

ELECTIONS 2011

As at 18th January, 2011

		Votes	Vote %
1	Susana Narotzky	147	14,98
2	Jeanette Edwards	125	12,74
3	Maria Couroucli	117	11,93
4	Abdullahi El-Tom	114	11,62
5	Noel Salazar	108	11,01
6	Hana Cervinkova	99	10,09
7	Paolo Favero	95	9,68
8	Vincenzo Matera	64	6,52
9	Patrick Laviolette	58	5,91
10	Nadine Wanono Gauthier	54	5,51

Turnout	Constituency	Turnout %
271	1044	25,96

During the first meeting of the new Executive Committee in Paris (February 3rd and 4th, 2011), Susana Narotzky was elected unanimously as new President and Jeanette Edwards as Vice-President (unanimously) of EASA. Mark Maguire (co-editor of the Journal), and Thomas Fillitz (Secretary) were co-opted into the Executive Committee.

The new Executive Committee (2011-2013):

Susana Narotzky (President)
Jeanette Edwards (Vice-President)
Maria Couroucli
Abdullahi El-Tom
Noel Salazar
David Shankland (Treasurer)
Mark Maguire (Co-editor Social Anthropology|Anthropologie Sociale)
Thomas Fillitz (Secretary)

Letter from the President

Susana Narotzky

Dear Easa Members,

Thank you all for participating in the election. The results have brought forward a new Executive Committee that will guide EASA for the next two years, culminating at the Paris conference in July 2012. This will be our main goal that we will carry out in coordination with the Scientific Committee, the Local Committee and the invaluable support of NomadIT. The experience of Maria Couroucli, Thomas Fillitz and David Shankland from the previous Executive will provide the long term perspective and help us go beyond. Other issues will be in our agenda as well and we would want to find better ways of communicating with members and sound out their opinion on important questions. Hopefully the Executive Committee will accomplish all of it with dignity, and I am very pleased and honoured at having been elected President of the EASA EC that will address these challenges.

Present day Europe is a space in turmoil. The economic crisis, fiscal debt and deficit, the severe adjustment policies, the retreat of the welfare state and the rise of unemployment are having terrible social effects. Some impacts of the crisis and government's response to them are already affecting anthropologists and anthropology in Europe and beyond. This is felt in several domains of our professional activity. The first one relates to the people we often work with in our research field sites: many are now subject to economic, political and cultural tensions that seriously threaten their well being and their ability to make projects for the next generation. Indirectly it is also bound to affect the way we go about doing research. It is probably something we should give some thought to.

The second relates to higher education and research policies in European countries and in the EU as a whole. Cuts in funding are primarily aimed at social sciences and the humanities, with most anthropology departments suffering from this through reduced staff appointments, non replacement of retiring professors and general precarization of teaching jobs. Although this is a general problem of the social sciences and humanities it does seem to threaten our discipline's insecure status in many European countries, and it increases social differentiation within anthropology departments. Many young anthropologists will be at pains to enter the academic career and will have to develop their anthropological knowledge and expertise in other fields and professions. Although this has always been an open choice for some anthropologists, it is becoming compulsory for an increasing number. This situation compels us to think about the diverse ways in which professionalization of anthropologists will be taking place in the future and how EASA wants to respond to it.

On the research front, in many European countries funding is being increasingly limited to applied sciences and technological innovation, and to management and governance techniques. As national deficit curtails budgets, funding will be increasingly related to EU Framework Programme design of research priorities. It has come to our attention that there is a strong possibility that the actually existing Specific Programme for research in the Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities might be absorbed into the other specific programmes, rendering SSH research subsidiary to the orientations designed for other research programmes. Our previous president, Michal Buchowski, wrote a letter to the chairman of the European Committee of "Industry, Research and Energy" pointing at our concern (see in this Newsletter). In the meantime, the EU has open consultation on a Green paper "From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation funding". I strongly encourage individuals and national associations and universities to participate in the consultation: http://ec.europa.eu/research/consultations/csfri/consultation_en.htm. At an institutional level, the Executive Committee is debating which might be the better course of action. And we will keep you informed through the EASA website in between Newsletters.

We do have some encouraging news as well! EASA is growing, with an increasingly wide representation of European countries. It is also helping consolidate networks of collaboration among European anthropologists of different nations. All of this has contributed to making anthropological knowledge produced in Europe more visible and more desirable for our colleague anthropologists worldwide. We need to pursue this dynamics and our journal *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale* in the hands of its co-editors for the 2011-2014 period, David Berliner and Mark Maguire (book review editor Vlad Naumescu), is an excellent instrument, reaching a wide public. We encourage you all to send your contributions in order to strengthen its role as a reference journal in world anthropology.

The Book series published by Berghahn is in an excellent moment thanks to the enormous effort of its editor James Carrier and to Marion Berghahn's interest and faith in anthropology. The EASA anthropology book prize (5,000 Euro) is open to members' submission of manuscripts until 30th September 2011: it is an opportunity I hope you will consider!

Finally I would like to thank the magnificent work of NomadIT, whose team under the guidance of Rohan Jackson is crucial to the administration of EASA. The electronic platform that they have put together has yet unexplored possibilities for enhancing communication between the Executive Committee and the rest of the members of EASA that we wish to develop.

