

ELECTIONS

From the current Executive Committee, the President, Shalini Randeria, and the Vice-President, Benoît de L'Estoile are standing down. The following candidates are presenting themselves to the elections:

- Michal Buhowski;
- Maria Couroucli;
- Manuela da Cunha;
- Paolo Favero;
- Brian Moeran;
- Gísli Pálsson;
- Ronald Stæde.



Michal Buhowski

University of Poznan and University of Frankfurt|Oder

Nominated by Hastings Donnan

Supported by Ulf Hannerz

Deconstructing borders and overcoming disparities is what anthropology is all about. Educated in so-called Eastern Europe, I have spent six academic years in the 'West', i.e. in Britain, France, the United States and Germany, where now, in addition to my positions in Poland, I also teach. Being an intermediary fits my experience. Extending and strengthening ties between these two, still partly divided, anthropological communities, would continue to be my major task as a member of the Committee. It ought to be possible to involve both anthropologists and 'ethnologists' in all parts and corners of the continent, more closely in EASA activities; their ideas should become a part of our common intellectual discourses. This can be done, for instance, by facilitating students' and scholars' communication and by expanding the linguistic range and volume of a translation series.

If elected I would also endorse inter-conference EASA functioning, particularly by supporting networks activities leading to scholarly exchange of ideas and persons. Expansion of channels of communication and collaboration involves also a support extended to young anthropologists that should find our association an appropriate platform for interaction and for entering their professional careers. Tightening cooperation means also development of teaching curricula that actively and adequately respond to the creation of a pan-European education space.



Maria Couroucli

Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie comparative | CNRS-Université Paris X-Nanterre

Nominated by Benoît de L'Estoile

Supported by Thomas Fillitz

Maria Couroucli is a research fellow at the CNRS since 1990, holds a doctoral degree in Social and Historical Anthropology from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (Paris) and a BA and MA from Cambridge (UK). Her doctoral research was carried out in Corfu, where she studied an olive-growing village community (Cf. *Les oliviers du lignage*, Maisonneuve et Larose, Paris 1985).

She has carried further research in Greece on kinship and family, identity and nationalism. Her current research interests include shared religious practices in the post-ottoman world as well as questions of memory and identity in relation to the Greek civil war (1945-49). She teaches in the post-graduate programme of the Departement d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie comparative at Nanterre University (Paris, France) and is member of the editorial board of *Ethnologie Française*.



Manuela Ivone P. Pereira da Cunha
University of Minho

Nominated by Benoît de l'Estoile
Supported by João de Pina Cabral and Susana Narotzky

In the past two years I have had the privilege of serving in the Executive Committee of EASA, within a balanced team in terms of origins and background of its members. Besides the experience I gained in the workings of the association during this first term, I became more aware of the importance of the principles of balance and plurality to which EASA has been committed since its inception, and how I can keep participating in their continuous and concrete upholding.

By running for a second term, I hope I can make a twofold contribution:

- within the association, by fostering plurality at several levels and areas of its activity, from conference preparation to publishing orientations. Braiding together different academic and intellectual traditions, enhancing sensitivity to linguistic diversity and styles of anthropological work and writing: these are important endeavours that demand constant attention and renewal.

- in a time of growing pressures towards uniformity and quantitative evaluation, by contributing to alert EASA's external interlocutors about anthropology's distinctive character and the necessity to pluralize procedures and parameters for quality assessment.

I hold a teaching position at the University of Minho, in Portugal, and I am a member of two research centres, CRIA (Lisbon, Portugal) and IDEMEC (Aix-en-Provence, France).



Paolo Favero
University College London

Nominated by Shalini Randeria
Supported by David Napier

I am hereby glad to accept the candidature to the EASA Executive Committee. At present I am lecturing in Visual culture at University College London, yet my past has been widely spread across different European countries, Italy, Sweden, and the UK. I believe that my exposure to different European anthropological traditions and practices would be beneficial for the EASA. The Association needs to drive further integration between the North and the South, the East and the West of Europe. With my involvement in Scandinavian, Italian and British networks, I would be able to make a few steps in that direction.

In the past, I have established a Socrates exchange program between Sweden and Italy and recently, I was nominated Erasmus/Socrates tutor for the Department of Anthropology, University College London. I have published in English, Swedish and Italian. It is my aim to activate these different networks and experiences in order to connect anthropological traditions across Europe. I also plan to develop my interest in the dissemination of anthropology as a way to open up new spaces of visibility for the EASA, an Association that has become a part of (and can further strengthen in its role in) the panorama of global anthropology.

Brian Moeran
Copenhagen Business School

Nominated by Christina Garsten
Supported by Christoph Brumann and Nils Burbandt

My anthropological interests in cultural production (pottery, advertising, fashion magazines and incense and perfume) in a modern industrialized society (Japan), together with my current position as an anthropologist working in a business school, must make me a somewhat suspect candidate for membership of the EASA Executive Committee. Why then do I put forward my name? Partly out of a sense of indebtedness to colleagues in Europe (and Asia) for all the inspiring ideas, thoughtful critique, hard work, and sheer fun that they have provided me over the years. But also because I think that my extensive administrative and multi-cultural communicative

experiences (as Department Head, Associate Dean, and now Research Director) might be useful to the Committee. I also believe that my practical experiences and research in the world of academic publishing (I have been non-executive Director of both Curzon and Berg presses between 1995 and November 2008, and am a patron of the UK Independent Publishers' Guild) could help EASA members as we continue our discussions about the future of anthropological monographs and new forms of intellectual outputs. Born in England; passport Irish; lived in Denmark, Greece, Spain, Hong Kong and Japan over the past 40+ years. I'm almost European!



Gílsi Pálsson

University of Iceland

Nominated by Tim Ingold

Supported by Kristín E. Harðardóttir

EASA is now entering a new phase, with a larger and more sound basis than ever before in terms of finances, membership and enthusiasm. At the same time, the contexts within which we work are changing fast, offering both opportunities and dangers in the years to come. Drawing upon my experience from being a member of the Executive and from representing anthropology for several on the Standing Committee for the Humanities under the European Science Foundation, I would like to take part in the shaping of the next phase of EASA's development in response to these developments. If re-elected, I will work on the basis of the principles I expressed earlier, focusing on strengthening the democratic operation of EASA and broadening the disciplinary definition of anthropology.

Further work seems needed to ensure the responsiveness of the EASA body to different voices within the anthropological community (especially students) and to reintegrate the different factions of European anthropology. At the same time, I would like to emphasize the importance of increasing EASA's engagement with pressing contemporary issues and new ways of doing anthropology, rethinking departmental structures, traditions of funding and publishing, and participating in the anthropological community at the global level.



Ronald Stade

Malmö University

Nominated by Thomas Hylland Eriksen

Supported by Nigel Rapport

The honour of serving as a member of the EASA's Executive Committee corresponds to commitments, supreme of which should be the maintenance and development of the organization. Such a commitment is compatible with a focus on specific fields of activity. My own engagement with EASA, and with anthropology more generally, can be summarized under the headings of:

1. Public anthropology. For the sake of extending the public presence of anthropologists and anthropology, I founded the EASA network, Peace and Conflict Studies in Anthropology (PACSA).

2. Research ethics in anthropology deserves further analysis and specification. For example, we may want to investigate the relationship between EASA as a European organization and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. While it makes sense from a scholarly perspective to probe the cultural (and political) context of ethical reviews, its function as a professional organization requires EASA to also adopt a more policy-oriented approach.

3. Global cooperation. The collaboration of EASA with its sister organizations in other parts of the world is linked to the identity of anthropology as a scholarly field, and being per definition a cosmopolitan field of study. This should be reflected in EASA's efforts toward global cooperation within the WCAA.

Election Procedures

All eligible members will be emailed a URL and a unique password. They can then use these to complete and submit the online ballot paper. Members will receive an email confirming that they have voted. If a member does not receive the password email by January 18th, they should email membership@easaonline.org.

If a member receives an email confirming that s/he has voted, when s/he has not, s/he should email membership@easaonline.org. This message will be emailed in time to all members.

Rohan Jackson, NomadIT

**Voting period | January 14 till January 24;
Results | end of January, early February 2009
Handover | February 6, 2009**

Statement on the Subject European Reference Index Humanities | ERIH

Shalini Randeria
President of EASA on Behalf of the Executive Committee
Zurich, November 6, 2008

The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) was discussed during the meetings of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) in Ljubljana last August, both at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the EASA and a Roundtable on the changing research context in Europe and its implications for anthropology. In addition there was a special presentation of the Index by a representative from the European Science Foundation (ESF), Dr. Julianne Nyhan, Coordinator for the Index.

Having discussed the Index, its goals, designs, and implications, the Executive Committee of the EASA welcomes the development of the ERIH and other indexes with similar purposes and concerns of balance and linguistic diversity (such as SCOPUS and LATINDEX). Aiming to advance anthropology and more generally the humanities and social sciences in Europe, making them more visible both internationally and in Europe, all these indexes multiply the possibilities of parameters for assessing quality. The competition between them can be healthy and productive.

The key goals of the ERIH, to reduce or eliminate existing bibliometric biases in terms of geography, language, and disciplines, are quite important, advancing fairness and community dialogue on pertinent issues relating to the measurement of academic productivity. The EASA expresses its interest in cooperating in this venture and wishes to emphasize the central role of books (including edited volumes) and monographs in anthropological publishing. It also would like to stress the importance of including other qualitative measures of productivity when ranking colleagues, departments, and universities. At the same time, we would like to express our concerns that some of the features of the ERIH as it stands, in particular the categorization of "A", "B", and "C" journals, invite dangers of abuse. While the categories of A ("high-ranking") and B ("standard") refer to a hierarchy of standards, C ("research journals with an important local / regional significance in Europe") does not. Growing evidence indicates on the other hand that European institutions and agencies adopting the ERIH tend to rank publications in "C" journals as below those of A and B, thereby violating the principles of fairness assumed from the outset. This is an issue that needs to be seriously addressed.

Letter from Michael Herzfeld

Editor at Large for Polyglot Perspectives, Anthropological Quarterly

Dear Professor Randeria,

I write to solicit your help and substantive contributions to a new venture that we are launching at Anthropological Quarterly. It has long been evident that Anglophone anthropologists lacked sufficient information about important theoretical, methodological, and ethnographic work published in languages other than English. With the new feature, Polyglot Perspectives, we are inaugurating a series of presentations of such work and would specifically like to invite you to submit a proposal. A detailed account of the project appears below, underneath my „signature.“ This is more or less the text that will appear with the first such essay, which I have written myself, and which I attach – not so much to insist that you follow the same format, but to give you a sense of the kind of thing we are looking for ... We hope to build a rich stock of these presentations and that they will contribute to a better flow of knowledge across national linguistic borders.

Please join us in this important endeavor, and feel free to share this invitation with others you think might be interested in participating.

With best wishes,
Michael

The description:

In this issue, we inaugurate a new section that we hope will make an important and lasting contribution to the exchange of anthropological knowledge: Polyglot Perspectives. We launch our new feature in this issue of Anthropological Quarterly with an inaugural essay by the newly appointed Editor-at-Large responsible for soliciting and evaluating possible contributions, Michael Herzfeld (Harvard University). In Polyglot Perspectives, scholars will present essays on books written in languages other than English. Such languages may include those in which there is a long tradition of anthropological scholarship, but we hope to give particular emphasis to less widely used languages in which a nascent anthropology is already making important contributions that may be invisible to the larger international community.

