raised in them and discussed by participants, will be made in the following section of the report. Besides, the abstracts of the papers as offered for publication are provided as Annexes 3 and 4, arranged in two volumes, one with the papers dealing with teaching, and another with the research papers. The proceedings of the workshop will be published in full, hopefully in a year’s time or so². As a brief advance of debates that ensued paper presentations, it has to be mentioned the discussion -pointing to the very root of the workshop’s theme- on the opportunity and feasibility of construing an Anthropology of Europe, rather than merely continuing with the regular business of doing Anthropology

² Proposals are being prepared for the publication of most of the papers presented at the workshop, with some additional contributions from colleagues who were invited but could not attend the meeting. In this regard, there is a proposal ready for an special issue of the journal *Ethnologie Française* with a selection of papers on the ‘teaching side’; and another proposal for an special issue of the journal *FOCAAL. European Journal of Anthropology*, with a selection of papers on the ‘research side’ of an Anthropology of Europe. We are discussing whether the whole of the proceedings should be published as an independent book, in one or two volumes, apart from the special issues of the journals mentioned. The proceedings to be published will include the content of oral presentations, debates and discussion all through the workshop. For all these were audio and video taped, and literal transcriptions of them will be produced with support from the ESF grant.

in Europe. Debates also touched on fundamental issues like whether Europe is an appropriate object of study; and whether such an ‘object’ of enquiry could be dealt with by applying canonical Anthropology’s theoretical models, methods and research tools.

Obviously, the convenors (as well as many of the invited participants, some of whom have already made substantial contributions along these lines, both in research and in teaching) were of the opinion that Europe certainly is an appropriate and legitimate object for anthropological enquiry. Moreover, they are convinced that Anthropology is compelled to turn its gaze to the near and the familiar (besides its continuous attention to the distant and foreign); and that anthropologists cannot afford to stay aloof from having a say on contemporary issues, contributing (surely from its unique or distinctive outlook in theory, in method and epistemology) to public debates and to policy formulation on issues and areas within their professional expertise and scholarly concern.

All along the workshop sessions, participants were confronted with fundamental issues for debate such as: how can Anthropology take account of European Societies and Cultures?; what and how can Anthropology contribute in explaining and interpreting Europe as a historical and as an ‘emerging’ reality?; or, what in this regard would an anthropological approach yield that other Social Sciences or disciplines within the Humanities cannot deliver? Issues of interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, the scientific method, the status of Anthropology among akin disciplines within the Humanities and the Social Sciences, cropped up here and there and were passionately debated.

On a more pragmatic level, inspired by a contribution from Alexandra Bitusikova very much to the point, there was discussion on how Anthropology can effectively face the challenges raised by the Bologna Declaration, and the governmental policies that stem from it. Therefore, it was debated what institutional and academic niche might be reserved for Anthropology in the ongoing reworking of the European Higher Education and Research Areas. Although we are not departing from nil in facing these challenges, for relevant new research work is already being done, as it was shown by contributions from several participants. Moreover, initiatives of different sorts have been taken, in

terms of making appropriate arrangements for institutional cooperation in developing teaching-training programmes on a regional or pan-European scale. Yet, in what regards Anthropology specifically, we are probably in need of more decisive action in terms of furthering cooperation and collaboration Europe wide.

Precisely, as an outcome of this meeting it was decided to take steps for extending and strengthening cooperation among a wider network of Europe's educational and research institutions, along both directions of teaching-training and research within Anthropology, broadly defined. Consequently, it was agreed to call up two meetings, in a year's time or so. One in Siena (convened by Fabio Mugnaini), dedicated to set afoot and start implementing joint teaching-training programmes in Anthropology among one or several sets of departments/universities. Another in Paris (convened by Martine Segalen), dedicated to develop specific research projects in collaboration, again by one or several sets of research institutions. To this specific end, a proposal has been forwarded to COST (European Cooperation in the Field of Scientific and Technical Research), applying for a four years long 'COST Action' programme on the theme: *Anthropology in Europe. Devising and Implementing a Teaching-Training and Research Agenda*. The COST grant would eventually allow us to take these projects, singled out in the course of the workshop, decisively ahead and to a fruitful culmination.

b) Scientific content of the event

As it was stated in the original proposal to the European Science Foundation, this workshop is related to an already existing teaching-training and research project aiming at setting up a common course and continuous research programme on *The Anthropology of Europe* in a number of European universities. Besides the explicit teaching-teaching goals, the project implies -it was argued in the proposal to the ESF- the development of a coordinated research agenda; because the scientific soundness of such pursuit relies decisively on the growth of a truly comparative ethnography of Europe's diverse societies and cultures. Thus, the project carries with it both an educational and an intellectual challenge: how to account for Europe's unity and diversity in cultural terms.

Let us continue quoting from the proposal: "The project aims at opening avenues for a more comprehensive and systematic account of the anthropological, ethnological and cognate literature produced about local, regional and national societies in Europe. This will in parallel clear the way for devising and implementing a long-term research agenda... We are aware that the named literature is vast, widely dispersed and very diverse in character. Moreover, much of it is written originally in languages other than those dominant in the profession (English, French, German); and published in less known journals, or by local-regional printing houses. Consequently, it is a literature not readily available, and thus seldom quoted in scholarly publications, or taken into account for teaching and research done in and around the profession's dominant circles. Accounting for this diverse and dispersed literature is a formidable undertaking, a task not within the reach of a small group of researchers and lecturers. Yet, what we aim at with this project is not at filling the whole of the gap, but at making a significant contribution in the right direction."