This two year period leading to the Paris Conference of July 2012, confronts us with serious challenges but also with opportunities. With the collaboration of the EC colleagues and the help of members, in my capacity as the President of the new Executive Committee, I will do my best to guide EASA through this period.

Presentation of the New Members of the Executive Committee

Susana Narotzky, Universitat de Barcelona

After graduating at the University of Barcelona in 1982 I pursued my Anthropological training at the New School for Social Research in New York, obtaining a M.A. degree in 1984 and a PhD in 1990. I became Full Professor (Catedrática) in 2006 in the department of Cultural Anthropology, History of America and Africa at the Universitat de Barcelona, where I am presently chair of the doctoral studies committee. I have received among others the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Fellowship and the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship for Collaborative Research. From 2006 to 2010 I was a member of the Advisory Council of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. I am presently Visiting Research Fellow of Goldsmiths College, University of London, and have been recently awarded the Institut Català de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA-Academia) five year fellowship for intensification of research (2011-2015).

Through the invitation of Arturo Escobar and Gustavo Lins Ribeiro I became an active member of the World Anthropologies Network collective. This responded to my long-term interest on the production of anthropological knowledge and its political implications. Our aim has been to underscore the diverse epistemological histories of various anthropological traditions, and to contribute to a conversation that will question hegemonic anthropologies.

International research and collaboration has been very central to my career. An extended collaborative research with Prof. Gavin Smith (University of Toronto) around the theme "Informal Economic Activity in Western Europe: A Historic and Comparative Study" led to a co-authored monograph *Immediate Struggles: People, Power and Place in Rural Spain*, Berkeley: University of California Press (2006) [Spanish translation 2010] and to many articles and conference contributions.

Presently I am scientific coordinator of a 7th FP European Union project "Models and their Effects on Development paths" (MEDEA) (2009-2012), coordinated by Victoria Goddard at Goldsmiths. Since 1998, I have been the head of the Study Group on Reciprocity (GER) of the University of Barcelona. The GER builds upon in-depth research projects located in different European contexts (Germany, France, Spain, Italy) and in Brazil, Mexico, Philippines, Syria, Puerto Rico and Ecuador, that have as a common element the use of informal social networks and the reference to previous social ties and moral imperatives as support for resource circulation. This group has been training young anthropologists for over ten years and helping them in the early stages of their career.

My present research focuses on the articulation between folk models of the economy that inform practices at the micro sociological level, and expert models of the economy that frame policy, corporative and institutional behavior.

Jeanette Edwards, University of Manchester

I am delighted to have been elected to the EASA Executive Committee. EASA is fortunate to have had a recent committee and an administrative team that have worked extremely hard to grow the organization, secure

its financial stability and support successful and dynamic conferences. Us 'newbies' are privileged to be working from a strong base and with such well experienced committee members. It is already clear the 'new' committee, fortunately comprising both 'old' and 'new' members, are committed to preserving the legacy of its predecessors while, at the same time, responding as actively as it can to current challenges facing not only social anthropology in Europe but also to EASA as one of its 'learned societies'. I appreciate the opportunity to work with colleagues, on behalf of members, over the next two years.

I am currently Head of Department at Manchester University, prompting some colleagues to suggest I must be a 'glutton for punishment'. Maybe ... I am keen, however, to raise my head from the bureaucratic and administrative overload that I think many academics, not only heads of department, are presently experiencing. Current academic and university practices seem to encourage a myopia which EASA, the movement of students and early career scholars, as well as research collaborations across Europe counter. I am hoping, therefore, that my role in Manchester can inform what I do on the EASA committee and vice versa.

Apart from lots of administration, then, what else do I do? My research interests have revolved around kinship and assisted reproductive technologies, with fieldwork in England and more recently Lebanon. I have a long-standing interest in the anthropology of Britain and in the politics of social class and am particularly exercised at the moment by a racialisation of 'the white working class'. I have also collaborated with social anthropologists (amongst others) in several European countries on an EU funded project that focused on the social implications of new reproductive and genetic technologies (<http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/pug/>). My current research looks at the growing interest in, and popularity of, family history and genealogical research. I am interested (amongst other things) in the way in which science, kinship and ICTs are mobilised by different publics in their search for ancestors.

My publications include: *Born and Bred: Idioms of Kinship and New Reproductive Technologies in England* (2000, Oxford University Press); with C. Salazar, *European Kinship in the Age of Biotechnology* (2009, Bergahn Books); with P. Harvey and P. Wade, *Technologised Vision: Technologised Bodies* (2010, Bergahn Books). More on: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/disciplines/socialanthropology/>

Noel B. Salazar, University of Leuven

I'm honoured to have been elected as youngest member of the EASA Executive Committee and I look forward to being in touch with many EASA members over the coming two years. During the election period, I already presented my vision on anthropology in general and the association in particular. Here I briefly want to tell you more about my professional background and interests.

After having studied psychology and philosophy at the University of Leuven (Belgium) and neuropsychology at the University of Essex (UK), I obtained

my Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Pennsylvania (USA). I am currently a Marie Curie Fellow (FP7) and Fellow of the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leuven. In addition, I am a Visiting Research Associate at the Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change, Leeds Metropolitan University (UK).