In launching this new section, we acknowledge that, in many ways, the English language has been allowed to define the anthropological mainstream. We also acknowledge that in many disciplines, English has become the language of scholarship in countries where English is not the locally dominant language. Anthropology, however, is both a cosmopolitan discipline and one that seeks to recognize and study politically less powerful cultures and languages.

AQ wishes to apply to our collegial relations the same ethic that we bring to our fieldwork. With *Polyglot Perspectives*, Anthropological Quarterly seeks a more just balance while also expanding the scope of the journal's content. We encourage scholars familiar with a recent work in a language other than English to submit a brief proposal (1-2 single-spaced pages), outlining the work's significance for an international audience. If the potential contributor has already been involved in the production of the work (for example, as a consultant or commentator), we see no conflict of interest: we are looking less for reviews than for informed presentations that are original, substantive, provocative, and analytically powerful.

All proposals should be sent to Michael Herzfeld at <herzfeld(AT)wjh.harvard.edu>

Statement From the Second Meeting of Association Presidents and International Delegates World Council of Anthropological Associations

July 10-13, Osaka, Japan

Thomas Reuter

Deputy Chair, On behalf of the WCAA Organising Committee, 28 October 2008

This second face-to-face meeting of Presidents and International Delegates of the member associations of the WCAA, which also benefited greatly from the participation of Leslie Aiello, President of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, provided us with an invaluable opportunity to:

- review the aims and objectives of the Council as defined by the founding document prepared at the first WCAA meeting in Recife, Brazil, in 2004;
- consider whether any further goals should be added to WCAA's mission;
- reflect on the best way of achieving our aims and objectives in terms of procedures and organization.

Given that the number of member associations has doubled in the four years since WCAA's foundation and further growth remains likely, an in-depth review of this kind was essential. One of the major results of the meeting was agreement amongst the delegates to hold similar meetings of the entire WCAA Council every two years in future. To make this practicable, given that we could not normally expect to receive the level of support that had been so generously provided by our hosts in Osaka, it was agreed that such meetings should coincide with a conference convened by one of our member associations, to maximise

the opportunities for delegates to obtain support from a variety of funding sources, and that they should have a thematic agenda relevant to advancing the primary goals of the WCAA.

The meeting reaffirmed the three primary objectives of our founding document, which were:

- To promote the discipline internationally
- To promote cooperation and sharing of information among anthropologists worldwide
- To promote jointly organized events of scientific debate and cooperation in research activities

Dissemination of anthropological knowledge, originally included in the third of these objectives, has now been promoted to a fourth primary objective within what will now become the constitution of the WCAA. This reflects our conviction that we need not only to promote better understanding among anthropologists working in different languages and national and regional traditions, but also better *public understanding* of the work that anthropologists do and its relevance to major issues of public policy and social concern at national and international levels.

Our discussions thus led us to a series of concrete proposals about

how we could best further our aims that can be divided into activities and initiatives internal to the WCAA and those that are externally orientated towards society and the public sphere. In terms of the internal development of WCAA, as a framework for bringing associations together, WCAA is concerned with recognizing and debating a diversity of views and perspectives within world anthropologies whilst also seeking to identify and disseminate common concerns and conclusions. WCAA will act as a clearinghouse for communication of news, ideas and knowledge, and as a network facilitating the exchange and flow of information. This will include ethical codes, to promote global discussion about how the profession can best respond to contemporary challenges that are themselves often the product of forces and relations beyond the level of the individual nation-state. We aim to strengthen the circulation of ideas and knowledge by facilitating the translation of anthropological work into a multiplicity of languages to improve knowledge of world anthropologies on all sides, counter-act the hegemony of English-based knowledge production, and to enable different local publics to learn about the results of anthropological research in their vernacular languages. WCAA-sponsored panels will be organized at meetings of member associations, with a target

of three per year, and our website will be developed to make it a more powerful instrument for providing up-to-date information and facilitating scholarly exchange. WCAA will also seek to promote international networks of postgraduate students, as already requested by national student networks in the UK and Australia.

In terms of external orientation, WCAA will continue the work it has already begun to improve the profile and image of the discipline through different forms of public engagement. These will include a focus on deepening and broadening anthropology's presence in the education system, especially secondary schools, and encouraging anthropologists to contribute to public debates on issues such as multiculturalism, cultural diversity and immigration, by seeking to clarify the meaning of key terms on which anthropologists hold expertise and by practising appropriate forms of political advocacy. The WCAA itself will seek, when there is a consensus among its member associations, to issue public statements that reflect anthropological knowledge on issues such as indigenous and minority rights, as well as draw attention to arbitrary acts on the part of states and other groups towards such groups, and to threats to the lives and welfare of anthropologists and others. We will also issue statements on matters of worldwide professional concern. These include the impacts and potential biases of academic evaluation processes on the development of anthropology and of changes in funding models and the institutional organization of teaching and research in different national contexts. In some cases, such developments may raise ethical concerns and pose threats to academic freedom. As past WCAA actions have shown, the positions taken by member associations at national level are likely to be greatly strengthened by the support of the other WCAA member associations.

In order for advocacy statements to be made by the WCAA itself, the meeting reaffirmed the principle that this requires the unanimous support of all member association representatives, but clarified the

original article by agreeing that two weeks be allowed for a response to ensure that WCAA could respond opportunely to events. To ensure the viability of the new rule, it was also agreed that each association should nominate an alternate to the official international delegate to the Council, who is usually although not necessarily the association president, so that two people would receive all communications by email from WCAA. In order to strengthen the authority of the WCAA facilitator as spokesperson of the Council in communication with the external arena, it was agreed that this office be renamed that of "Chair". It was, however, also agreed that the Council made up of all member association delegates remains the sole decision-making body, and that this could be underscored by renaming the existing Executive Secretariat an "Organizing Committee", dedicated to managing the Council's business and oversight of ongoing activities.

Our meeting did, nevertheless, agree some further changes to the loose governance structure specified in the founding document, whose inadequacy had already been recognized by the constitution of an executive secretariat. The work of the organizing committee will be overseen by the Chair, serving for a non-renewable period of two years, supported by a deputy chair who will take over the Chair's role in the next two-year period. There are now four other committee members, each of whom will take on a particular oversight task: organization of the upcoming biannual WCAA meeting; facilitation of WCAA-sponsored sessions at member association meetings; liaison with Wenner-Gren and other funding agencies; oversight of the website (previously the responsibility of the facilitator). A system of rotation will be developed to ensure that the entire committee will not change at the same time, and continuity in the immediate future was ensured by the re-election of former facilitator Junji Koizumi of JASCA to the post of Chair and former executivesecretariatmemberThomas Reuter of AAS as deputy-chair. Henk Pauw of ASnA and Gustavo Lins Ribeiro of ABA also agreed to stay on as committee members, but the

voluntary retirement of John Gledhill of ASA allowed two new members to be elected, Setha Low of AAA and Shalini Randeria of EASA. The new organizing committee therefore has an improved gender composition whilst conforming to the condition that the organizing committee should include members from five world regions (The Americas, Africa, Asia, Europe and Oceania) with no more than two members from the same region.

These improvements in our organization are essential if WCAA is to pursue its mission effectively in the future, but WCAA will remain a network rather than seek to build a substantial and costly bureaucratic infrastructure. It will be necessary to seek funding for a webmaster if the website is to be kept up-to-date and fulfil its role in the development of new WCAA dissemination initiatives, but no further infrastructure investment should be necessary. WCAA does not seek to duplicate the role of the IUAES as a world anthropological body organizing congresses and extensive commissions on sub-fields of the discipline. Our role is to facilitate the collaboration and integration of world anthropology by bringing the representatives of the different international, regional, national associations and organizations of anthropology together to pursue shared goals and pool their resources to the benefit of anthropology worldwide. As a result of the Osaka meeting, we are confident that we now have the consensus on aims, objectives, procedures and organization necessary to move forward substantively on the agenda that we have set ourselves for the coming years.

In the aftermath of the meeting, Deputy Chair Thomas Reuter in consultation with the Organising Committee has written and lodged an application for institutional funding of the WCAA with the Wenner-Gren Foundation. The application is pending but a decision should be reached by end of November 2008. The new constitution will be circulated for approval by WCAA members within the next few weeks.

REPORT

“Anthropological Perspectives on a Changing Europe”

Seminar organised by the European Commission DG Research Directorate L Science, Society and Economy
European University Institute | Fiesole, 23-24 October 2008

Thomas Fillitz

Jean Michel Baer, Director Directorate L Science, Society and Economy, presented the aim of the workshop: how can anthropologists contribute to Socio Economic Science and Humanities EU funded research.

Baer insisted that it was the first time that the Research Directorate organised such a venue for scholars of a particular discipline. The main goals for the team EC-Team were to listen to anthropologists, to develop ideas for programmes and research actions, and to think about anthropological approaches to Europe.

The programme, which the participants were invited to reflect, was the one of People. This means that in the calls, research themes are addressed and oriented, and the teams must be collaborative, and interdisciplinary. In order to launch the debate, Baer mentioned four possible topics, such as national symbols in the EU, movements (at large), the idea of Europe in a historical, geographical, and social perspective, or how to live in “Europe.”

Johannes Klumpers, Head of Unit Scientific Culture and Gender Issues, addressed the participation of Humanities and in particular of anthropologists in the EU Framework programmes. Specifically Theme 8 of the FP-7 (2007-2013) is relevant for our discipline, and disposes of a financial volume of € 623 Mio. He too emphasized that this programme line is fundamentally multidisciplinary, and issue (topic) oriented. He further stressed that “issue orientation” should be understood within a wider frame of policy relevance at a middle and longer term, and at either EU-level, or national, regional, and even local ones.

These introductory statements were followed by short impulse contributions by Michael Herzfeld, Marc Abélès, and Christina Garsten.

Herzfeld focussed in his paper „Cultural Intimacy and the Reconfiguration of Nationalism in 21st-Century Europe” on the notion of cultural intimacy, the zone of mutual knowledge shared. He insisted on two dimensions: a) the quality of long-term field research, and the learning of local languages in order to create

a socio-cultural intimacy with the interlocutors; b) how can anthropology connect to policy oriented research, as it is by definition a subversive discipline.

Abélès dealt with „New Challenges for the Anthropology of Europe.” He reflected on developments in the discipline after the 1980s, and new topics of debates, such as anthropology and the experience of globalization, the deterritorialisation of culture, and the consideration of Europe as a process, a metaphor and less a reality. New challenges could be among others the construction of European public spaces, and the inside|outside circulation of different categories of people.

Garsten’s paper was „Global Swirl: Some Reflections on European Organizing in the Context of Globalization.” She proposed as research agenda the topic of international institutions, and how they are building the social world with some universal standard, and different impacts t national, regional, or local levels. The anthropological approach would study dense interactions in these areas, with multi-sited fieldwork, and collaborative methodologies.

The first day ended with a round table chaired by Ulf Hannerz, on the current state of anthropological research on Europe and Europeans and addressing the main questions of the seminar. In his introductory statement, Hannerz mentioned several themes, which could be of interest for anthropological inquiry in the given programme framework: variations of languages, family contexts, European party systems, or productions of national cultures. The participants of the round table agreed upon one of the most powerful contribution of anthropology could be to “bring the people in.”

The next day was dedicated to three themes of the current FP-7 People programme:

1) Activity 8.3: Major Trends in Society:

Discussed by Ulf Hannerz (Stockholm), Signe Howell (Oslo), Hastings Donnan (Belfast), Michal Buchowski (Poznan and Frankfurt/Oder), Joan

Bestard (Barcelona), Rajko Mursic (Ljubljana).

The working group formulated four central anthropological aims: to challenge ‘naturalistic’ assumptions, to question dichotomies, to stress the processual, and to use the method of comparison. As possible topics the group considered a) ageing, b) kinship, c) migration, d) lifestyles, e) cultural interactions, and f) gender issues.