To finish with the direct quoting from the ESF proposal: "It is clear to us that the great effort and material cost involved in planning and carrying out such a project has to find additional justification in pursuing objectives complementary to those explicitly stated;

and in reaching benefits beyond that of devising a new course and a research agenda. A project like this ought to be seen as one step in the more ambitious pursuit of developing common curricula among European universities. Moreover, the setting up of the proposed common course -- based on a comprehensive and thoroughly comparative ethnography -- will bring about substantial benefits at the empirical, methodological and theoretical levels. A collaborative endeavor such as this, involving universities and professional instances across Europe, will certainly contribute to enrich teaching and research at the local level. It will also be of benefit to the discipline of Socio-Cultural Anthropology as a whole, certainly to its development in Europe.”

Precisely, the proposal forwarded to the COST Programme (see: Annex 7, and Section c) of this Report, for additional details about this proposal), as one of the main outcomes of the workshop, intends to pave the way in the recalled cooperative effort to meet the more general and overall purposes of the project. It also describes in more detail the rationale behind the ESF workshop, and the other initiatives following it.

We will now make detailed reference to the papers that were presented in Litomysl, and the debates that ensued from these presentations. Drafts of some of the papers -as well as abstracts and miscellaneous materials used in the presentations- were offered *in situ* to the participants, in printed form. Moreover, oral presentations, debates and discussion have been audio taped, and the recordings will in due time be transcribed to incorporate these materials in the planned publication of the workshop proceedings. Twenty eight papers, on a wide range of topics, were presented and discussed during the three full days that the workshop lasted for. They were grouped in five ‘working sessions’ arranged under three main headings (see: the Final Programme offered as Annex 1). The working sessions leading up to ‘concluding debates’ where issues of more general concern were reconsidered and discussed in open debate.

Martine Segalen, co-convenor of the workshop, delivered the inaugural lecture in the afternoon of Wednesday, 1. In her lecture she pointed out to the challenges that lay ahead of us, both as professional anthropologists and as citizens. As a scientific pursuit, Social Anthropology provides tools and means for a better understanding of social and cultural realities; as a human pursuit, it should contribute to a better and

peaceful understanding between peoples. In what concerns this particular project, we should be in a position to analyze, interpret and explain the social and cultural realities linked to the process of the building of the new Europe. Segalen's argument was underpinned with references both to the history of European anthropology and to her own personal life as a European living through some of the most tragic, but also hopeful, events in contemporary Europe. Martine Segalen is in favor of the engagement of Anthropology and anthropologists with the world around. Our discipline can and ought to contribute to an understanding of the complex and pressing issues and realities facing us in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

Thursday, 1 sessions were placed under the general heading: *Towards an Anthropology of Europe. The teaching dimension.* **Working Session I** in the morning started with a brief presentation by **Gérald Berthoud** of the European Science Foundation: its history, goals and the different programmes it undertakes. He took the opportunity of this presentation to put forward an argument in favour of the strengthening of Social Anthropology in the context of the Social Sciences specifically; and he underlined the need for Anthropology to regain a more unified and integrated outlook.

Andrés Barrera, convenor of the workshop, followed with a presentation that aimed at setting a general framework for debate in regard to this academic meeting. He argued that in pursuing an Anthropology of Europe we ought to start by making a critical appraisal of Anthropology's scholarly legacy. A legacy constituted by some worthy assets and contributions, but also some controversial features. Barrera argued for reclaiming Anthropology's ambition as the *Science of Man*, a truly interdisciplinary and multidimensional pursuit, narrowed neither in time nor in space. He briefly evaluated some precedents in the history of the discipline that are relevant in construing an Anthropology of Europe. And endorsed the idea that Europe is a legitimate object for anthropological enquiry, and that the discipline should not shy from broaching (surely from its unique perspective in theory and method) all contemporary and socially relevant issues, the near as well as the distant. Barrera ended up his presentation making a proposal and discussing an outline for a course on The Anthropology of Europe, drawing on his experience in teaching such a course in Madrid.

Paolo Viazzo outlined in his presentation the basic themes that make up the anthropological study of ‘circum-alpine’ societies in Europe; and how different schools and methodological perspectives have contributed in this. He showed how the area has been the scene of encounters between local scholars and ‘foreign’ anthropologists with different scholarly backgrounds. A circumstance that has generated some tension and misunderstandings, but in the end contributed to an intellectual dialogue and exchange that has enriched the research agenda. Anthropological studies of circum-alpine societies make up a very important chapter of the discipline’s contributions as regards the study of Europe, and thus offers relevant lessons in the attempt to build an Anthropology of Europe. Viazzo’s research and published work stands in this regard as a model contribution to an interdisciplinary and integrated understanding of social and cultural systems.

After a short break, **Jon P. Mitchell** told us about the Sussex graduate programme on the Anthropology of Europe, which has been running for seven years. This programme is characterized by an interdisciplinary approach to studying European contemporary issues like nationalism, transnational migration or European integration. In fact, it is evolving over the last years into a European Studies master’s programme, with the anthropological input as privileged but not exclusive. In this regard, Mitchell argued that Anthropology needs to engage in constructive dialogue with other disciplines (namely within the Social Sciences) which are equally relevant in accounting for European issues and processes.

Grazyna Kubica-Heller made in her presentation a compelling argument in favour of the involvement of Anthropology in teaching pursuits that are ‘locally bounded’, and dealing with locally relevant issues. She also argued in favour of taking issue of moral and ethical obligations, as anthropologists, scientists and citizens. Significantly, her research at the moment deals among other issues with that of anthropological discourses in and about Europe. Consequently, Dr Kubica-Heller is for the full engagement of Anthropology and anthropologists in public life, instead of remaining secluded in academia.