My research interests include anthropologies of mobility and travel, the local-to-global nexus, discourses and imaginaries of Otherness, heritage, cultural brokering and cosmopolitanism. I have published peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and newspaper articles on these topics in the USA, the UK, India, Indonesia, Belgium, the Netherlands, France, Spain and Colombia.

I am the author of *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond* (2010, Oxford: Bergahn), a book analyzing the circulation and dynamics of tourism imaginaries. My current research project focuses on the complex (dis)connections between tourism imaginaries and ideas of transcultural migration (with ethnographic fieldwork in Indonesia, Tanzania, Chile, and Belgium). In this context, I founded CuMoRe (Cultural Mobilities Research) and the EASA Anthropology and Mobility Network.

I am on the editorial boards of *AIBR - Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, *Annals of Tourism Research*, *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, and *Mondes du Tourisme*. In addition, I am on UNESCO's and UNWTO's roster of consultants and an expert panel member of the National Geographic Society's Center for Sustainable Destinations.

More about my publications and research projects is available online:

<http://kuleuven.academia.edu/NoelBSalazar/>

Maria Couroucli, CNRS

Maria Couroucli is a senior researcher at the CNRS (Paris, France) working on Modern Greece. She 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). She teaches in the post-graduate program of the Département d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie comparative at Nanterre University (Paris, France) and is member of the editorial board of *Ethnologie Française*. Her research interests include ethnic and national representations, shared religious practices in the post-ottoman world and their relation to community and territory; questions of memory and identity in relation to the Greek civil war (1945-49). She is currently attached to the French School at Athens. Most recent book: *Religions traversées : lieux saints partagés entre chrétiens, musulmans et juifs en Méditerranée*. / Couroucli, Maria, ed. & Albera, Dionigi, éd. Arles : Actes sud, 2009., 359 p. An english translation, *Shared Sacred Spaces in the Mediterranean, Christians, muslims and Jews at Shrines and Sanctuaries* is announced for July 2011 (Indiana University Press).

Abdullahi Osman El-Tom, NUI Maynooth

I am thrilled to be elected into the EASA Executive Committee. I promise all that I will do my best and work with my colleagues in the Committee to advance EASA and help promoting its ideals.

My academic background has been long, arduous and nomadic. With no intended offence, it was in my first year at the University of Khartoum when I first heard about something called "anthropology". That something became my major and I graduated in 1979. I continued my affair with anthropology earning an MA at Queens University of Belfast (1981) and later a Ph. D, at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland UK, 1983.

My work career started at the University of Gezira, Sudan from 1983 to 1990. At Gezira, I established and headed the Department of Rural Development but was soon caught up in the political turbulence of the Sudan. I was kicked out of the country but managed to challenge my alleged dispensability. I am now the longest serving member of staff at the Department of Anthropology at the NUI Maynooth, where I have been since 1990.

My early research focussed on medical anthropology. My urge for applied issues pushed me into various other areas, currently housed under structural violence branch of our discipline. Since the onset of Darfur/Sudan conflicts seven or eight years ago, I have done nothing but politics at both ends, academic as well as advocacy and activism. I wrote about violence in Sudan but also participated as a senior negotiator at various peace talks in Nigeria, Libya and Qatar.

My research interest in the politics of Sudan culminated in my last and fourth book, just published: "Darfur. JEM and the Khalil Ibrahim Story, RSP, 2011". If you think I am doing nothing but anthropology of violence, then please think again. By way of redeeming my soul, I am now researching and co-editing a book on Milk Banking and Related Issues, - but "vorsicht" no money is involved despite Ireland's economic collapse-.

Marc Maguire, NUI Maynooth, Journal Co-Editor

Mark Maguire is a Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology, National University of Ireland Maynooth. His work concerns international migration and security. He has carried out ethnographic projects on nationalism and violence, asylum and integration, programme refugees, and new security technologies such as biometrics. He is the author of *Differently Irish* (Woodfield Press, 2004) and, with Fiona Murphy, co-author of *After Asylum* (Manchester University Press, forthcoming 2011). In 2008 he held the 2nd Fulbright Advanced Scholarship and Visiting Assistant Professorship in the Department of Anthropology, Stanford University. During 2011 he was also a Visiting Associate Professor in Stanford. He is co-editor with David Berliner of *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*.

EASA BOOK PRIZE

Deadline September 30th, 2011, Midnight

BOOK COMPETITION RULES

1. The European Association of Social Anthropology (EASA) offers a prize for an unpublished work on any anthropological topic.
2. The prize shall be 5000 Euros, paid to the winner's bank account immediately after the prize winner is announced. The winner is responsible for any tax that this prize may attract. If no suitable entry is submitted, EASA reserves the right not to offer a prize.
3. Manuscripts should be between 80-100,000 words long (including appendices, references, bibliography and any other apparatus), be in English, and submitted to the EASA book editor, James Carrier in electronic form.
4. The competition is open to any paid-up EASA member.
5. The closing date for submissions is midnight 30th September 2011. It is expected that the winner be announced at the Paris EASA conference, July 2012.
6. In submitting a work to the competition, the submitter undertakes that the work is all their own, that it is unpublished, and that if they win the prize, they will allow the work to be considered by Berghahn, EASA's publisher, for publication by EASA in their series in the normal way, and that there is no impediment copyright or otherwise to its being published should it be accepted by Berghahn.
7. Any royalties ensuing from the publication go to EASA.
8. Manuscripts submitted to the competition will be evaluated by the series editor with the assistance of an expert committee formed by him for this purpose, and a recommendation made to the Executive Committee.
9. Members of the Executive Committee and other current EASA office holders are not eligible to enter the competition.
10. In the event of an occurrence outside EASA's control (such as an international emergency, war or similar), EASA reserves the right to vary these conditions.