2) Activity 8.4: Europe in the World
Discussed by Benoît de L’Estoile (Paris), Susana Narotzky (Barcelona), Michael Herzfeld (Harvard), Marc Abélès (Paris), João de Piña Cabral (Lisbon), Thomas Fillitz (Vienna), Christina Garsten (Stockholm).

The group insisted that the topics to be presented are formulated in respect to the whole anthropological scientific community. It refrained from making recommendations based on the personal preferences of the participants of this working group. Second, these topics should be considered from an anthropological dimension, this means “to bring people in”- to emphasize face-to-face relations in respect to Europe and the Transnational. On these grounds, five major thematic areas have been formulated: Human mobilities for work and security (incl. such problematic notions as informal economies), categorisation and discrimination, representations and ways of seeing and experiencing Europe, colonial legacies – Europe and elsewhere, mobilities of ideas and things.

3) Activity 8.5: The Citizen in the European Union

Discussed by Lilith Mahmud (Irvine), Aziliz Gouez (Notre Europe), Enricque Porqueres i Gené (Paris), Maja Povrzanovic Frykman (Malmö), Lynda De Matteo (Paris).

The group proposed themes such as the notion of the EU-citizen and the inequalities connected to their statuses, citizenship as management of diversity, hope and humiliation, borderlands and coastlines, and finally spaces of commonality.

Other aspects, which had been

addressed:

- Questions about method and themes;
- The design of the calls;
- Recommendations to the

Research Directorate:

- Much of the calls and the condition of work did not seem conducive for anthropological work (field-work!). Therefore the participants requested that the frame should be produced in such a way that it:

1. Enables long-term field research;

2. That there are not only deliverables (reports), but the consideration of articles, monographs, or edited volumes as well

3. The mission (research travels, etc.) could be further reflected and adapted to our needs;

4. It seemed advantageous to the participants that the topics could be more general, therefore enabling a wider range of possibilities in the production of a research project and team.

In the final discussion, Jean Michel Baer reminded us that the Directorate we had met in Fiesole-Florence is not a part of the architects of the project of Europe and of the EU-programmes. Alessia Bursi, Scientific Officer of the EC, added regarding the final recommendations (points a-d above) that most of these requests are possible already in the current programme outlines, there are project which last more than three years, and may allow for fieldwork, and the question of the "deliverables" does not forbid monographs, articles, or films. They are basically connected to decisions of the project coordinator, and the outline of the project.

It was felt that the dialogue between the Research Directorate and the anthropological community should be continued, and that projects coordinated by anthropologists would be most welcome.

virtual or online seminars, and so on. Also there is the possibility of setting up a list-Serv or emailing list for the exchange of information among all members. The required cybernetic resources are readily available, and technically speaking it poses no great problem to set up a website or a list-Serv. However, all this requires the professional services and time of people who can take care of designing and administering the e-tools. Thus, either we can rely on some individual members' altruism, or we would have to look for the financial means needed to pay for these services externally. Then, we should carefully consider what we want these tools for, weighing the pros and cons, and making decisions as to how to go about it, notwithstanding the need to provide solid academic and scholarly contents for these activities.

Mid-term meetings:

The Europeanist network has been striving for some time to establish the 'tradition' of convening mid-term meetings, to be held the odd years in between EASA's conference dates. Yet, not having at hand the funding required to convene a workshop or conference exclusively dedicated to matters of direct interest to members of the network, the formula we are trying to apply is making informal arrangements for holding parallel meetings, with the involvement of a sizeable number of members of the network, in the framework of larger conferences, congresses or symposia. Like it was done at the end of October 2007 on the occasion of a workshop held in Paris, with funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, related to the Anthropology in Europe scholarly endeavour. One such meeting, a workshop, will be organised by three members of the network in the framework of the International Association for Southeast European Anthropology's conference, which will take place in Ankara, 21-24 May 2009. An additional mid-term meeting of the Europeanist network will probably be called for in the autumn of this same year, making it coincide with the EASA's AGM.

Publications:

The coordinator and two other members of the network are in talks and negotiations with LIT Verlag Publishers, Berlin, with the aim to establish a book series on Europeanist Anthropology and Ethnology. The problem with LIT, and with other publishers similarly, is that they require the payment of a cash subsidy

Network Reports

Europeanist Network activities

2007-2008

The Europeanist network held its regular 'business meeting' the 27th of August 2008 in the city of Ljubljana, on the occasion of the 10th EASA conference. The minutes of this meeting are available at the network's webpage, set up within the EASA website. Andrés Barrera González, coordinator of the network at present, also attended a meeting convened by the executive committee on the 28th, with all chairs and coordinators of EASA's networks. Moreover, he read a report on the activities of the Europeanist network at the Member's Forum on the 29th. What follows is a general report on the activities and projects of the network, where the main issues at stake are summarised, referring to specific moments and events when it is relevant.

Membership

About twelve people have requested to join the network after the Ljubljana conference, thus raising the total membership to seventy four. Let us remind whoever is interested in subscribing to the network that there exists a form, downloadable from the webpage, to fill in to this end. Data provided in this form is also required for building and updating the Directory of Members.

Therefore, we call upon all present and future members please visit the site, download the Word file, and fill it in whenever you want to update your profile. This would be particularly advisable to do now, on the part of all members, if we are to take up Rohan Jackson's offer to build an online directory, as agreed it would be done for all networks during the above mentioned meeting with EASA's executive committee. A service by Nomadit which will be covered with EASA funds; as it is the case with the continuous provision of basic webpage support for networks. Incidentally, the issue was raised in this meeting that EASA networks do not have specific statutes, and whether this is a normative void that should be filled at some point.

Communication between members:

As already mentioned, there is a webpage set up within EASA's website where information about the activities of the network are regularly posted, as well as various files pertaining to its 'historical record', and other matters of interest for members. There has been a continuous debate about the need to broaden the means of communication between members. For instance, by setting up an independent fully fledged website, with all the regular features, that will allow for organising discussion fora,

for each volume to be published. Now, if we can't count on a regular budget to tape from, like when you have an Institute or Department behind the initiative, things get enormously complicated. Therefore, the options in what regards publication plans are kept open. If you have any idea and specific proposal to make, please come forward.

The Anthropology in Europe scholarly endeavour:

A sizeable number of members of the Europeanist network are at present fully involved in bringing about the Anthropology in Europe scholarly endeavour. This has become, from the very moment when the network was established in 2004, a core part (with varying, evolving formulations) of the efforts and activities of the network as such. The second of the meetings linked to this project was held in Madrid the first week in September 2008. At the Madrid conference it was decided to go ahead with the endeavour as planned. Thus, the closing conference is to be convened in the autumn of 2010, in the city of Poznan. Information about the Anthropology in Europe project you can obtain it from the Paris07 webpage:

http://www.u-paris10.fr/1191427395578/0/fiche_actualite/&RH=FR

Or the Madrid08 conference website: <http://www.ucm.es/info/antrosim>.

Collaborative research projects:

Conversations during the official meetings of network, and beyond them, go on as regards the convenience that we agree on drawing some priority research agendas on Europeanist themes; and then furthering the collaboration of members of the network in the development of the specific research projects that stem from them. Appropriate themes, as items of an open list, for these research agendas that have come up at one point or another in these exchanges of views, might be the following: a) Cultural dimensions in the process of European unification; b) The anthropology of supranational and international institutions; c) Language diversity in Europe: ideologies, politics, policies. There is agreement between the more active members of the Europeanist network that this should be a most important line of action for the members of the network to pursue in the future. Namely, the furthering of cooperative and collaborative

research endeavours.

EASA Medical Anthropology Network

Birgit Obrist

Created during the 2006 Biennial Conference of the EASA in Bristol, United Kingdom, the EASA Medical Anthropology Network held its second meeting at the 10th Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on 27 August 2008.

During the first term from 2006-2008, we developed our own section on the EASA website with links to already existing and networks, special interest groups and journals in different languages. We also set up an EASA Medanthnet mailing list announcing workshops, publications, research projects and jobs and this list serve now has almost 170 subscribers. Members of our network organized several exciting panels during the 10th Biennial EASA Conference in Ljubljana "Experiencing Diversity and Mutuality".

During the second term, we plan to continue along these lines. Brigit Obrist, University of Basel, Switzerland, (Chair, 2nd term), leads the network and represents it towards the EASA Board and other organizations. She will participate in the mid-term EASA meeting and advocates for the network to play a more active role in inviting and organizing panels on medical anthropology at the next Biennial Conference of EASA in Ireland 2010. She will further visit regional and topical groups and networks to strengthen the links within and beyond the umbrella network.

Janus Oomen from the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, (Vice-Chair) creates and manages contact with new members, institutions, groups and networks. Together with Agita Lūse from Riga Stradiņš University, Latvia, (IT Officer, 2nd term) he will improve our presence on the internet and develop new web-based communication tools and a platform which allow network members to engage in a more lively exchange between the biennial conferences.

We firmly believe that medical anthropology is and should continue to be rooted in general anthropology. Viola Hörbst, Centro de Estudos Africanos at the ISCTE-Lisbon University Institute in

Portugal (General Anthropology representative) will closely monitor debates in social and cultural theory as well as in closely related fields, for instance the anthropology of religion, science and technology studies and political anthropology and create links with interesting institutions, research groups and networks within and beyond the EASA.

The Teaching Medical Anthropology representative Elisabeth Hsu, University of Oxford, will establish closer ties between European centres of medical anthropology and foster an active dialogue between them with regard to teaching on BA, MA and PhD levels. She is also planning to organise an RAI conference at Oxford on «Medical anthropology in Europe: past, present, future».

The student representatives Claire Baudevain (University Paul Cezanne of Aix-Marseille) and Susan Huschke (Free University Berlin) plan to create a platform for an exchange and discussion on student issues (e.g. exchange programs, funding, summer schools) with a focus on the doctoral level. They will explore and link up with already existing websites in Europe and beyond.

Rachael Goberman-Hill, University of Bristol, United Kingdom (Applied Medical Anthropology representative, 2nd term) has already set up a special interest group on the EASA Medical Anthropology Network website. This section showcases and provides links to departments working in applied medical anthropology and their projects. Rachael will continue to develop connections between applied anthropologists inside and beyond the membership of EASA.

Scholars and students who want to join our network are invited to register as EASA member.

Anthropology of Religion Network

We had an excellent second meeting of the EASA Religion Network (our first meeting had been in Bristol, when the Network was founded). Simon and Ramon reported on the meeting they and other Network co-ordinators had had earlier that day with the EASA Executive, and they and others at the meeting explored ways in which the Religion Network could consolidate its position both within EASA and as a resource for

its members.

Central to our discussions was the need to balance expanded activity of the group without it becoming a burden to its members, and without developing restrictive bureaucratic structures. The following were broadly agreed upon:

1) The co-ordinators would explore the possibility of developing a simple web-based presence on the EASA site. This might prove a place in which to put information on member interests, brief introductions to each member, relevant teaching materials, and so on.

2) The co-ordinators would remain in touch with the EASA Executive, in order to track any opportunities for funding of conferences or workshops 'in between' main EASA conferences, or for sponsoring workshops dealing with the anthropology of religion in other conferences (for instance, in regional or national anthropological association meetings, or in other conferences dealing with religion).

3) All members were encouraged to send notices to the List-serve, relating to jobs, conferences, journals, publications, and so on.

4) The Network would explore ways in which to exchange resources and ideas relating to the teaching of the anthropology of religion (see above).