Hana Cervinková, a young anthropologist from the Czech Republic, who teaches at the University of Lower Silesia (Poland), where she is Director of the International Institute for the Study of Culture and Education, told us about a very interesting project -undertaken in collaboration with a Czech University to the other side of the border- to teach Social Sciences to senior high school pupils. They use the city as an ethnographic research laboratory, to convey the students an understanding of human diversity and the meaning of civil society. The teachers participating in this project are anthropologists who mostly draw from the concepts and methodologies of cultural anthropology, to engage these high school students intellectual attention in the understanding of diversity in their own social environment and in everyday life. It is certainly an inspiring project, in that it proves that Anthropology can have a strong appeal among the youngest, and thus it is justified to bring it into the curriculum of secondary education, and out of too restricted academic circles.

Working Session I ended with a presentation by **Rajko Mursic**, also a forceful argument in favor of introducing anthropology in secondary education curricula around Europe. Considering the diversity and complexity of European societies, and the challenges that the enlargement of the EU and globalization more generally cause, a level of what he names 'cross-cultural literacy' is a must for everybody, namely for professional advance, and in everyday life as well in many respects. Therefore, Anthropology is called to play a most relevant role in educational programmes across Europe, and elsewhere. Maybe we should seriously consider –in the framework of this project- the convenience to promote the writing of Anthropology textbooks and readings addressed to Secondary Education students, to be used in high school courses. A task that, as far as we know, has not been at all carried out or even seriously taken into consideration.

In **Working Session II** on Thursday afternoon six more papers were presented, dealing with the teaching dimensions of an Anthropology of Europe. **Ulrich Kockel** talked to us about his experience in the teaching of Area Studies, a growing field of academic activity in the United Kingdom. There, ethnologists and anthropologists are in demand, although the initiative in this academic turn comes from departments like Modern

Languages, transformed partly or entirely to Area Studies. Within this framework, European Studies is acquiring greater visibility. It is in this context that attempts are currently made to develop a postgraduate curriculum in European Ethnology, with the aim to examine issues of interdisciplinarity and interculturality. Here we observe developments concurrent with those taking place in Sussex, as Jon P. Mitchell informed us about.

The *Anthropology of Transition*, as it applies specifically to post-socialist transformations in Central-Eastern Europe, was the theme addressed by **Ines Prica** in her presentation. It is a field of study that draws from the methodological tradition of regional and case studies, although it aims at contributing to global cross-cultural comparativeness. Ines Prica also reflected on the relatively novel concept of ‘socialist culture’ and how new original empirical research might contribute to substantiating this notion. Moreover, she noticed that the transformation of these societies goes hand in hand with radical changes in the production of professional knowledge. A change of scenario that might not be well understood by ‘western’ anthropologists working in the same countries and topics. Therefore, she pointed out to the desirability to overcome old simplistic stereotypes that block fruitful communication between local and foreign anthropologists. And she argued for the need to bring about a ‘*reciprocal transitional anthropology*’ in turn. In this sense, the catch phrase ‘*together in the field*’ is waved as a call for bridging the gap between the different categories of professional anthropologists, in an effort to advance a shared anthropological knowledge of Europe.

The role of the city and urban culture in historical and contemporary Europe was the theme of **Zdenek Uherek**’s presentation. Urban culture has substantially influenced the spirit of contemporary Europe. Consequently, the Anthropology of Europe cannot do without taking into account specific urban realities and urban concepts. And in this pursuit History and Ethnography have to join forces. Zdenek Uherek referred specifically to the study of Central European cities (Vienna, Prague) in the 19th and 20th centuries; and to issues to migration, minorities and ethnicity. Incidentally, he pointed out how it was inescapable for the researcher in this context to master several languages, because many of the sources that he or she has to tap on are written in minority languages, like Czech for example. How these sources can be made available to the

larger community of researchers might be an issue for a project such as the one we are involved in to sort out!

The *Volkskunde* tradition is in good shape in the Baltic States, **Vytis Ciubrinskas** informed us with some dismay. A fact that has come about in the process of substituting the colonial and communist framework with nationalist ideologies and outlook. Thus, Anthropology had to be labeled ‘national anthropology’ to stand a chance of being admitted into the curriculum; ‘grupology’ (or the study of social groups) rather than ‘studies of mankind’ was acceptable to the local intelligentsia driven by nationalist zeal. The practice of ‘salvage ethnology’, cartography applied to ethnological pursuits, the documentation of the ‘authentic national traditions’ were thus legitimized. New influences already visible in the nineties are modifying the panorama, though. There are for instance the paradigms of ‘anthropology at home’, ‘anthropology of contemporaneous worlds’, or the ‘anthropology of Central/Eastern Europe’ that have proven decisive in curriculum innovation. The opportunities opened for study abroad with programmes such as Tempus or Socrates has had a very positive impact in this respect. In the context of the Baltics, Lithuania has taken the lead in the introduction of modern Social Anthropology in higher education curricula –as Vytis Ciubrinskas informed us.

In his presentation **László Kürti** reflected on the transition in Eastern Europe, touching on issues that Ines Prica had commented upon before him, although from a different corner of the region. It was a process of „transit” –as he named it- from centrally planned socialist society to a free market, multi-party democratic system, investigated by anthropologists as well as other social scientists. What were the consequences of these processes for the people we study, and for the discipline of Anthropology itself? In László Kürti’s analysis examples were provided in order to highlight some of the more problematic aspects of the anthropology of post-socialist Europe; as well as to show how Europe is conceived in the anthropological curricula in these countries.