Results of Financial Support for EASA-Network Activities

Network	Funding €
Africanists	1600
Anthr Religion	1000
Biosoc Becoming	0
Europeanist	1600
Media	1700
Medical Anthr	2300
Mediterraneanist	1700
PACSA	2300
Sacred Healing & Communication	1000
VANEASA	2500
Total	15700

The application of the Network "Anthropology of the Middle East and Central Eurasia (Russia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, China)" came in after the end of the deadline and could not be considered for support.

WELOCME ADDRESS TO THE EASA CONFERENCE IN PARIS 2012

The Local Committee

The local EASA committee warmly welcomes delegates to join for the 12th EASA Conference in Paris-Nanterre. It is challenging to host the Conference after so many well-organized previous edition of the EASA biennale. We wish to offer a week rich of anthropological debates, discussions, movies, exhibitions as much as a unique opportunity for meeting, networking and editing; this, for your daily time. As for your evenings, July is certainly a lovely time to experience Parisian thriving evenings when sleeping is only one option among many!

The University of Paris-Ouest Nanterre / La Défense (<http://www.u-paris10.fr>) (formerly called Paris-10 is the second largest campus in France and welcomes 35,000 students every year in all fields of studies, and hosts 2000 teachers. It is one of the 13 successor universities of the University of Paris and was built in the 1960s as an extension of the Sorbonne. Nanterre became famous shortly after its opening by being at the origin of the May 68 student rebellion. The campus was nicknamed "Nanterre la rouge" (red Nanterre). It all started when, Paul Ricoeur (who later became the President of the University) was campaigning for more egalitarian relationships between teachers and students. Some of his colleagues were ferociously opposing his proposals and were advocating for a security group to be posted on the campus. Ricoeur, joined by Henri Lefebvre, Alain Touraine and Guy Michaud wrote a libel in the daily newspaper, starting student unrest on the campus and leading to the administrative closure of the campus. The movement then spread to the Latin Quarter. To this day, the university lives up to its reputation for an independent spirit, and the intellectual figures of this time are part of the local memory: you will attend the keynote lecture and plenary sessions in the Henri Lefebvre theatre ...

The University of Paris-Ouest- Nanterre is located 3 miles from the Parisian business district known as "La Défense". It is very easy to get there by train or metro express from anywhere in Paris. The University boasts a proper campus of 27 ha, quite unique for a Parisian university (the old French universities are generally smaller and integrated in the city they were in) with sport facilities you will be welcome to use (Olympic-sized swimming pool, a stadium and a fitness centre), a major library, a theatre, a restaurant and even a circus which gives the place a quirky touch which anthropologists cannot but appreciate. In the past ten years, the University has undergone major improvements and renovations. New buildings and well-equipped venues have been erected that allow for international conference to be host in one site.

The Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie Comparative, with its Library dedicated to Anthropology (Bibliothèque Éric-de-Dampierre), is part of the campus and is hosted in the building of the René Ginouvès Institute for Archeology and Anthropology (MAE). It will be at the core of the organization of the conference at the local level, in close collaboration with other main French research centres in Anthropology (Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale at College de France, created by Claude Levi-Strauss; Institut Interdisciplinaire d'Anthropologie du Contemporain, at the EHESS; Institut d'Ethnologie Méditerranéenne, Européenne et Comparative, in Aix-en-Provence). Last but not least, the prestigious Musée du Quai Branly (<http://www.quaibranly.fr>) will be welcoming you for a vibrant evening of ethnomusical performance and will offer you a free pass for the whole week of the conference to attend its exhibitions and permanent collections.

The conference being set the second week of July, this allow for a spectacular closing evening with French people celebrating their National Day. Be ready to experience a night of dance, fireworks, and festive celebrations all over the town... certainly the best way to end up a gathering in France. Welcome in Paris!

The Scientific Committee |

Paris: Isabelle Rivoal, Gilles Tarabout, Dionigi Albera, Sophie Chevalier, Dimitri Karadimas, Anna Laban, Anne de Sales, Baptiste Buob, Monica Heintz.

EASA: Susana Narotzky, Jeanette Edwards, Maria Couroucli, Abdullahi El-Tom, Noel Salazar, Marc Maguire, David Shankland, Thomas Fillitz.

The Local Committee |

Isabelle Rivoal, LESC ; Gilles Tarabout, Directeur LESC; Dionigi Albera, IDEMEC; Sophie Chevalier, IIAC; Dimitri Karadimas, Deputy Directeur LAS; Anna Laban, Administrator of Dept for Research, MQB; Anne de Sales; Baptiste Buob, LESC; Monica Heintz.