5) A general satisfaction expressed by everybody at the meeting was about the big number of successful workshops on religion at the Conference this year. There was some frustration expressed over the fact that some of such workshops overlapped. We agreed that the network should work in such a way as to keep this overlapping to a minimum in future EASA conferences, firstly by keeping each other informed as to the workshops proposed, and secondly by asking the organizers of the conference to avoid it -- if or when possible.

6) Members were generally agreed that we could hold further 'e-conferences' in the future (a successful one had been held during the previous year). The model here is of a paper being posted to the

List-serve, followed by discussant's comments. After a few days the whole list is invited to comment on the paper (and on the discussant's remarks), over the period of around a week-ten days. We felt that this model could provide an excellent forum to discuss 'works in progress', when a member might be seeking feedback on a paper that would also be of interest to a large proportion of the Network as a whole.

7) Members agreed that we would explore a simple method of introducing ourselves to each other on the List-Serve. Particular topics relating to the anthropology of religion would be suggested to the group, and over a given period, e.g. two weeks, members with a particular interest in that topic would send a brief post to the list explaining their interest (two lines of comment, and reference to one indicative publication). This would provide a quick means of working out which 'mini-networks' of researchers might be able to be formed within the EASA Religion Network as a whole. Simon and Ramon gathered some 20 suggestions for relevant topics, and propose to work through these topics in the order that they were suggested to the meeting. We agreed that this strategy would only work if people kept their postings very short, and spread out over the two-week period, as we do not want to generate large amounts of unwanted traffic within the List-serve.

If you have any further suggestions or comments feel free to email Simon (s.m.coleman@sussex.ac.uk) and Ramon (ramonsarro@gmail.com).

Caucasus and Central Asia Net (CCANet)

On August 28th at the 10th EASA biennial conference in Ljubljana, a new network was convened by Tsypylma Darieva to bring together EASA members working in and on Central Asian and the Caucasus. After a lively and well-attended initial meeting, the establishment

of the Caucasus and Central Asia Network (CCANet) was announced at the EASA Members' session on August 30th.

CCANet is established with the aim of strengthening links and facilitating opportunities for scholarly collaboration amongst anthropologists of and from these regions, broadly defined. Whilst there is growing interest in the Caucasus and Central Asia, anthropological study of this area remains weakly institutionalised and there are relatively few opportunities for collaboration between scholars trained in different intellectual traditions. The network seeks to promote such exchange, motivated by the recognition that anthropological study of these regions can contribute important insights into the location of "Europe" and "Asia".

We invite all interested members of EASA to join the network and encourage further discussion of the use, benefits and gains of CCANet for anthropology and EASA. The CCANet in the first instance is expected to facilitate academic linkages, exchange of practical input through syllabi, references to new materials and resources, literature including those published in local languages, and discussion of particular questions that we encounter in our research and scholarly practice. We particularly welcome the participation of anthropologists and ethnologists from the Caucasus and Central Asia in the network.

The network is coordinated by Tsypylma Darieva (Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany), Madeleine Reeves (University of Manchester, UK) and Sophie Roche (Max-Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Germany)

tsypylma.darieva@staff.hu-berlin.de
madeleinereeves@gmail.com
roche@eth.mpg.de

Biology as Destiny

Interview with Gísli Pálsson | Lisbon, June 3 -7, 2008

Catarina Frois

Post-doctoral Fellow, Centre for Research in Anthropology, Portugal

*My first question, obviously, is about your latest book **Anthropology and the New Genetics** (2007). I would like very much if you could explain what your book is about, what is your interest in doing this kind of research; it is not a common theme in Anthropology.*

It is an attempt to provide an anthropological take on recent developments in biomedicine and genetics. There is so much going on now, cloning, genetic engineering, biobanks, biosecurity, and the rest of it. The dividing line between nature and culture, body and society, is being blurred in the making of bodies. Anthropology, by definition, should have much to say about this. The idea of the human is being refashioned; the post-human is possibly coming, etc. So, I see the book as an attempt to deal with some of these issues. Anthropology approaches these issues somewhat different from other disciplines, although there is always an overlap with philosophy, sociology, political science, etc. Our strong points are ethnography and the ambition to see things as they are, we interview people which is always beneficial; philosophers tend to close themselves behind their office doors and speculate about what is going on – which is fine up to a point– but we need to do our ethnography as well. So that is the book to me.

Of course there is a personal angle as well. I come to this theme from a specific personal history. I had been studying several different issues for years and I was looking for a new domain, sort of moving out. I like to change gears every now and then, it is refreshing. I can't imagine being stuck with the same theme throughout my career. I like to have several things going every time and it always amazes me how they benefit from each other. So I was systematically looking for something new. And then several things occurred at the same time. I was increasingly drawn to the body, partly through my work on skills and embodiment, the ways in which skills become part of our habitus. Also, I was teaching a course on "The body and social theory" for my students

in Reykjavik. Lastly my attention was tuned to medicine and genetics through a series of events happening right at home.

In 1998, the Icelandic government and a private company, deCODE genetics presented a biobank scheme involving the assembly of medical records for the entire Icelandic population. Within weeks everything went crazy, with hot debates on property rights, ethics, consent, and commodification. All the themes that have emerged in the biobank domain were literally fleshed out in a few weeks. I decided to stay there and watch the events, to follow the media discussion and to do fieldwork within the company in question. So it was really partly a chance: I was there at the time, I was ready for something new and had the freedom to switch. Of course, at the same time I was drawing upon my earlier works, on the embodiment of skills, property rights, stuff like that. This proved to be very productive. I worked with Paul Rabinow on some of the issues involved, which was quite stimulating. He had studied the French case, published in his book *French DNA*, and the development of PCR technology, *Making PCR*. Also, I worked with a graduate student Kristín Harðardóttir.

I imagined that when my book would be done I would, again, be turning my attention to something new, but I keep coming back to related themes. Thus, I am involved in comparative project, organized by colleagues in Vienna, on biobanks and human tissue collections. Moreover, I am co-organising a project on Inuit genetic history. So, I keep writing on the new genetics in one way or another. My most recent paper (to be published in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*) focuses on the notion of biosociality and what I call "biosocial relations of production". Also, I have just published an article in *Current Anthropology* on genomic anthropology.

May you speak a little about how the genetic program in Iceland changed or didn't change the way people see the community, genealogical importance, the way they see the family; because you speak about

"imagined genetic communities" and at some point when I was reading your book I was thinking that Icelanders are all relatives or searching for relatives Was that the major concern for citizens, for example or the medical aspects of the deCODE project?

In the biobank case, of course, Icelanders had followed what went on elsewhere - discussions on genetics and genetic engineering - and here as elsewhere there had been studies for years on blood types and human genetics. So, the public was aware of many of the pertinent issues, so to speak. But things rapidly changed with deCODE genetics, because there was a hot debate and everyone was kind of forced to take a stand on the issues. All the media were full of analysis and commentaries for months. For one thing, this was the first proposal to have a national biobank collapsing all available medical records. This was a massive scheme, and it was bound to create critique and opposition with all kinds of nuances, even memories of totalitarian states, things like that. And then, secondly, biobank knowledge about personal genetic makeup seemed to open up possibilities for developing personalized medicine, on the basis of genetic signatures. And then, thirdly, the genealogies were important: Icelanders have been collecting and playing with genealogies for centuries. The interest arouse and faded away from time to time, but with the new genetics family histories were redefined and firmly placed on the agenda. deCODE had this ambitious and almost crazy idea of assembling the genealogies and making them available on a CD-ROM or on the web. That was a major event. Nowadays, you have lots of stuff of this kind in different parts of the world. People can log in and check their ancestry; there is a number of website for this, either for free or for a small payment. I followed the Icelandic developments ethnographically, listening to people and requesting a password for myself so that I could see what was available for me. I also followed the media discussion, exploring how people were using the

web, and part of my book reflects on this. I think the presence of the biobank issue and this genealogical database made Icelanders focused on family histories, thoroughly and intensively. It was a kind of revisiting of family history.

But when you have access to your genealogy, do you also have access to medical history?

No, you only get access to family history. And what you have on the web is only your own personal data. You can click on some of your ancestors, the further way the less important the privacy issue becomes.

So you can't do the same thing the Israeli do, you cannot map or pinpoint diseases like that?

deCODE and some others agencies have information of this kind, they have assembled genetic information for specific patient groups and they have detailed genealogies. So theoretically they could see if there is a possibility of Tay-Sacks or Huntington diseases. But the individual "consumer" cannot do this and, moreover, there are massive restrictions for everyone involved. You cannot play with this stuff the way you like, I mean you get a license to study arthritis or breast cancer or whatever, you cannot just have fun with the data and see if someone has the likelihood of this or that disease.

But the consumer aspect is one of the things I would like to know more because in fact we are speaking about enterprises and companies which want to have profits, we are speaking about the development of pharmaceuticals. Did you think this was an important aspect of your study, to think about the financial and commercial aspects of this kind of venture?

It is a very important aspect, our bodies become experimental sites for laboratories and pharmaceutical companies which eventually somehow use the result of these experiments and there are lots of important and pressing issues and concerns: property rights, privacy, and biopiracy and the possibility of extracting tissue or information which is useful in one way or another for the bioindustry and maybe sensitive to you as a patient or client. There are huge political and economical issues which have been outlined in a number of works recently coming

out on biovalue and biocapital - stuff like that. Personally, I have not been that much interested in these aspects and some of it is technical in the economic sense, it's really beyond my domain. But I can see they are important. Just as big companies are refashioning crops through out the world, playing with fields and restricting the opportunities for farmers and controlling what we consume and bringing to our bodies (including genetically modified food), these very same companies might eventually control the pharmaceutical industry and manage our bodies in a more profound sense, not just controlling what we eat but monitoring our genetic constitution and physical health as well. So these are big issues, I haven't so far addressed them systematically but some people are doing this and it is important.

Some people say that in today's world, when we think about biometrics and genetics, that biology and biography are opposite fields. Do you think that is true? It seems that our body is more important than our personal history and the person itself.

Deep down this is a question of how you see genetics and the genes. One of the recent exciting books in this genre is *Culturing Life: How Cells Became Technology* by Landecker (2007). It draws up on Rabinow's idea of biosociality, pointing out that life is cultured in a literal sense. The old distinction between the natural and the artificial doesn't make sense anymore; the natural is a product of the artificial. We now have the capability to rework the human; cyborgs are a fact. Our bodies are mixing all kinds of stuff, artificial limbs, pacemakers and the rest of it, and this will not doubt escalate. In addition, our possibility to work on our genetics means that human bodies are not just exposed to processes of natural selection. We can change the species, quite literally. This is a theme that has been played with by novelists and fiction writers, now it is a biological fact.

So much has happened in the space domain in the last 50 years: Sputnik, humans on the moon, the international space station, etc. Tourism in the space is coming, and given how much has happened in these 50 years in the space domain this is unlikely to slow down. I think space exploration will even escalate. Some people have reasoned - for instance Stephen Hawking, the

Cambridge astrophysicist - that with growing environmental problems, global warming, humans are bound to speed up the search for other habitats. If we venture into space - this is not a new argument, it was developed by anthropologists during Cold War -we can expect that the human will change radically. The further you go into space, the less the opportunity of coming back, so over time there will be populations of humans with very little in common and no chance of communicating. It will take years to respond to messages and human evolution will speed up and the species will diversify, with subspecies and post-human, etc. This is science fiction but is coming. The phrase from the old Beatles song "Lucy in the sky ..." may acquire a new meaning. What happens to personhood in this process is difficult to say.

And you think genetics are an important part of that process?