The presentation by **Cris Hann** marked a turning point in our discussion, in that his proposals challenged some of the assumptions on which the workshop was founded.

He argued that Eurasia, defined as the entire landmass between the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian and Arctic Oceans, is a more appropriate entity for comparative anthropological analysis than Europe is. In his view, recognition of the unity of Eurasia has been hindered by Eurocentric preoccupations with civilizational differences; and also by the dominant research methods of modern anthropology. This plea to privilege Eurasia as a framework of reference in anthropological pursuits is not an argument -Hann argues- to stop doing anthropology in the space we call Europe; nor is it an argument against widening the comparative framework beyond Eurasia whenever this is warranted by the question at hand. However, he strongly warned that anthropologists have a duty to ensure that their work cannot easily be hijacked by those seeking to instrumentalise 'civilizational' boundaries. A danger that he perceives affects the project to build an Anthropology of Europe. Moreover, he thinks the project is misguided because Europe does not possess a sufficient degree of cultural unity. All the important social, demographic, technological, and religious variables which anthropologists can document in Europe are variants of a repertoire found within the broader unity of Eurasia.

There was strong disagreement on the part of several people in the room regarding Cris Hann's conceptions of Europe, his not sufficiently grounded dismissal of Europe as a framework of reference in research and teaching, and what Barrera pointed out were unfair value judgements or judgement of intentions regarding the position of europeanists. He was also compelled to provide a more rigorous account of what makes Eurasia a more solid and justified framework for anthropological practice, rather than Europe, or Euroamerica, for that matter. We are looking forward to a full development of Hann's arguments in his paper for publication; and to the opportunity to continue the passionate debate that they provoked on other occasions in the future.

The **open debate** that culminated Thursday's session was very much dominated by the issues raised in the last presentation by Cris Hann. No surprise, anyway, considering the leading questions that were to guide the discussion: Is Europe an Adequate Object of Study? What Would Anthropology Have to Say About Europe? Issues of substance, and other more formal or nominalistic, were raised and passionately debated. Like for instance whether there was sufficient ground for an Anthropology of Europe, rather than merely going on with doing Anthropology in Europe. Other

participants in the workshop came at this stage forcefully into the debate (Llobera, Giordano, Kürti, Segalen, Skalník...). There was finally agreement that an Anthropology of Europe ought to be an open-ended project. Open for instance to other disciplines within the Social Sciences and the Humanities like history, sociology or political science. Therefore we ought to recall Anthropology's true interdisciplinary vocation. Moreover, to take Europe as a framework of reference (a step up the scale of systematic comparison) does not mean we conceive of it as a perfectly bounded or closed entity, a well defined 'culture area' of sorts. As Christian Giordano put it, Europe is a Subsystem within the World System –recalling Wallerstein's notions. In fact, in defining Europe as a meaningful region, a system or subsystem, we should draw on historico-geographical analysis and regional systems theory; rather than on the loose concept of 'culture area' as generally used in Anthropology.

Relying on his experience in teaching a course on the Anthropology of Europe, Barrera stated his preference for a thematic, problem-oriented approach, rather than a canonical disciplinary approach narrowly limited to Anthropology's concerns. For we are interested in learning about and analysing specific themes and topics. To this end we should freely draw on the relevant literature available, be it anthropological or ethnological, or placed within the bounds of other akin disciplines. Last but not least, an Anthropology of Europe -as Arensberg had already noted back in 1963- is to be taken as just one step in the pursuit of a global, world Anthropology, that has as its ultimate and legitimizing end to account for human unity and diversity overall, with no spatial or temporal limitations.

Friday, 3 workshop sessions were framed under the general heading: *Towards an Anthropology of Europe. The research dimension.* **Working Session III** in the morning included presentations by six participants. **Anne Byrne** opened the session with an inspiring presentation about the Harvard Mission to Ireland in the 1930's, which yielded some of the pioneer anthropological monographs on Europe, namely: Arensberg's (1937) *The Irish Countryman*, and Arensberg and Kimball's (1940) *Family and Community in Ireland*. In her paper Dr Byrne explores the merits and challenges of re-investigating previous anthropological studies, so that more can be learned about the socio-political and intellectual context in which the research took place. There were

interesting comments about the political implications of this research by a group of American anthropologists in the context of the building of the Irish Free State after obtaining independence from Great Britain.

Anthropologists of the period in question were spare in describing their methodological approaches and concerns. Thus historical research into the archives of these projects provide clues in regard to the methodological frames and theoretical concerns which informed their work. Questions were raised concerning research relations at the site of the research (at the level of the church, state, community and household for example) as well as the relationship of the Irish study to American social anthropology and Irish ethnography and sociology.

In his presentation and paper **Jeremy Boissevain** made a point for the inclusion of the study of New Social Movements in the teaching and research agenda of the Anthropology of Europe under discussion. He explored some cases in Malta that illustrate the importance of such movements at the local level in the periphery of the new Europe. The cases deal with conflict in Malta between developers, planning authorities and environmentalists related to several construction developments in the island. It is demonstrated that detailed planning procedures do not guarantee protection to the environment. While operating within the legal framework, lease conditions may be altered to benefit developers, government officers can be persuaded to approve destruction of monuments, and expert opinion can be suppressed. Although NGOs and environmental activists have only won a few contests, they have sensitized elements of civil society to environmental issues and, via campaigns and increasingly sophisticated use of the local media, they have kept these issues before the public. They have helped civil society to become more vocal and are slowly beginning to influence environmental policy.