EASA BOOK SERIES

James G. Carrier, Series Editor

Members who are new to the EASA may not know about the book series, about what it publishes and how it operates. In this newsletter I want to explain these.

The first book published in the EASA series appeared in 2003, and there are now sixteen titles, twelve of them already out and the other four expected to appear by the end of this year. The series hopes to publish between two and four titles each year.

The series aims to publish works on any anthropological topic, and they can be edited collections or monographs. The only requirement, in fact, is that the person submitting a proposal to the series is a member of the EASA.

The series is published by Berghahn Books (www.berghahnbooks.com/series.php?pg=easa_ser), which publishes a number of works of interest to anthropologists. Although Berghahn is the publisher, the series is run by an editor appointed by the EASA. The editor corresponds with people who want to propose works to the series and arranges for the evaluation of proposals and manuscripts. The editor also makes decisions about what to accept, and submits these to Berghahn for approval. I have been series editor for about two years, and Berghahn has not disagreed with any of my decisions.

How the series works

It is unusual for anyone to submit a completed manuscript to the series. Rather, most people send me an e-mail describing a project, and asking if the series would be willing to consider it. I read the description and make suggestions about how it might be strengthened, to make it more likely to appeal to the specialist readers who evaluate submissions. Once the description is in good shape, I get the proposer to complete the New Book Outline that Berghahn requires for all submissions to the series.

Once I have these materials, I locate specialists to read the proposal. Often these are other EASA members, but they might not be. I ask those specialists to complete their reports in a month or six weeks, and usually they do. Once I have those reports, I prepare an overall evaluation of the proposal and present it to Berghahn for approval. That overall evaluation lays out the decision on the proposal and explains it in terms of the comments from the specialist readers.

Three sorts of decisions are possible

The proposal may be very good indeed, which means that it would require no important rethinking or modification. That is, the topic is interesting, the argument is sound and coherent, and the proposal takes into account existing important work and ideas that relate to the topic. In that case, it would be accepted by the series. That means that Berghahn would offer a contract for the work, and the proposer would agree to submit the completed work to me by the agreed date. Once I have the complete work, I send it out once more to specialists, usually the same people who read the proposal, and ask them to complete their evaluations within three months. Their main task is to see if the text lives up to the promise shown in the proposal. If those readers think that it does live up to that promise, the work is then accepted for publication. Readers may, of course, make suggestions about how the text could be strengthened, but usually these are relatively minor. If readers have doubts, I communicate these to the author, and between us we see if the text could be revised to deal with those doubts.

Very few proposals are good enough to be offered a contract. Instead, most are good, but need to be made stronger. In this case, I consult with the proposer. I explain what my decision is and how I arrived at it, drawing on the comments from the specialist readers. I indicate the most important criticisms that the readers have and try to suggest ways to deal with them. As well, I may suggest that the proposer write a complete text, taking into account the evaluation of the proposal. If the proposer decides not to do so, that is the end of it. If the proposer does decide to produce the complete text, I wait, and occasionally send messages asking how things are going. Once the proposer sends me the complete text, I treat it as a new submission of a manuscript rather than a proposal. I then send it out to specialist readers, preferably the people who read the initial proposal. Once I have their reports, I produce an overall evaluation.

That evaluation may be an acceptance, though there may be suggestions for final, minor revision. Equally, it may be a rejection. Finally, it may be that the specialist readers think that the work is of good quality, but needs to be strengthened if it is to be accepted for the series. If this happens, I explain things to the author and indicate what sort of revision seems to be important. In some cases, the revisions that are needed are relatively small, and in that case it may be that the revised manuscript would not need to go to specialist readers again. I would evaluate it myself. In other cases, the revisions may be more substantial, in which case the revised manuscript would need to go to specialist readers once more. If they are satisfied, then the work would be accepted in the series.

Although there are a lot of steps to the process, the system I have described is fairly simple: a person proposes a project, we work to make it as strong as we can, we see what specialist readers have to say.

If you are thinking about a book, or what to know more about the series:

- a) look at the EASA web site (www.easaonline.org/bookseri.htm);
- b) send me an e-mail ([jgc\(at\)jgcarrier.demon.co.uk](mailto:jgc(at)jgcarrier.demon.co.uk)).

Institutional Development Grant | Wenner-Gren Foundation

The Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research established the Institutional Development Grant (IDG) program in 2008. The IDG is intended to strengthen (or to support the development of) anthropological doctoral programs in countries where the discipline is underrepresented. The grant provides \$25,000 per year, is renewable for a maximum of five years (total support of \$125,000), and may be used for any purpose to achieve the academic development goals of the applicant department. A minimum of one new award will be made each year and priority will be given to those applicant departments which have arranged strong partnership arrangements with other anthropological institutions that can help them achieve their development goals.

Since the program's inauguration, four institutions have received IDG grants: The Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Tribhuvan University, Nepal; The Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology at Mongolian National University; The Museo Antropologia, National University of Cordoba, Argentina, and The Anthropological Studies Program, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Philippines. All the institutions are combining an innovative program of staff, student, and program development.

The Institutional Development Grant has a two-stage application process; a preliminary inquiry followed by a full application. The deadline for the mandatory preliminary inquiry is May 15, 2011. The preliminary inquiry must be submitted on the preliminary inquiry form which can be downloaded from the Wenner-Gren website, <http://www.wennergren.org/programs/institutional-development-grants>. The deadline for those applicants invited to submit a full application is September 15, 2011. Awards will be announced in November 2011 for programs beginning in January 2012.