It is quite possible that humans will be literally designing babies for the sky. As a species we have evolved with respect to the habitat of the earth. The habitat of outer space is something quite different, in terms of gravity and "climate". There are forces slowing down developments in space, the mere fact that the body doesn't easily adapt to radiation, the costs involved, etc. And we might ruin our planet and humanity before we get to this stage. Nevertheless it is something to speculate about. And genetics may speed up the quest for space.

But, this is a common sense question, are you speaking about genetics our eugenics?

Both. Eugenics, by definition, is the attempt to refashion our genetic makeup given certain goals: these goals can be related to the future in the space or governments trying to eradicate certain medical problems. Genetics can be massively abused, like Nazi's science decades ago, but it can also be used systematically for human benefit, to reduce the costs of the health service and to reduce human misery and pain.

How is your work in this field of research being received by the general community of anthropologists?

It is difficult to say; so far I have only seen one review of my book, it is too early to see. But I get personal

messages from "significant others", so to speak, from people following similar tracks, and they seem to like what I've been doing. And I published a number of articles that have been peer reviewed and.

But you realize that it is not a common ground for anthropologists, it is very much mediated by technology, highly technical. I am wondering to what extent more "traditional" anthropologists have been reading your work.

I may not be the right judge, but reflecting on my own development I am increasingly drawn to interdisciplinary works, to science studies and conferences focusing on biomedicine, the new genetics, etc. For the last 10 years, this has gradually taken over my interests and I find many of the academic meetings I go to, which are interdisciplinary and focusing on something thematic, more rewarding and fun. It probably means at the same time that I am moving away from classical anthropological issues, which makes me wonder if people who are working on classical anthropological issues find my kind of stuff marginal, trivial, or not properly anthropology; I don't know. But my feeling is that this kind of stuff is becoming more central, there is so much going on in this field of anthropology.

Do you think that anthropologists are aware or concerned with these themes/issues or this could be a "new anthropology"?

It is coming, I think. Many of our colleagues have kept these new developments at a distance, imagining that this is not their "cup of tea" or that "this is irrelevant" to what they do, not even anthropology possibly. But I think people increasingly see the relevance of the new genetics, it infringes on and affects so many lives in so many ways, you cannot ignore it and, as I said, it raises fundamental questions about who we are and what it means to belong, introducing the theme of genetic citizenship, for instance. So it cannot easily be ignored. If you look at anthropology journals occasionally there are central pieces on some of these issues.

I believe this relates to medical anthropology, the anthropology of the family and the body.

Yes, the body has moved to the cent

of theoretical discourse over the last 20 years or so. The anthropological focus on the new genetics has accelerated that process.

Do you think genetics is about monitoring bodies or monitoring people?

It is potentially both. By definition it is about monitoring bodies, genetic screening and the attempt to find medical remedies, trying to see how people are related and to calculate the risks for developing this or that disease. This is monitoring bodies. But at the same time this is biopolitics in the Foucauldian sense, a matter of governing populations, the development of a kind of a scientifically engineered panopticon. This has huge implications for politics in the future, for democracy, human rights, etc.

I always find it amazing how we tend to speak about the body without speaking about the "person". How we think about these things imagining that they can be kept separate: we tend to identify a person in terms of her body without any interest in her personal background, her personal history, unless it can be used in some way, for medical purposes, for example, or for identification.

Yes, this raises issues of commodification and alienation and some of our colleagues are precisely working on this; the person is reduced to a thing. My paper on "biosocial relations of production" draws upon early Marx to explore how we become alienated from ourselves in the course of biosocial production, with the extraction of tissue, body parts, organs, genes, etc. Our daily lives are increasingly monitored by biomedical companies, as part of the accumulation of biocapital.

But this is a new kind of bodily transfer, isn't it? It is not the person who is at issue but her body parts. It is a strange thing to think about, it's your own data which is "travelling".

True, it is separated from your life history, but we also have to rethink the notion of the autonomous individual, the methodological individualism of recent Western history. It is a flawed understanding of persons and bodies. As Marx put it, we are an "ensemble" of social relations, which resonates with relational theoretical perspectives which many people are now trying to develop right now,

including the "dividualism" of Marilyn Strathern. We are not autonomous beings that somehow relate once they are fully developed; right from the beginning we are enmeshed in social relations from which we cannot be separated. We need to keep this in mind as well, and not just the "simple" fact that things are extracted from bodies.

Regarding the establishment of the massive genetic database in Iceland, what arenas of conflicts did this bring about?

The biobank issue opened up a new domain: earlier, biomedicine had been practiced more or less quietly, with only minimal rules of the game. Suddenly people were convinced that the rules of the game needed to be significantly expanded and made clearer.

What kind of people?

The people leading the discussion were academics, bioethicists and physicians. The argument was basically that now we were trying to set up a biobank for an entire population and a private company would be keeping the bank and the information gathered, for 12 years, practically without competition from others. Also, the medical records would be assembled on the basis of presumed consent, not informed consent. This raised big questions about who owns what? The national medical records have been written down by physicians for decades, by people employed by the state, and now these records were being – or that was the plan – centralized and exploited for business purposes. Who was entitled to what? How does the community, theoretically, get something back for its investment for decades, if not centuries? Also, there was a privacy issue: the records were assembled typically in clinics, in a very private context between physician and patient, assuming trust. Now the state was involved in assembling all of this centrally, making it available to a single company for a variety of purposes. So, this opened up a huge debate for which there were no precedents. Icelanders could not look abroad and see how these things are being done. Of course there are international protocols about medical research, consent, biological samples, and things like that – the *Helsinki Agreement*, the *Nuremberg Code*, etc. – but many issues regarding

ethical codes and legal frameworks were underdeveloped. As a result, there was a raging debate on how to go about things, both locally and internationally. Some of the recent works on the Icelandic case precisely indicate that while on surface the Icelandic biobank was a simple case – involving just one case and 300000 people, in a few months it fleshed out the key issues that have remained on the agenda internationally.

You think it was a precedent for other similar databases?

Yes, in the sense that the architects of many of the other databases looked to Iceland attempting to avoid earlier “mistakes”. So whether or not you see it as a mistake, it remains a fact that all the other cases that followed took reference to the Icelandic case, emphasizing the potential of biobanks of this kind and the trickiness, legal problems, and ethical issues necessarily involved.

Which actors have been central in shaping the debate and what has been their role? Do you think these were pressure groups, national or international? Do you think the media played an important role?

One of my earliest papers on the case, jointly written with Kristín Harðardóttir, was precisely on this issue (“For whom the cell tolls?” in *Current Anthropology*, 2002). We analyzed the discourse of Icelandic media, a complicated picture. The majority of the population supported the biobank scheme according to polls. The public was informed by the rhetoric that this would provide a new avenue for a new economy, given the stagnation of Icelandic economy in fisheries, overexploited stocks. Also, people imagined that Icelandic expertise abroad would come back and, thirdly, Icelanders seemed convinced – partly by nationalistic rhetoric – that the Icelandic genome had some unique properties which could be tackled by the biomedical industry for the benefit of mankind, nothing less. People imagined that they had some message for science, to the world, their bodies would help to nail down the genetic causes of common diseases. So, there were many reasons why the public supported this. Some 20.000 people abstained, signed a statement to the effect that they did not agree to be involved in the database, protesting against the operation of “presumed consent”. The opponents emphasised

several many arguments. The scheme, they suggested, would lead to the monopoly of scientific data which would result in the stagnation of science and slow down economic recovery. Perhaps the key issue was “informed consent”. The critics referred to international standards in research on the human body, suggesting that informed consent was absolutely critical; the person involved would have to be knowledgeable about what was going on, and signing a statement to the effect he or she agreed.

But for example, in your book you speak about Tonga and the Inuit. What is the interest in studying these kinds of populations in terms of genetics? For example in relation to Tonga you say that one of their arguments for not collaborating is that companies are “stealing” their genes.

That is an important point: many of these studies are carried out in the context of a prior history of colonialism which complicated things. It was quite clear when the Human Genome Diversity project was launched that the goal was to map the variety of our genome. It was an appealing idea. Why shouldn’t we seek to establish the genetic variation of the species? Anthropologists were involved, but they ran into difficulties underlining the same sort of concerns expressed in Tonga: People were saying: “the colonialists have taken a lot from us in the past, now they are into our bodies, extracting personal information and tissue”. This was alienation, possibly, some would say, as bad as you can get.

Don’t you think that Inuit will have that same reaction?

It depends. I’ve been involved myself with genetic issues in the Inuit context, organizing a project on people in Greenland and Canada and negotiating for permission to assemble DNA information. This has been a very interesting exercise which I reflect on in new paper in *Current Anthropology* (2008). I am suggesting that there must be avenues for doing this kind of work, but anthropology needs to revise its take, it needs to revise its methodology and approach along the lines of collaborated methods. We need to collaborate more closely with our informants – if we can call them informants; they are part of the creative process, they should

even be co-authors, some people argue. I am saying that the same arguments should hold for genetic and ethnographic research. When carrying out genetic research among Inuit, Tonga, Icelanders, Portuguese, etc. you need to bring the people donating samples to the same table and have their views on what is interesting to study, how to go about doing it, and the possibilities of interpreting results. This opens a minefield of questions. I mean, people can refuse to engage in any dialogue on genetics and they may refuse to take on board the scientific explanations of genetics. Often, no doubt, communication at the table will break down, but I don’t think there is any other way out, we need to respect people’s right to control information on themselves and the biological material we may be using, and the only way to avoid biopiracy is by doing this collaboratively. Also, it is clearly more productive to work this way. I think I demonstrate this in my own work, the value of listening to the Inuit and to explore how they interpret sociality, what it means to belong and how personhood is constructed, etc. You get a far better sense of context. It turns out that naming is a big issue for Inuit, they think of personhood primarily as something that is constructed through the process of naming and renaming children. It is critically important to attend to these theories and to bring them to the table. So-called “scientists” do not have any privileged rights to address reality.

In a sense, aren’t anthropologists working on such projects searching for the “exotic” once again?

No, not necessarily, you can address genetic questions for any population anywhere, any time.

But the Tonga reaction, which you describe in your book and we already spoke about, for me it was like they were saying “here they are again turning us into the Other”.

Yes, the response is a reflection of colonial history and the way the Tonga research was being planned: there was a private company from Australia, apparently negotiating with some leaders but not with the public, there was no sign of a democratic process. It was precisely the failure to collaborate, in my sense, and if you fail to collaborate you are bound to have reactions like that. I think there have been similar reactions

among some Native groups in North America in the context of the recent Genographic Project. Anthropologists and human geneticists have sometimes naively entered the scene, asking people to contribute what they have, a blood sample, a mouth swab, and sometimes in a context of power, arrogance, and domination. Understandably, leaders of indigenous groups pick on this and sometimes fiercely protest and just simply refuse to collaborate.

But, for example, when you speak about the importance of naming in the Inuit context, if we relate it to genetics we are again speaking about biology and not about biography: how do you reconcile naming with genetics? How do you explain this to them? When you speak about naming you are also speaking about persons, family, places.

Yes. My new paper is precisely on this. For the Inuit, names construct personhood. There is a certain resemblance to genetics, interestingly. Sometimes Inuit say that if there is something wrong with a child there must be a naming problem. They sometimes revise the name, a child can have three or four or five names and people may experiment with dropping one of the names or rearranging the order. It is almost like a genetic metaphor: let's fix this gene! It sounds like genetic engineering, through the vocabulary of names.

Ok, that's my point: you can see the metaphor, you can make that relation, but when you say that you need to explain to people what you are going to do and you want to emphasise the importance of collaborating you can see metaphor but they don't necessarily see it like that, so you cannot translate to them, in fact, what are you doing.