The paper by **Peter Skalník** is an attempt at construing a comparative political anthropology of the post-communist East-Central Europe. A region which is still struggling with the residues of totalitarian ways of thinking and practices in everyday politics at all levels, from the state to local social units. It draws from the long-term field research project in the East Bohemian village of Dolní Roveň, in the Czech Republic; while it considers data from other anthropological research project elsewhere in the region. It also discusses the potential of anthropology to unveil processes that

escape to political science or political sociology. Peter Skalník discussed in his presentation what are the cornerstones of what he names ‘political culture’: truth and morality, and how these principles are eventually manipulated by politicians. For he takes the concept of ‘political culture’ as pertaining to professional politicians, rather than the common citizens. In a comment following Skalník’s presentation, Patrick Heady argued that conflict and competition are nevertheless legitimate components of the political process.

Political culture was also the driving theme behind **Michal Buchowski**’s presentation. His ethnography referring primarily to the case of post-communist Poland. Global capitalism -Buchowski argued- implicated a processes in which a restructuring of the perception of social inequalities takes place. The degree to which various countries and social groups have embraced the free market and democracy has become a yardstick for classifying them as fitting more or less the category of the Modern West. A strategy of blaming the victims has been applied. It has several shortcomings, but above all it is anti-sociological and it is also culture-deterministic. Intellectuals participating in drawing these dominant discourses are reinforced in their views about the mechanism of social change, what heartens them in their endeavors to transform people into ‘civilized citizens’. Poland is merely an instructive case not only for all post-socialist countries, but for any society in which the excluded from mainstream society are reproached and ostracized.

Magdalena Elchinova centered her presentation on Macedonian identity in the context of the Balkan region. On the theoretical premise that identity is constructed in the processes of interaction with the various ‘others’, Macedonian identity is discussed in regard to various discourses and rhetoric contexts. On the example of a number of life histories, recorded in the last ten years in Bulgaria and the Republic of Macedonia, Dr Elchinova describes various ways of being Macedonian; and she analyses the regional, ethnic and national dimensions of this identification. The characteristic traits of ‘Macedonian-ness’ are discussed in a broader European context, drawing comparison with case studies documented in other European countries. The images of Macedonians are construed both by members of these communities, and the various ‘others’ around them. Consequently, some culture modes of setting and lifting boundaries between these

counterparts are outlined. In her paper Magdalena Elchinova also comments on the role of nationalist projects in the construction and expression of Macedonian identity.

About social and political identities, this time from Slovakia, is **Alexandra Bitusikova**'s paper as well. Slovakia is one of the smallest countries in Europe, yet it shows deep regional, ethnic, religious, social, economic and cultural differences. Dr Bitusikova discussed anthropological studies of regions in Slovakia. She referred to the basis of regional differences, and to the impact of administrative reforms on regionalisation from the tenth century up to the latest post-1989 regional reforms. Her presentation ending up with some references to the establishment of cross-border Euro-regions, and the way this influences (or not) peoples' lives and identities.

Working session IV allowed for the presentation of six additional papers. **Josep Llobera** opened the session presenting a paper on Nations and States in Europe since the French Revolution. Dr Llobera explained that Nationalism is a modern category that had its roots in the Enlightenment. Over the next two centuries, however, nationalism spread, in different forms, all over the world. Along with liberalism and socialism, nationalism is one of the most powerful ideologies of modernity. Yet, as a container of meaning, nationalism can refer to both the good and the evil realities of the nation. Quoting from Tom Nairn (1977) Llobera argued that we must see the phenomena as a whole, in its 'positive' and 'negative' sides. This way can we hope to escape from a 'moralizing perspective' and rise to a more scientific one. It was a very suggestive presentation on a topic on which the author has published and researched abundantly.

It was then **Christian Giordano**'s turn to make his presentation. He argued that it is misleading to think of Europe as a 'united civilization' or a sum of 'cultural areas'. As suggested by authors such as Immanuel Wallerstein, Europe must be considered as a system of interdependent yet structurally diverse 'historical regions.' The rise of the capitalist 'world-system' (a concept that he spouses) and the emergence of a new international division of labour transformed those regions into core, peripheries and marginal external areas. Therefore, we should not take Europe as a closed or homogeneous entity in any sense. However, this does not mean to say Europe is not a

legitimate object of enquiry, be it for Social Anthropology, Sociology or any of the other Social Sciences. In fact, Christian Giordano is very much for the idea of an Anthropology of Europe. A task where our discipline should be open to collaboration with akin disciplines, namely with Sociology.

Gudrun Dahl made a very suggestive inroad in the discussion of some Swedish modern values, as they reflect in discourses related to development aid and assistance. Gudrun Dahl's paper derives from a larger project on buzzwords in development discourse, and it is concerned with the overarching ways in which the aid/assistance/cooperation link is rhetorically dressed up in the Swedish language. While the larger project is mainly concerned with words that circulate internationally, her paper deals mainly with terms that specifically are used for convincing Swedish taxpayers and voluntary workers that the whole venture is morally worthwhile by relating to "Swedish" values. Professor Dahl does not intend to judge to what extent development practice is actually motivated by these values, nor whether the activities could in any sense be objectively measured as fulfilling the ideals. Rather, she is concerned with terms denoting a desirable relation, and not so much with the bureaucratic categorization of social identities.