The Wenner-Gren Foundation
470 Park Avenue South, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10016 USA
Tel (212) 683-5000
Fax (212) 683-9151
General inquiries: inquiries@wennergren.org
Institutional Development Grant inquiries: development@wennergren.org

AGM 2011

The AGM 2011 will be take place in Athens on October 7, 2011, at 5 p.m. local time.
Further details will be announced on EASA's website and the next Newsletter.



Glasgow, 28 February 2011

Dear Professors Narotzky and Edwards,

I am writing to you both in your capacities as current President and Vice-President respectively of the EASA. Last week the Court of the University of Glasgow approved a proposal brought forward by the University's Senior Management Group to begin a 'consultation process' over possible disinvestment in a number of areas. This includes the possible redundancy of two members of staff from the subject area of Sociology.

It may be appropriate to briefly explain something of the wider context here. The Department (as it was called until recently) has run a Joint Honours Anthropology programme for some years. This has always been very popular, has always received positive feedback from students and has been repeatedly commended by our external examiners as a particular and characteristic strength of the syllabus that we offer. In 2009, however, it became clear that, in the absence of further investment to support the appointment of new teaching staff, the Joint Anthropology programme had become unsustainable (put simply, a very small number of dedicated and committed staff were having to teach considerably more than was manageable, in order to try to provide a full and varied programme). As a result, and with regret, it was agreed that Anthropology should be phased out from the Joint Honours programme. This change was formally approved last year. The current cohort of first year students will be the last to have the option to carry on through to a Joint Honours Anthropology degree.

In all of the discussions which surrounded this decision and in the documents produced in relation to it, we reiterated the fact that anthropological perspectives, a concern for global and comparative research and an interest in anthropological research methods remained central to what we were doing and what we would continue to do within the subject area of Sociology. We have never seen, then or now, any kind of simple distinction between Sociology and Anthropology. Most of us do work which is informed by writing and research from both disciplines (and others), and we are absolutely convinced that our Sociology teaching programmes benefit hugely from the inclusion of insights and evidence drawn from anthropology. The University, however, clearly sees the ending of the anthropology programme as an opportunity for 'cost savings'. This, despite the fact that the institution has recently advertised a significant number of posts, including many at professorial

level, in Medicine and other areas. Despite the fact, also, that one of the colleagues in question was appointed as a medical anthropologist after the decision to 'teach out' the Anthropology programme had been taken.

Although the numbers of staff involved here are not huge, what is proposed constitutes a profound attack on both disciplines. It is an attack on Anthropology, insofar as the colleagues whose jobs are under threat are those who specifically offer anthropological expertise in relation to research and teaching. These colleagues have a significant track record of research in areas that are of real contemporary importance – the cross-cultural study of embodiment and drug use; ritual, religion and conversion. The fact that they have been targeted suggests a blindness to the distinctive contribution of anthropology to understanding the globalised world. The proposals are also an attack on Sociology, however, insofar as these colleagues form an integral part of the running and delivery of our Sociology courses at all levels, and to the wider intellectual life of the subject. Both colleagues have played an important part in the recruitment of overseas PGR students, and are central to our existing MSc in Equality and Human Rights and to a forthcoming MSc in Global Health. Despite all the rhetoric about support for inter-disciplinarity, it would appear that the managers of Glasgow University, at least, see disciplinary identities as bureaucratic definitions which can be mobilised in order to make individuals or groups of individuals vulnerable.

We would ask for your support, and for the support of the EASA more widely, as we go about contesting these proposed redundancies. We would ask, first of all, for your support in informing colleagues within the wider disciplinary community of this situation. Moreover, if you felt that it was appropriate, it would be very helpful for us to have a letter of support from the EASA which we could refer to in the course of the forthcoming consultation process, and which would provide evidence of the fact that these proposed changes have the potential to damage the University of Glasgow's standing in the eyes of a wider academic community.

We have sent this letter electronically, because we felt that it was imperative that the EASA be informed of this situation; a hard copy will follow.

With best wishes,

Andy Smith (acting Head of Subject, Sociology)

e-mail: andrew.smith.2@glasgow.ac.uk



European Association of Social Anthropologists
Association Européenne des Anthropologues Sociaux

To

Prof. Anton Muscatelli
Principal of the University
University of Glasgow

The President

Prof. Susana Narotzy
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ Montealegre 6-8
E - 08001 Barcelona
Spain

narotzky@ub.edu
<http://www.easaonline.org/>

Barcelona, 17 March 2011

Dear Prof. Muscatelli,

I write as President of EASA, and on behalf of the Executive Committee, to express our deep concern about the proposed disinvestment in Sociology and Anthropology at The University of Glasgow. And more precisely the possibility that anthropologists are to be made redundant in the near future. We are acutely aware of the difficulties facing universities in the UK at present and we know that hard decisions are having to be made. We are also aware that the decision to phase out the successful and popular Joint Honours programme was made last year in the light of financial constraints and questions of investment. While it was one of the few genuinely joint programmes in the UK, representing a real synergy between the cognate disciplines of Sociology and Social Anthropology, it was clearly unsustainable, given existing pressures on few staff, without further appointments in Anthropology. Despite the phasing out of the Joint Honours programme, the distinctive and productive relationship between Sociology and Anthropology at Glasgow continues, and it is the case that Sociology at the University of Glasgow is known for combining sociological and anthropological approaches. We are therefore dismayed to hear that this may be under threat. We are also extremely concerned that disciplinary identities are being used by senior management to identify who should be made redundant.