There is a translation problem, but this is only part of the story. The difference between Inuit "name talk" as I would call it and current "gene talk" among Euro-Americans is that the Inuit emphasise agency and human relations. Names are established within a relational field and they keep being revised; even the child itself can change its name and Inuit greatly respect the decisions of children. In "gene talk" you're stuck with what you have and it's genetic determinism, either you have the Huntington gene or you don't, either you have one of the genes for breast cancer or you don't. So, it is radically different perspective. To me, Inuit theory on naming and personhood is strangely close to epigenetics and developmental systems theory which are gaining increasing ground, it seems. Many geneticists and biologists are coming to this conclusion, it's coming from the inside so to speak. It seems that on their own genes do not account for that much, there is so much that

cannot be explained by genes in our phenotypes; exactly the same genetic make-up, genotype, can "produce" radically different phenotypes, so there must be a hell of a lot more than just genes. Developmental systems theory is picking on this, suggesting that genes are part of an assembly of genes, interacting with cells, cellular structures, the organism and an environment. So, the naming theory of the Inuit seems to agree fairly closely with epigenetics and developmental systems theory.

Much depends on what you are discussing, with say the Inuit. Sometimes the translation problem results in a break-down of communication, but sometimes there is an easy dialogue. My position with respect to genetic studies is that while I am critical of gene centrism and sympathetic to Inuit "name talk" and developmental systems theory, genes represent a potential avenue into history. I mean, each of us has genetic signatures from our parents - and they, in turn, from their parents, etc. - so genetics offer us a way to explore the history of the populations, groups, where are we coming from. Genetics, then, doesn't define our future, "biology is not destiny" in the jargon of de Beauvoir, but unavoidably biology keeps a record of history which is useful for anthropologists exploring particular kinds of questions about space, time, and movement.

REPORTS ON EASA BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

LJUBLJANA, August 2008

The 10th biennial EASA conference, Ljubljana, 26 to 29 August 2008 "Experiencing diversity and mutuality"

Jean-Pierre Warnier
Centre d'Études Africaines (EHES, Paris)

Rushing through the corridor of the ground floor in the Conference building, I cling to the *Programme* and its 88 solid pages of workshops, plenaries, maps and special events. I am confronted with a direct experience of diversity and its attendant syndrome or panel anxiety. What will I choose? The body, death, prison and the army? Or friendship, honour, privacy, family and food?

Or shall I rush to room 115 where they discuss power, power, POWER? But at the very same time, two of my friends and colleagues are giving presentations, one on moral economy in room 302 and the other one on social hierarchies in room 415.

The large meta-paradigms of the 1900s to the 1980s are far behind us. Anthropology and anthropologists have become incredibly diverse, mirroring more and more the diversity of our world in spite or perhaps because of the ongoing and deceitful globalization. At the Conference, research accounts come from Istria, Southern Bucovina, Algarve, Vanuatu, the Azores and what else? You name it, it is somewhere in the programme. No doubt.

Thank God, there was also mutuality, and we experienced it in practice. We did meet together. We met the publishers, the authors, the networks, the European and American research institutions. We accounted for our researches as encounters in mobility, stasis, globalized flows, cosmopolitanism. There was even a fair amount of interdisciplinary dialogue. The mutuality, however, did not reach as far as meeting all the colleagues I knew and whose name could be found on the list of the 1200 participants. So-and-so was there. I rushed to his workshop at the end of its first session. The door was open, and I was told he had already left. Someone saw his back on the steps in front of the building where

the smokers congregated in between sessions. I rushed through the thick crowd. "Oh! Yey, he has just left. You know him, he loves strolling in the streets." The weather was gorgeous. I never got to meet him.

So much about the practical exercise constituted by the Conference itself – an exercise in diversity and mutuality. What about its contents? What about the way anthropology and anthropologists analyse diversity and mutuality as experiences – not by anthropologists – but by the people out there, in Vanuatu or Northern Kirghizstan? Well, though I attended most of the plenaries, I sampled only very few of the many workshops. Yet it is clear that there is enough mutuality in European (and World) anthropology for the many theoretical paradigms, approaches and objects of study to keep in touch with one another. There were points of disagreement. Fortunately! Yet there was little estrangement between the participants however diverse their mother tongue, their country of origin, their institutions and their field research. There were

Agnieszka Poźniak

The report is based on statements received also from: Agnieszka Kościańska, Karolina Bielenin-Lenczowska, Agnieszka Chwieduk, Anna Niedźwiedz, Helena Patzer, Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka

The members of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) met at the conference for the tenth time. The tenth conference of the EASA consisted of plenary sessions, workshops, discussions, "round tables" and network meetings. The most important publishing houses that specialize in anthropological publications presented their recently published and soon to be published books. Moreover, a small film festival was organized where over 30 movies were shown. Young scholars met during the Moving Anthropology Student Network that accompanied the conference. This year the EASA conference took place in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, where about 1200 anthropologists attended. They came mainly from Europe but there were also guests from other parts of world. The Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology from the Ljubljana University hosted the entire event.

The main subjects of the conference

many younger people, doctorate candidates and post-doc. There were also not so young people. They talked to each other on a kind of equal footing. The different schools of thought and hierarchies seem to have lost some of their sharp edges, and to fade into the past. No doubt the experience of mutuality reflects the quick circulation of information within anthropology and with the outside, through books, journals, the internet, films, videos, photos, student and staff mobility, easy travel, discount air tickets. And the English language has become the unchallenged *lingua franca*, the pidgin of inter-tribal mutuality within anthropology, although you could hear people speak such exotic languages as Spanish, solvene, russian and even French in the corridors.

In a word, the Conference was an unprecedented success thanks to our hosts and to the organizers.

were "diversity" and "mutuality" - key terms for both contemporary anthropology and today's European culture. Mutuality and diversity manifest on different fields: they are the basis of European societies, but they are also present in constructing anthropological knowledge itself. They are as important as ethnographical research during intellectual exchanges between scholars. These topics were also discussed during plenary sessions.

The workshops were the most interesting part of the conference. The smaller groups in the workshops encouraged discussions based on concrete problems, often illustrated with examples from participants' own investigations. Since there were close to 120 workshops during the conference, it was impossible to participate even in small a part of the whole event. Therefore, the following report has a subjective character reflecting the author's own interests.

The two workshops that I attended concerned - at least partly - common subjects: the coexistence, as well as the diverse defining, of the title "difference" and "mutuality" by confessors of different religions. The workshop called "Mutuality and Difference in Multireligious Local Communities:

The Politics of Neighbourliness", led by Karolina Bielenin - Lenczowska from the University of Warsaw and Glenn Bowman from the University of Kent, showed different strategies for peaceful coexistence of neighbors who practice different religions. The other workshop was called: "Islam Within and Across Religiously Diverse Communities: Case Studies from Muslims in the Balkans and Europe" and was led by Mentor Mustafa from Boston University and Boštjana Kravanja from Ljubljana University. Participants from both workshops stressed several points. First of all, as far as one can talk about peaceable coexistence of the representatives of two different religions, religion and ethnicity are often still perceived as essential. Secondly, different communities generate models of peaceful coexistence, and usually outside factors (like political or international authorities) are blamed for conflicts.

The workshop entitled "Belonging Embodied, Reciprocity Materialised. Migrants' Transnational Practices", led by Maja Povrzanović Frykman (University of Malmö) and Tatjana Pezdir (University of Ljubljana) presented the experiences of different immigrant groups as well as different kinds of practices that these groups share.

Diversity and mutuality concern also the exchange of anthropological knowledge. Because the conference was located on the eastern side of the old "Iron Curtain", there were a lot of discussions about Southern, Eastern and Central Europe perspectives in anthropological research as well as the development of anthropology and ethnology in post- socialist countries. In the workshop "Liminal Europe", led by Ines Prica from the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies and Tomislav Pletenac from Zagreb University, the topics were connected with, mainly symbolic, marginalization of Eastern Europe countries. Another problem concerned the connections between the "center", the "borders" and their reference to the conception of local community.

During another important workshop, "Changing Global Flows of Anthropological Knowledge", led by Michal Buchowski From Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, with Fabian Johannes as respondent, differences between "Eastern" and "Western" anthropologies were considered.

The problems of Central Europe were also discussed in a workshop

concerning trust, "A Matter of Trust: Anthropological Explorations into an Old Concept" led by Małgorzata Rajtar (Max Planck Institute in Halls) and Anika Keinz (Humboldt University in Berlin). During this discussion participants tried to answer the questions about the meaning of trust and what are the implications of lack of trust in different types of institutions for democratic changes and development of the European Union.

When talking about diversity and mutuality, one can't miss the topics of health, disease and treatment. Medical anthropology was one the most strongly represented fields during the conference. The unabated interest was shown at several workshops that addressed important questions such as anthropological perspectives on the establishment of new medical technologies. The key problems of medical anthropology were discussed during two workshops: "Medical Anthropological Fieldwork: Ethical and Methodological Issues" and "From Medical Pluralism to Therapeutic Plurality: Medical Anthropology and the Politics of Diversity, Knowledge, and Experience from Multiple Perspectives." The discussions focused on human suffering as well as on ethical issues, which are inseparable from anthropology research concerning health and disease.

Researchers from different parts of world studying religion gathered during "What Makes Popular Piety Popular?" workshop led by Liza Debevec (the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts) and Samuli Schielke (the University in Joensuu, Finland; ISIM, Leiden). The main question was about legitimacy of applying the category "popular religiosity." The participants tried to (re)read this during discussion based on ethnographical research of different dimensions of modern religiosity. There was special emphasis on the meaning of ethnographical and existential perspectives when trying to understand modern religious practices of everyday life. The research showed the benefits of using a common nomenclature for similar phenomena present in different societies as well as the need for studying different religious traditions in transnational comparative contexts.

The subject of the conference was strongly linked to the topic of leading ethnographical research. Attention was devoted to this subject during the workshop: "Ethically Sensitive

Research in Anthropology". Ethical questions, which anthropologists and sociologists face during different stages of research work, were discussed. This session was led by Mojca Ramšak from the Center of Biographic Research in Ljubljana. The participants concentrated on the problems of the researcher's rapport with the people they are studying and how far the closeness between them can go and how this influences the final effect of the investigative project. Questions arose about the expectations of the interlocutor in relation to the research(er). The matter of empathy seemed to be very important as well. Many emotions were aroused during discussions about the degree to which a researcher can or should manipulate subjects or situations to get information. Where are the borders of lying and omitting information. Is an anthropologist cynical and ruthless sometimes while getting the "valuable" data. The discussion seemed to raise more questions than answers but the exchange of experiences, doubts, as well as solutions for some problems were definitely inspiring.

Among the panel discussions, one deserves special attention - "What is Happening to the Anthropological Monograph?" with Don Handelman, Marion Berghahn and Helena Wulff as debaters. The participation of many well-known professors (like Marilyn Strathern and Judith Okely) confirmed that this topic is essential in present anthropology. Don Handelman expressed anxiety that a small number of new, good monographs are being published, and stressed their crucial role for anthropology (he called them the "creative center of anthropology"). The discussion concentrated on the requirements of the market and the difficulties of publishing anthropological books.

In conclusion, it is important to say that workshops and many other plenary sessions were accompanied by a lot of events - both scientific and social. A lot of sub disciplinary meetings took place, like those between medical and visual anthropologists or meetings among other groups interested with regional matters of religion, media, methodology of teaching and many others. The members of different "networks" could get to know each other personally - although they had often been in email contact on different forums. They were able to discuss the possibility of developing research as well as internet communication (for example a very

active religious section decided to create their own webpage). The creation of new networks were announced like the Caucasus and Central Asia Network.