Fabio Mugnaini did his lively presentation on Folklore and Local Politics after the break. Dr Mugnaini underlined the organizational aspects of traditional rituals and festivals. Moreover, by pointing to the constructive nature of traditions, he underlined the need to rethink the anthropological interpretation of local or folk customs. Two levels at least seem to be equally relevant, that of the actual events or customary fact (with its historical roots, its load of symbolic sense, its formal peculiarities) and that of the political causes or effects in its contemporary re-enactment. Such a two leveled reality requires the folklorist to open up to themes and tools of sociology as well as anthropology. And the comparative tradition of folklore studies will help understand better what is locally embedded in single forms or institutions. Fabio Mugnaini's presentation was thus a call for interdisciplinarity and the use of the comparative method in construing an Anthropology of Europe.

Ana I. Afonso, a young anthropologist from Lisbon, told us about an original and creative piece of research she is involved in at the moment, the analysis of the impact of motorisation in society. By ‘motorisation’ meaning the massive phenomena of diffusion of automobiles and its uses. An interesting example of new themes that arise in anthropologically oriented research. Hers is a project on road behaviour in Portugal, a country with one of the highest rates of road accidents in the European Union, approaching the level of a true epidemic of injury. Ana Afonso’s presentation of this project in the making aimed at bringing to discussion some key-issues involved in their approach to the theme. She argued for collaborative long-term research and comparison between different European contexts, which will enhance our knowledge of important dimensions of human behaviour in contemporary society.

Mihaly Sárkany planned presentation could not take place as scheduled, due to the workshop ‘dynamics’ and the lack of time. He told us briefly, though, about his project to carry out a re-study of the village of Vársany, in the context of other projects to revisit classical sociological and anthropological studies like those of Dolní Roven, Czech Republic or Clare County, Ireland, carried out by Peter Skalník and Anne Byrne respectively. Moreover, Dr Sárkany will contribute a paper for publication on his experience in teaching a course on the Anthropology of Europe, in Budapest, as well as his research work for years which perfectly fits that same Europeanist framework.

As scheduled, a second general **Open Debate** was held at the end of Friday’s working sessions. This debate was on: *The Status of Anthropological Knowledge*. The leading question for debate presented to the participants being: “What Can Anthropology Contribute in Accounting for European Societies and Cultures?”. In many respects, this second general debate replicated and enlarged Thursday’s evening debate. Take for instance the discussion on the most appropriate prepositions to use; whether what we can contribute to the understanding of European societies and cultures can be phrased as an Anthropology of/in/about Europe! The debate was not merely nominalistic, for there surfaced substantive arguments as well. Several participants in the discussion emphasized that Europe was a legitimate object for study and research. In fact, numerous elements in its history and contemporary socio-political reality make it

an inescapable object of enquiry also for Anthropology. Consequently, we should broach these issues if we want to avoid marginalization within the academy, and retreat from public relevance and visibility.

And again, the fact that we take Europe as a framework of reference does not mean we take it as being a perfectly bounded or closed entity. Neither Europe, nor any of the national or regional categories below or above, could be conceived as well bounded entities. It is just a question of degrees of interconnectedness, and of density of exchanges, be they of a cultural, social, intellectual or economic character. This is what makes particular boundaries significant and relevant in specific historical moments and places. In this sense, there is no doubt that the emerging reality we name Europe (or the European Union more specifically) is a powerful point of reference, and makes a real presence we cannot possibly avoid trying to account for.

The morning of **Saturday, 4** was dedicated to present and discuss a number of research projects (**Working Session Va**) and educational projects (**Working Session Vb**). The general heading informing these sessions being: “*Cooperation in Teaching and Research in the European Arena*”, a pursuit that of necessity ought to be placed in the broader context of policies and debates aiming at the establishment of the European Higher Education and Research Areas. Alexandra Bitusikova had already very pointedly informed us about this, advancing issues that were in principle scheduled to be brought in on Saturday morning session.

Elisabeth Vestergaard, in representation of the ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities, who had joined the workshop on Friday afternoon, made a presentation outlining the options and programmes available to Anthropology at the ESF, which would allow us to take our projects a step ahead. It was a very informative and useful presentation, calling our attention to opportunities and resources for research that for whatever reason have not been tapped on by anthropologists to any noticeable extent so far. We thank Dr Vestergaard and Dr Berthoud, both of them anthropologists, for their generosity in attending the workshop and making themselves available for consultation and information. It made us feel we were receiving a high degree of attention from the ESF, and that our projects and pursuits were taken into consideration .

Following the presentation by Elisabeth Vestergaard, it was Joan Bestard's and Patrick Heady's turn to fill the first part of Saturday's session telling us about two very challenging research projects, both of them undertaken from the quarters of Social Anthropology. **Joan Bestard** told us about a European research project just concluded, in which he has taken part. He discussed how recent developments in new reproductive and genetic technologies (NRGT) have led to the assertion that genetics is increasingly being used across Europe to explain and define significant social identities (for example, of family, race, gender, sexuality and nationality). This project (PUG) aimed to investigate such an assertion. Its focus was the 'public understanding of genetics' (for example, as lay persons, patients, politicians, professionals, journalists or campaigners). The distinctiveness of the study was in its ethnographic approach. This means that data is qualitative, in depth and holistic, and is collected in the context of everyday life –be it in the clinic, community, organization or mass media.