Individually, the anthropologists at Glasgow have a significant track record in research, publications and in recruiting PGR students. Collectively they contribute to the inter-disciplinarity valued in current academic and funding regimes and to the outward-looking and cross-cultural perspectives that are crucial to universities in the UK in the twenty first century. The contribution that anthropology makes, not only through its ethnographic research in societies across the world, but also in its cross-disciplinary and comparative approaches, is invaluable in the contemporary globalized conjuncture. We believe it would be a great loss to the academic portfolio of the University of Glasgow, and a great loss to this and a future generation of students if they are not able to take up and benefit from such approaches at the University of Glasgow.

The EASA Executive Committee would urge the Senior Management Team to reconsider eliminating Anthropology from its research and teaching portfolio. We believe that if it does so it would be to the detriment not only of Sociology and the Social Sciences at the University of Glasgow, but also the University itself and its standing in the eyes of the wider academic community. It will also be to the detriment of present and future students who stand to lose access to anthropological perspectives and approaches that are increasingly valuable and necessary in the contemporary world.

We hope you will take our views into consideration in the process of making an informed decision in relation to the proposed disinvestment in the area of Sociology and Anthropology.

With best wishes,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Narotzy', with a stylized, cursive script.

Prof. Susana Narotzy
President
European Association of Social Anthropologists



European Association of Social Anthropologists
Association Européenne des Anthropologues Sociaux

To
General Director
Robert-Jan SMITS | EC-DG-Research
robert-jan.smits@ec.europa.eu

To
Member of EU-Parliament
Herbert Reul | EP ITRE Committee Chair
herbert.reul@europarl.europa.eu

Reg. | Downsizing of Social Science Research Funding in FP8
Poznań,

The President

Prof. Dr. Michal Buchowski
Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań
Institute of Ethnology and Cultural
Anthropology
Św. Marcin 78
PL - 61-809 Poznań
Tel: (48-61) 8294817
Fax: (48-61) 8294710
mbuch@amu.edu.pl

Dear Mr. Smits, Dear Mr. Reul,

A number of proposals for FP8 have attracted the attention of the Executive Committee of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), Europe's leading professional Association in the discipline.

As President of EASA, and on behalf of its Executive Committee, I would like to express my unease at these developments for FP8, as they may impact severely on the future of Social Sciences and Humanities, and specifically on our discipline of Social Anthropology in Europe.

My colleagues and I think that these disciplines have their societal importance, particularly in times when the project of Europe is facing dissatisfaction among its populations, when they no more understand what this project symbolises, or how the impact of institutions on their life-worlds is experienced and imagined by them.

Our greatest concerns are, firstly, the downsizing of funding for socio-economic and humanities research projects in FP8, and second, that the focus on major topics of transformation is taking into account only to a small degree the cultural and social interconnections of these "thematic structures". By doing so, I have the impression that it neglects the contribution of these disciplines in these fields, be it for discerning and understanding problems, or for solution orientation.

My colleagues and I acknowledge the intention to prioritize researches in Europe that make major contribution to solving big challenges of mid- and long-term societal transformations. Considering these "Grand Challenges" as they are outlined in many preparatory papers to FP8 – climate change, ageing population, new pressures in global markets, a sustainable energy supply, or social cohesion (what actually about the social perspectives of youth?) – all these topics nevertheless refer to a need for flexibility, for innovative creativity, and for multi-disciplinary approaches within which Social Sciences cannot be relegated at a downgraded, secondary level.

Europe's position in world research is closely connected to its openness, its conjunctures across borders, its great pluralism of equally considered disciplines. These qualities now seem to be threatened! If we truly think of the further development and implementation of the ERA, I acknowledge required structural adjustments and improvements concerning cross-border networks. But my colleagues and I too envision a true and sustainable ERA on the grounds of including scholarly disciplines, which consider the people, the citizens, their ways of life, their hopes, their fears, their imagination, their creativity ... from the bottom. Thus, we understand pluralism as well in the structural approaches to these requirements and visions of ERA2020.

Competitiveness (industry|market determined) then is but one such network, others would be constituted with the centrality of civil society actors, others with basic research networks (centrality of scholars).

Speaking in particular for our discipline, Social Anthropology, its major feature actually is "to bring people in". As I understand it, this was the *raison par excellence* why Jean-Michel Baer, Director of Directorate L | DG Research, had invited a group of Social Anthropologists to a seminar in Florence – "Seminar Anthropological Perspectives in a Changing Europe – 'Bringing People In' " (October 2008). Even if focussing on the Programme *Cooperation*, these two days very clearly helped to emphasize main issues of Social Anthropology as related to different activities of the Programme, and in my view fit very well into the "Grand Challenges" as outlined for FP8. I would like to cite but a few from the brochure your institution has produced (EC 2009. pp. 17-18)

- * Activity 3 | Major Trends in Society: generation, new kinship relations and their socio-economic importance, consumption and identity, racism;
- * Activity 4 | Europe in the World: human mobility for work and security, representations of Europe, mobility of ideas and things, colonial legacies in Europe and the World;
- * Activity 5 | The Citizens in the European Union: borderlands and border crossings, forms of diversity, European citizenship, the crisis of political representation, power-symbols-language, hopes, humiliation, cultural avant-gardes as a European phenomenon.