The social events were also very interesting. On the first day the participants met in the Castle of Ljubljana where a party was held in the courtyard, and on the last day of the conference everyone enjoyed a party in the local Ethnographical Museum.

The host of the next conference will be the National University of Ireland in Maynooth near Dublin.

The Anthropology of Religion in 2008

EASA - Ljubljana'08

Ruy Llera Blanes

Institute of Social Sciences,
University of Lisbon | Leiden
University (Guest Researcher)

One of the interesting facts about the Ljubljana summit was the confirmation of a renewed and increasing interest in the anthropology of religion. This was manifest in the number of workshops with explicit proposals on religious issues in Slovenia: a total of nine, as opposed to six in the Bristol '06 conference (which in turned offered a plenary session on "Diffusion, religion and secularism", convened by David Shankland) and four in the Vienna '04 meeting.

In Ljubljana, the nine workshops were the following: W008 (What makes popular piety popular?) W011 (Body and soul: on corporeality in contemporary religiosity), W018 (Mutuality and difference in multireligious local communities: the politics of neighbourliness), W029 (African Christianities in Europe: the politics of religious recognition), W031 (Children, youth and religion: visions of mutuality and diversity across generations), W036 (Moralities of nature), W064 (Interpreting religious diversity: conversion, syncretism and religious practice), W094 (Rethinking spirit possession), and W098 (Islam within and across religiously diverse communities: case studies from Muslims in the Balkans and Europe).

The workshops showed interesting parallels and recurrences that highlight the main themes and debates in contemporary anthropology of religion. For instance, a focus on plurality and diversity as

ethnographic settings (W008, W018, W029, W031, W064, W098), on Europe as scenery or background for a discussion on religion today (W029, W098), on anthropological concepts, approaches and categories and their currency (W011, W036, W064, W094), on the analytical potential of the body in religious contexts (W011, W094), on the critical 'observation' of global religions (Christianity, Islam) in local contexts (W008, W029, W098), etc.

Another interesting fact was that most of these workshops (at least those I was able to attend – still working on being omnipresent) were not only well attended, with packed rooms and extra chairs being brought for every session, but also filled mostly with a younger generation of anthropologists from extremely

diverse contexts and approaches. A quick look at the convenors of the workshops mentioned above can easily confirm this.

Even more interesting (and fun) was the fact that many of these workshops extended outside the main conference building and into the dining areas at lunchtime or after the sessions in the countless and charming terraces that surrounded the Ljubljana river, with small groups from different workshops intermingling and prolonging debates from the actual working sessions. I'm pretty sure many future endeavours were proposed and discussed in these moments.

Finally, an important extension of this interaction was the growing interest many of the participants

showed in belonging/improving the Anthropology of Religion network, convened by Simon Coleman and Ramon Sarró, and sponsored by EASA. The kick-off meeting held in Bristol housed a group of approximately twenty attendants that agreed on the creation of a mailing list; on the other hand, the network meeting at the University of Ljubljana more than doubled the attendance, and many ideas and proposals were set forth regarding the network's expansion into other initiatives (discussion groups, inter-congress meetings, etc.). Thus, it seems like these are good times for scholars (and namely anthropologists) of religion.

Dmitri Bondarenko

Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow

Thank you for the interest in my opinion about the Conference. I will be absolutely honest: I really liked it very much. I see the merit of the EASA Executive Committee, Secretariat and local Organizing Committee in its success. The Conference Program was compiled logically and thoughtfully, as much as it was possible when it was necessary to schedule so many workshops in such limited time span (this is really a serious problem but the only way out I see is to extend the Conference for one more day, otherwise, if one tries to reduce the number of workshops, too many EASA members will not be able to participate in it). The organization of other important points, like participants bags, coffee breaks, receptions, lunches, culture program was also up to high

level and in many respects original, not repeating previous, even successful experiences what was very pleasant. The work having been done by Rohan between the Bristol and Ljubljana Conferences was incredibly important and successful too, many thanks to him. What I also liked greatly, is the attitude to younger scholars; it is very nice that the EASA is paying more and more attention to their work. Maybe the book exhibition could be more extensive if more non-European publishing houses (American, Indian, etc.) had been attracted. I could not visit too many workshops and business meetings (as well as any other participant) but all those in which I participated as a co-convenor and paper-giver or just listener, were very interesting indeed. I also find very prospective the idea first (if I am not mistaken) implemented

into life just in Ljubljana: to hold a meeting of Network Convenors; that meeting was very productive, as well as other non-academic events of the sort, for example, the Closing Session. I do see the rising level of the Conferences organization and intellectual standards (and I have participated in them all from 1998). I also really see strong desire of the present leaders of our Association to promote further integration of European anthropologists, and the ideas Dr Shalini Randeria and others expressed at the Network Convenors meeting and Closing Session demonstrate that the Association is looking actively for the new ways and forms of achieving its goals. Finally, what was probably most important and pleasant, was the atmosphere: very friendly, thought stimulating -- a real meeting of not only colleagues but also friends!

TWENTY YEARS EASA

University of Vienna, February 6 and 7, 2009

Programme

Friday, Feb. 6, 2009 | New Campus University (AAKH)

17:00 – 17:30 | Welcome Addresses

- By Rudolf Richter, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Vienna
- By Shalini Randeria, President of EASA

17:30 – 18:15 | Distinguished Lecture

| Don Brenneis, University of California| Santa Cruz

18:15 | Reception

Saturday, Feb. 7, 2009 | Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology

10:00 – 10:20 | Introduction by Shalini Randeria, President of EASA

10:25 – 12:00 | Round Table 1: The Founding and Need of EASA

Chair: Benoît de L'Estoile

Introducing: Kirsten Hastrup, Adam Kuper, João de Pina-Cabral

12:00 – 14:00 | Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 | Round Table 2: EASA and the Present Landscape of Anthropology in Europe

Chair: Manuela da Cunha

Introducing: Dorle Dracklé, Andre Gingrich, Jon Mitchell

15:30 – 16:00 | Tea-Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:30 | Round Table 3: New Horizons: EASA and World Anthropology

Chair: Michał Buchowski

Introducing: Shalini Randeria, Ulf Hannerz

17:30 – 17:40 | Final remarks by the new President

19:30 | Invited Dinner

CALENDAR

2009

March 2009

Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement, Partnerships and Practice.

69th Annual Meeting in Santa Fe, NM

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA)
March 17 – 21, 2009.

The Society is a multi-disciplinary association that focuses on problem definition and resolution. We welcome papers from all disciplines. The deadline for abstract submission is October 15, 2008

Contact:

Melissa Cope

Society for Applied Anthropology
PO Box 2436

Oklahoma City, OK 73101

405-843-5113

405-843-8553 (fax)

melissa@sfaa.net

www.sfaa.net, click on „Annual Meeting“

<http://www.sfaa.net/sfaa2009.html>

April 2009

Anthropological and Archaeological Imaginations: Past, Present and Future.

ASA 2009 in Bristol

Dept of Archaeology and Anthropology

University of Bristol

April 6 – 9, 2009

<http://www.theasa.org/conferences.htm>

VIVA AFRICA 2009

4th International Conference on African Studies

Department of Politics at the University of Hradec Králové and Department of Anthropology and History of the University of West Bohemia, Czech Republic

University of Hradec Králové

April 24 – 25, 2009

Strong efforts have been made since 2006 to establish a new tradition of African Studies in the Czech Republic by organizing an annual conference focused on various disciplines concerning Africa as its main object of study. So far, Viva Africa conferences have been organized by the Department of Anthropology and History, University of West Bo-

hemia, but since we can see an extensive academic interest in African Studies research in our country, the decision has been made to provide a wider platform for presenting results of primary research by connecting with another advanced research center.

1) ANTHROPOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY

2) HISTORY, POLITICS

3) LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, ART

Linguists, anthropologists, political scientists, historians, and other researchers, who have Africa as their field of study, are welcome. The conference is open for professors, academic scholars, PhD. students, and other specialists who want to present results of their primary research.

CONFERENCE FEES, TRAVEL, ACCOMMODATION

There are no conference fees, but the participants are expected to cover their accommodation and travel expenses. The organizers will provide information about suitable lodging, its reservation, optimal travel routing and general local conditions in Hradec Králové.

REGISTRATION

Please send your abstracts of 500-700 words before January 10, 2009, to

vivaafrika2009@gmail.com

May 2009

Living Islam in Europe: Muslim Traditions in European Contexts

Zentrum Moderner Orient (Centre for Modern Oriental Studies)

May 07–09, 2009

The collaborative research project on “Muslims in Europe and Their Societies of Origin in Asia and Africa” invites contributions to a conference to be held from 7 to 9 May 2009 at the Centre for Modern Oriental Studies, Berlin, Germany. This conference will present the results of the programme for the current research phase embedded in a wider context of academic scholarship. In consonance with the project the conference will discuss the various ways in which religious actors and institutions of Islam are taking root in today's Europe. While recent scholarship has primarily focused on processes of secularisation of Muslims in Europe, this conference seeks to go further by discus-

sing Muslim groups and individuals following religious lifestyles. In this process issues have emerged that have preoccupied politicians, public opinion as much as scholars through-out the last decades: Can European social and political realities be reconciled with growing religious plurality in general and religious projects deriving from Islam in particular – and if so, on what premises? What are the concepts, aims, needs and fears Muslim actors pursue and confront in the public arena, and what institutions do they develop to channel their objectives? To what extent are European political and social realities re-lected or inscribed in their religious, political, social and economic activities?

These processes have largely been shaped by the emergence of national and pan-European policies on Islam. While Muslim actors have been seeking a greater say in local and European affairs, governments have re-lected and incorporated public apprehensions about security, integration and identity. Some scholars have argued that European policies have largely focused on the control of Muslim communities, whereas public authorities and the media tend to accuse Muslim organisations of being rigid and divisive in their impact on social life.

At the same time Muslim communities have been shaped by intense exchange and interaction with their societies of origin in Asia and Africa, creating dynamic flows in and out of Europe that generate both opportunities and apprehensions.

The conference will thus seek to address issues related to Muslims' religious practice as well as the institutional settings and translocal dynamics of European societies. It will be held in two consecutive sections:

1. Islamic actors and institutions in Europe

- Islamic Mission,
- Islamic Education, and
- Islamic practice of organised Muslims.

2. On the European and translocal character of Islamic mobilisation

- institutional and legal arrangements of state, nation and religion which have affected Muslim settlement in Europe,

- emerging national or supranational governance of Islam in Europe, and
- translocal dynamics with Islamic societies in Asia and Africa with a specific focus on (post)colonial legacies.

The panels will primarily address political, social and legal conditions and issues connected with the processes of living Islam in the European context. The panels thus account in the first place for the impact of various national European settings in which Muslims live and interact. They also respond to the fact that Muslims in Europe have been influenced and shaped by intense exchange and interaction with Islamic societies in Asia and Africa. Researchers are invited to submit papers discussing the aforementioned concerns and fitting the suggested panels. Applications should include a brief summary of the paper (max. 1 page) accompanied by a curriculum vitae of max. 1 page. These should be sent to robert.pelzer@gmx.net latest by 15 September 2008. All proposals and paper should be written in English. For participants whose proposals are selected there is a limited budget to cover travel cost and accommodation. Please indicate whether you intend to claim the refund. The decision will be taken by the selection committee.