Another extremely promising research project is led from the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle, and coordinated by **Patrick Heady**: *Kinship and Social Security*. The aim of this EU-funded KASS project is to compare and explain the practical roles played by family and kinship ties in different parts of Europe. It is hoped that the findings will contribute to the future development of family and social security policies within the European Union. While most of the project's resources will be allocated to the collection and analysis of ethnographic data, substantial efforts will also be devoted to historical research and the analysis of census and social survey data. Theoretically the project will draw on economic and demographic theory, as well as on the traditions of socio-cultural anthropology and family history. The integration of ethnographic, historical and statistical data raises considerable practical problems. The attempt to integrate the different theoretical approaches also raises a number of philosophical issues –about the role of comparison, the relation between data and theory, and the contribution of research findings to public policy –which have been the subject of much controversy within anthropology and other human sciences.

Dorle Dracklé presented an ongoing research project on the understandings and applications of information in the digital era, on the global and the local. It will compare developments in the use of internet and other digital technologies in Europe and

elsewhere in South East Asia. This project is a good example of the new themes emerging, and the new frontiers opening up for anthropological research. A situation that will require to adapt our theories and methodologies, and be innovative in our approaches to investigating such new themes. Themes and contexts very unlike the classical scenarios where Anthropology used to work in the past.

The presentation by **Alexandra Bitusikova** on ERA and EHEA, which had been originally scheduled for Saturday, was in fact done on Friday morning, when developments in the discussion led us to broach issues she had planned to talk about later. Be it as it were, Alexandra Bitusikova's presentation dealt with the establishment of the European Higher Education and Research Areas, and the impact of these developments on academic arrangements in Europe, particularly in what concerns Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Bitusikova's presentation focused mainly on teaching programmes at the Master's level, describing opportunities opening at the European level for the setting up of Anthropology courses and programmes. She also discussed the implications of these processes for our project to build an Anthropology/Ethnology of Europe.

In the last of the presentations scheduled, **L. Kürti and D. Dracklé** told us about their experience in organizing and coordinating a network within the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), the *Teaching and Learning Anthropology Network*. They also commented upon two volumes recently published, which reflect work carried out along the last eight years or so that the network has been in operation. The books are titled "*Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*" and "*Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*". These two volumes provide a very practical and opportune base for current discussions concerning the process of European convergence in Higher Education and in Research, as concerns the discipline of Anthropology. They also provide a very good framework and point of departure for projects such as those foreseen in the context of this workshop.

The open **General Discussion** following each of the two sets of presentations on Saturday morning were focused on discussing and providing a broad outline of the kind

of projects that might be part of the Research and Teaching Agendas to be pushed forward as the outcome of this workshop. We acknowledged that it was premature to decide on specific projects, which corresponds to the 'exploratory' nature of the meeting. However, we agreed that it was worthwhile to pursue such goals in the immediate future, and that we should do it following the two avenues opened for cooperation: in teaching and in research.

Discussion along these lines continued over the **Closing Session**, which was called under the banner: *Steps Towards Further Cooperation in the Future*. After some exchange of views among the participants, Andrés Barrera made a specific proposal to set up two 'Committees' or 'Task Forces' dedicated to work out and implement common projects in teaching and in research respectively. The work of these committees will be addressed to the organization of two follow up meetings, in a year's time or so. The Committee on Joint Teaching Programmes will call a meeting in Siena, where Fabio Mugnaini will act as host. The Committee on Joint Research Projects will call a meeting in Paris; where Martine Segalen will be host. As to the sources of financial support to hold these two meetings, we agreed -on the suggestions and information provided by Elisabeth Vestergaard- that at this stage the European COST Programme will be the most adequate to look at. In effect, there was a Call for Proposals for Actions within the Social Sciences and Humanities open at the moment that seemed to fit our purposes.

In this Closing Session we also agreed to publish the full Proceedings of the Workshop, with papers contributed by the participants, and maybe including contributions by a few other people who were invited but were not in the end able to come to Litomyšl. Martine Segalen offered to negotiate publishing some of the papers, namely those dealing with the 'teaching dimension' of the theme of the workshop, as a special issue of the journal *Ethnologie Française*. Peter Skalník offered to do as much in what regards the papers having to do with the 'research dimension' of the workshop, negotiating with the journal *FOCAAL (European Journal of Anthropology)* to arrange for a special issue. Finally, it was agreed by some members of EASA -who were taking part in this meeting- to propose the establishment of a new network within the Association. The Biannual Conference that was going to be held in Vienna the week following that of our meeting in Litomyšl was the adequate occasion to do this. The

network should be instrumental in organizing and forwarding the interests of Europeanists within EASA: a *Network of Europeanists* might be named.

The local hosts had an splendid ‘guided tour of the town of Litomyšl’ organized for us. It included a tour of the town’s most interesting and monumental streets and squares, a visit to the Castle compounds and the Palace rooms, and an organ concert in the chapel of the Palace. A gala dinner offered to us on the terrace of Hotel Dalibor -where we were accommodated and held our meetings- marked the end of this very fruitful and enjoyable meeting.

c) Assessment of results, contribution to the future direction of the field

As it was stated in the original proposal to the ESF, we took this workshop as being a preparatory (effectively ‘exploratory’) meeting linked to “a more comprehensive teaching and research project.. aiming at setting up a common course and continuous research programme on *The Anthropology of Europe* in a number of Europe’s universities..” There was also the implicit aim to establish closer links among anthropologists and ethnologists all over Europe. Therefore, the convenors made a great effort to invite representatives from all regions of Europe, pushing to the limit the rules of the ESF ‘exploratory workshops’ programme, and the possibilities that the budget allowed us. We think that we have been successful on this account, for we managed to bring together twenty eight people from nineteen different countries. All of them presented original papers, and have agreed to contribute an updated version of their papers for publication. As it has been pointed out, it was a tight and intensive schedule for the workshop, yielding interesting results in terms of academic debate, as well as in terms of pragmatic agreements reached for the day after the workshop.

The following concrete outcomes, stemming from the workshop, should be mentioned:

- a)** The commitment from all participants (and two more people who were invited but could not attend the meeting) to forward updated versions of their papers for publication as part of the proceedings of the workshop. The publications will also incorporate contributions from discussion at the workshop, for the whole of the meeting was recorded on tape, and transcriptions of these recordings will be used in editing the planned volumes. Two proposals are already prepared in this regard. One for an special issue of the journal *Ethnologie Française* with a selection of papers covering the ‘teaching dimension’ of the theme, translated into French and edited by Martine Segalen and Andrés Barrera. The other for an special issue of the journal *FOCAAL. European Journal of Anthropology*, with a selection of papers covering the ‘research dimension’ of the theme. (See: the lists of papers offered for

consideration of the editorial committees of the two journals mentioned, with their respective abstracts, attached as Annex 3 and 4 to this Report).

- b) The most important outcome of this workshop was the decision to continue our collaborative work along both lines or dimensions of the project, teaching and research, with the calling of two follow up meetings in a year's time or before. One in Siena dedicated to set afoot and start implementing joint teaching-training programmes among one or more sets of departments/universities, primarily those represented in this workshop. Another in Paris, dedicated to discuss and agree on specific research projects to carry out in collaboration, again by one or several sets of research institutions, primarily those represented in this workshop. In looking for the material means needed to finance these meetings (and eventually the establishment of the specific programmes deriving from them) a proposal has been forwarded to the COST Programme (European Cooperation in the Field of Scientific and Technical Research) for a 'Cost Action' to last for four years (See: the 'abstract' of the proposal attached as Annex 7 to this Report).
- c) Following the workshop in Litomyšl, there was the EASA Conference held in Vienna. One of the convenors of the workshop, Andrés Barrera, organized a 'poster' as part of the Conference activities, to publicize the project *Towards an Anthropology of Europe*, and the ESF workshop itself. Moreover, linked to this poster, it was scheduled a presentation by Rüdiger Klein, coordinator of the EUROCORES Programme at the ESF, on: *European Science Foundation. A Presentation of Research Funding Instruments for Social Anthropology*. The aim of these activities was to inform professional anthropologists attending the Vienna Conference about ESF programmes and the opportunities that they offered for research in Anthropology. This was a most opportune thing to do, since there is apparently little knowledge of ESF programmes and activities among professional anthropologists Europe wide. All in all, the EASA Conference in Vienna allowed in some respects for a sort of follow up meeting immediately after the workshop itself. It was not out of mere chance, for the workshop dates and venue were set taking very much into account these fact. This facilitated the participation of some people

in both events, and it contributed as well to enhance academic results and the impact of the ESF workshop.

- d)** Again on the occasion of the EASA Conference, a number of participants in the Litomysl meeting decided to propose the establishment of a network dedicated to represent and forward the interests and activities of Europeanists. Andrés Barrera made the formal proposal and announcement at the Members' Forum, where it was granted the status of a network within EASA under the name: *A Europeanists Network*. To this end a 'founding statement' will be published in the November's issue of the EASA Newsletter, calling interested members to join the network and thus launch its activities as such (See: text of the founding statement offered as Annex 6 to this Report). On the request of the editor of the named EASA Newsletter, a shorter report on the Litomysl meeting has been produced and will be published in the coming November's issue as well (See: the full text of this report offered as Annex 5).

In conclusion, taking into consideration all the practical outcomes and results that have sprang from this 'exploratory workshop', it can be said this has been a very successful and productive meeting. We honestly think that our goals have been largely met; and we expect that in setting in motion all the projects stemming from the meeting, this will be shown more clearly in the immediate future. The workshop will surely prove to have contributed a noticeable impulse for the disciplines of Anthropology and Ethnology in the European arena, both in regard to its teaching-training-learning and research dimensions.

d) Statistical information on participants

Twenty eight scholars from diverse academic backgrounds (anthropologists, ethnologists, sociologists) were invited and took part in the Litomysl workshop. They are all members of University Departments and Research Institutes (in National Research Councils or Academies) of Socio-Cultural Anthropology, Ethnology and Sociology. Two representatives from the European Science Foundation, anthropologists themselves, attended the workshop (See: the *Final List of Participants* offered as Annex 2 to this Report). There were also two anthropologists who participated in the workshop as ‘observers’: Dr Hana Novotná, from the University of Hradec Králové; and Izabela Kolbon, PhD candidate from Jagiellonian University in Cracow. Three local students, from Univerzita Pardubice, occasionally attended sessions of the workshop.

There was a quite good balance reached in terms of geographical representation. If we divide Europe roughly in four quarters (corresponding to cardinal points) we can show clearly this is the case. There were ten participants coming from countries in North-Western Europe; eight came from countries in South-Western Europe; nine were from countries in North-Eastern Europe; and five from countries in South-Eastern Europe. This geographical/regional balanced result was not haphazard. We effectively wanted to get people from all ‘corners’ or regions of Europe, congruently with the general aims and purposes of the workshop.

There was also a quite good balance in terms of gender. Nineteen of the participants are male, and thirteen are female. Apparently the balance is not so good in terms of age. For instance, only four people are below 34 years of age. However, this can be accounted for if we consider that, given the general aims of our project, we were looking for people who already held permanent academic positions, be it as lecturers or full professors in Universities, or as senior researchers in Research Councils or Academies. And these permanent positions are usually reached at ages above thirty. Details about the distribution of participants are given in the Table: *Participants in the workshop, by country, sex and age* (Annex 8 to this Report)