Contact:

Robert Pelzer

Zentrum Moderner Orient (Centre for Modern Oriental Studies)

Kirchweg 33 14129 Berlin Phone: +49 30 80307-216 Fax: +49 30 80307-210

robert.pelzer@gmx.net

http://www.zmo.de/muslime_in_europa

June 2009

Changing Mediascapes and New Media Entrepreneurs in Africa

ECAS in Leipzig
June 4 – 7, 2009

The panel focuses on new media entrepreneurs, especially from the realm of religious movements, human rights activists, ethnic movements or NGOs, appropriating media such as radio stations, TV stations, film /Video studios, newspapers, publishing houses and websites, and the respective consequences for the configuration of public spheres in Africa. Here is a detailed description of the topic:

The panel addresses recent developments in the sphere of mass media in Africa that were facilitated by processes of media liberalisation. We will discuss ways in which new media entrepreneurs especially from religious movements, human rights activists, ethnic movements or NGOs, (re)-enter the public sphere, by appropriating independent media such as radio or TV stations, film /video studios, newspapers, publishing houses & websites; or acquiring broadcasting time/space of already established private or public media institutions.

Some of these actors establish strong transnational links e.g. by means of partnerships with other media institutions, exchanging data, programs, staff, job training or synchronising TV & Radio broadcasts; others are pursuing a more local agenda. What marks the biographic background & the relationship between these media entrepreneurs & their respective groups/communities? What are the conditions of their success in a competing media environment? In which respect do they alter the public sphere? We are inviting both case studies & essays exploring the general relationship between media & civil society in Africa, also in a comparative & diachronic perspective.

Please Upload your paper proposal by December 31, 2008 following these instructions:

http://www.unileipzig.de/~ecas2009/index.php?option=com_docman&task=catview&gid=12&Itemid=24

Sociology at the Crossroads

39th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology
Yerevan University
June 11 – 14, 2009
www.iisoc.org/iis2009.

Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations

Fifth International Conference
Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute for African Studies
Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies
Russian State University for The Humanities
School of History, Political Science
And Law
Moscow
June 16 – 19, 2009

First announcement and call for panel proposals

The aim of the Conference, like that of the four previous ones, is to bring together the researchers doing the respective problematics in the whole variety of its contexts, within the framework of different academic schools and traditions from the positions of a wide range of disciplines: social anthropology, archaeology, history, political science, sociology, philosophy, psychology, etc. The objective of the Conference is to discuss the following issues:

- hierarchical and net structures in the history of cultures and civilizations;
- civilizational and evolutionary models of socio-political development;
- historical and ethno-cultural variability of the forms of socio-political organization;
- from simple societies to the world-system: pathways and forms of political integration;
- socio-political and cultural factors of social transformations;
- cultural and socio-biological foundations of dominance in human societies;
- ideology and legitimation of power in different civilizational contexts;
- cultural models of power's perception in different civilizations;
- violence and non-violence in the history of political institutions;
- access to information as a means of political manipulation and mobilization;
- power, society, and culture in the era of globalization;
- the study of "hierarchy and power": schools, trends, and methods.

Suggestions for discussion of any other aspects of the general problematics of the Conference reflected in its title, are also welcomed.

The working languages of the Conference are Russian and English.

The Organizing Committee will be glad to consider any panel proposals (within 500 words in any of the Conference working languages) which will be received by February 1, 2008. The information to be submitted alongside with the proposal, includes the panel convenor's full name, title, institutional affiliation, full mail and e-mail addresses, and fax #, as well names, institutional affiliations, and e-mail addresses of not less than two other possible participants of the panel, at least one of which should represent a country other than that of the con-

venor.

Conference Secretaries:
r. Oleg I. Kavykin and Ms. Anastasia
A. Banschikova
e-mail: conf2009(AT)conf2009.ru
Phone + 7 495 291 4119.
Fax + 7 495 202 0786)
Mail: Center for Civilizational and
Regional Studies, Institute for Af-
rican Studies, Russian Academy of
Sciences
30/1 Spiridonovka St.
123001 Moscow, Russia

**Media, Democratization and
International Development:
Foundations for a More Robust
Research Agenda**

Central European University (CEU),
Budapest, Hungary
June 29 – July 15, 2009

<http://www.sun.ceu.hu/media>
Application deadline: February 16,
2009
Online application: <http://www.sun.ceu.hu/apply>

July 2009

16th IUAES World Congress

Kunming , Yunnan Province of China
July 27 – July 31, 2009

Please find attached the information
of confirmation and new application
of the panel/session.

1. Confirmation and New Ap-
plication for the 16th IUAES World
Congress
2. Panel Application Form
3. Preliminary Topics and
Program of the Academic Sessions/
Panels

The notice of registration, final
support and call for papers will be
posted on the website of the con-
ference. If you have any questions,
please let us know.

Contact Information

Organizing Committee for the 16th
IUAES World Congress
Contactors: Prof. & Dr. ZHANH Hai-
yang, Prof. & Dr. ZHANG Jijiao
Prof. DU Fachun, Prof. ZHANG Xiao-
min
Institute of Ethnology and Anthro-
pology, Chinese Academy of Social
Sciences
No. 27, Zhongguancun South Street
Haidian District, Beijing , China
Post code: 100081
Telephone: +86-10-6893-2100
+86-10-68938386
Fax: +86-10-6893-2100
+86-10-68421864

E-mail: iuaes2009@yahoo.cn

September 2009

**Objects - What Matters? Techno-
logy, Value and Social Change**

CRESC Annual Conference
ESCR, The Open University, The
University of Manchester, Centre for
Research on Socio-Cultural Change
University of Manchester

September 2 – 4, 2009

As contemporary social theorists
continue to signal the need to re-
configure our deliberations on the
social through attention to practi-
ce, to object-mediated relations,
to non-human agency and to the
affective dimensions of human so-
ciality, this conference takes as its
focus the objects and values which
find themselves at centre stage.
And we ask, in the context of nearly
two decades of diverse disciplinary
approaches to these issues, what
matters about objects? How are
they inflecting our understandings
of technology, of expertise, and of
social change? How has a focus on
objects reconfigured our understand-
ings of how values inflect the ways
in which people make relations,
create social worlds, and construct
conceptual categories? How have
objects become integral to hu-
man enthusiasms and energies, to
transformational ambition, or to
the transmission of values across
time and space? How do objects
move between ordinary and extra-
ordinary states, shade in and out
of significance, manifest instability
and uncertainty? How do moral and
material values attach to objects as
they move in space and time? What
dimensions do they inhabit and/or
reveal? To address these questions
we welcome papers on the following
themes.

Themes

- The transformational work
of everyday objects
- Object-centred learning
- Materiality, Stability and the
State
- Radical Archives – within
and beyond textual assemblages
- Conceptual Objects and
Methods as Objects
- Immaterial Objects –
haunting, virtuality, traces.
- Financial Objects
- Affective Objects
- Ephemera, Enthusiasm and
Excess

- Spiritual and/or Moral Ob-
jects
- Controversial and Messy
Objects

Please submit either (a) 300 word
abstracts for individual papers, or
(b) proposals for panels including 3
papers by the end of February 2009.
Proposal Forms are available online
at www.cresc.ac.uk and should be
sent to:

CRESC Conference Administration
178 Waterloo Place, Oxford Road,
University of Manchester, Manche-
ster M13 9PL
Tel: +44(0)161 275 8985 / Fax:
+44(0)161 275 8985
cresc@manchester.ac.uk
<http://www.cresc.ac.uk>

**Cultural Appropriation: Assimila-
tion – Adaptation – Camouflage**

Conference of the German Anthro-
pological Association (GAA | DGV)
University of Frankfurt am Main
September 30 – October 3, 2009

Global influences have long touched
off profound cultural changes in the
societies that constitute the object
of anthropological analysis. Due to
the more rapid diffusion of goods,
values and norms, the customa-
ry anthropological conception of
culture has been called into questi-
on: culture and society no longer
constitute a single entity. Just as
politics, the economy and law are
oriented toward the demands of
the world market, so global cultural
phenomena determine local actions.
An anthropology committed to the
study of contemporary societies
must take this into account. Its
particular focus is the continuance
of cultural diversity that by no
means succumbs to the onslaught
of globalization, but rather simply
undergoes transformation and is
expressed in the articulation of new
cultural identities.

While former anthropological
paradigms were primarily interested
in the forms of resistance to exter-
nal cultural influences, more recent
approaches have focussed on the
strategies with which social actors
actively engage the challenges of
globalisation. These are also to be
the focus of the up-coming GAA-
Conference dedicated to "Cultural
Appropriation". The term assimila-
tion refers to the selective adoption
of cultural imports, in which the
adopted ideas or things are adapted
to customary life ways and accord-
ed with alternating meanings. In
contrast to such forms of cultural

nostrification, adaptation to dominant orders results in a break with a group's own traditions, which – insofar as this break fails – often sparks attempts at retraditionalisation. Finally, the term camouflage highlights a strategy in which external demands are only apparently complied with, so that actors can secure sufficient latitude to pursue traditional goals.

For the up-coming conference of the German Anthropological Association we would encourage contributions that take up this approach in dealing with the manifold forms of cultural and social change and thereby provide answers to urgent questions regarding the assertion and revitalisation of cultural identity in an era of rapidly advancing globalisation.

Working groups, regional groups and members of the GAA are cordially invited to submit suggestions for workshops to be included in the 2009 conference programme. Please keep in mind this year's theme and include in your submission an abstract outlining the proposed workshop topic (no longer than 3000 characters) as well as the contact information of the submitter(s) of the proposal.

The deadline for submissions is January 31, 2009.

On the basis of the information provided the organisers will announce a call for papers for your workshop.

All GAA members are also invited to submit proposals for papers dealing with this year's conference theme. As in the past, the organisers will group papers of related content into workshops. In the proposal please include a brief abstract of your paper (no longer than 1500 characters) and the contact information of the person(s) making the submission.

The deadline for paper proposals is

January 31, 2009.

Contact

<http://www.dgv-net.de/home.html>

November 2009

The Construction of Forgetting, Symposium

Université Marc Bloch Strasbourg II
UMR 7043 "Cultures et Sociétés en Europe"

November 26 – 27, 2009

At the symposium we want to study in a transdisciplinary perspective the different ways of constructing forgetting as part of memory. Sociologists, anthropologists, historians, political scientists, psychologists, literary specialists, art historians and museum experts are thus invited to examine the construction of forgetting in all its forms. The languages of the symposium will be French, English and German.

Please submit your proposals (title and an abstract of about 5000 characters or 800 words) before November 1st 2008.

The organizing committee regrets it is unable to contribute to travel and hotel costs.

Contact:

Nicoletta Diasio: nicoletta.diasio@misha.fr

Klaus Wieland: Klaus.Wieland@umb.u-strasbg.fr

December 2010

108th AAA Annual Meeting

Philadelphia, PA.

December 2 – 6, 2009

<http://www.aaanet.org/>

2010

April 2010

Continuities, Dislocations and Transformations: Reflections on 50 Years of African Independence

Biennial Conference of the German Association for African Studies|Vereinigung für Afrikawissenschaften in Deutschland/VAD
Johannes Gutenberg University
Mainz

April 8 – 10, 2010

The year 2010 represents a significant milestone for many countries and a majority of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa, as it marks half a century of political independence. Since 1960 the continent has undergone profound changes, not only politically but also in economic, social and cultural terms, and manifold processes of consolidation, differentiation and transformation have radically increased the complexity of the African social terrain. The conference will focus on and assess these processes and the conflicts arising from them. Of particular interest are the historical continuities, dislocations and transformations that have marked the past 50 years, as well as how this historical legacy impacts the present situation on the African continent and what this portends for future developments.

We invite you to send proposals for panels and forums to the following e-mail address by 31 January 2009
Thomas Bierschenk
biersche@uni-mainz.de