Mr. General Director Smits, Mr. Parliament Committee Chair Reul, as President of the European Association of Social Anthropologists I would appreciate if the ongoing vision and the concrete structuring of FP8 could be readjusted and amended as to "bringing the people in" – to see their capacities in contributing with their ways of life, their imaginations and aspirations to solving the "Grand Challenges" Europe and the societies of the world are facing. Thus, I kindly request you to reconsider for FP8 the possible qualitative contributions of Social Sciences, as well as their important role in truly multi-disciplinary projects for dealing with socio-economic transformations of the future.

Yours Sincerely,

Michal Buchowski
President of EASA

Two Replies from the European Commission



ΕΒΡΟΠΕΪΣΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΟ ΕΥΡΩΠΣΚΥ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΑ-ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΕΤ
ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΣΧΕΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΟΡΑ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΑΝ ΠΑΡΛΙΑΜΕΝΤ
ΠΑΡΛΕΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΠΕΕΝ ΠΑΡΛΑΙΜΙΝΤ ΝΑ ΗΕΟΡΡΑ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΟ ΕΙΡΟΠΑΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΣ
ΕΥΡΟΠΟΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΑΣ ΕΥΡΩΠΑΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΙΛ-ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΠΕΥ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΕΣ ΠΑΡΛΕΜΕΝΤ
ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΪΣΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΟΥ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΥΛ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΑΝ
ΕΥΡΩΠΣΚΥ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΠΣΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΟΡΑΝ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΤΙ ΕΥΡΟΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΕΤ

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, RESEARCH AND ENERGY

The Chairman

301537 27.01.2011

Prof. Dr. Michal Buchowski
President of EASA
Adam Mickiewicz University
of Poznan
Institute of Ethnology and
Cultural Anthropology
Sw. Marcin 78
PL-61-809 Poznan
Poland

Ref.D(2011)4261
GO/IK/ca

Brussels,

Subject: Social Science Research Funding in FP8

Dear Mr Buchowski,

With interest I have read your letter in which you express the unease of the European Association of Social Anthropologists concerning the attention for social science research in the forthcoming framework programme for science and research. In our Committee the importance of the social sciences is well acknowledged. Various factors have to be taken into account in the next Framework Programme which will focus upon finding solutions for the so-called 'Grand Societal Challenges'. We understand your concern regarding the role of the social sciences herein and it is important to try to find an appropriate balance between the different priorities.

Towards the summer our Committee will draw up a report formulating the political orientations concerning the eighth Framework Programme. Your position will be duly taken into account upon the writing of this report.

I would like to thank EASA for expressing their opinion.

Yours sincerely,

Herbert REUL



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE GENERAL FOR RESEARCH & INNOVATION

The Director-General

25 FEB. 2011

Brussels,
RTD/B5/IP D(2011) 169205

Prof. Dr. M. Buchowski, President
European Association of
Social Anthropologists
Institute of Ethnology and
Cultural Anthropology
Adam Mickiewicz University of
Poznan
Sw. Marcin 78
PL – 61809 POZNAN

Dear Professor Buchowski,

I would like to thank you for your letter concerning the contributions which the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities (SSH) can offer in the future research and innovation programmes.

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Programme is a unique programme and its European added value consists in the fact that it addresses EU-wide issues and supports comparative research on them. At the same time it provides a very relevant tool in tackling the grand societal challenges.

Until December 2010, the SSH programme was managed in a Directorate named "Science, economy and society" in the former Directorate-General for Research. From 1 January 2011 the SSH programme became part of a new Directorate entitled "European Research Area" (ERA) in the Directorate-General Research and Innovation. The staffing levels and budget allocated to it remain unchanged. By anchoring the social sciences and humanities in the ERA Directorate alongside our work on universities and researchers' skills infrastructures, joint programming and science in society, notably ethics and gender, support for SSH is brought into the core of ERA policies and the social dimension of ERA is strengthened in the DG as requested by the Competitiveness Council in May 2010.

The procedure for determining research priorities in the social sciences and humanities remains the same. These priorities will be reflected in the annual work programme adopted by the Commission following the opinion of the Programme Committee consisting of Member States' representatives and the independent Advisory Group of experts from the different disciplines in the field.

I should add that support to SSH is also being provided through the Ideas Programme and the European Research Council. Some 15% of the ERC's budget of 7,5 billion Euros will go over the period 2007-2013 to the SSH area.

Finally, let me point out that the Commission issued on 9 February 2011 a Green Paper¹ on the Common Strategic Framework for Research and Innovation funding. I enclose a copy for your perusal. A major consultation exercise is underway on the Paper, culminating in a major stakeholder's conference on 10 June 2011. I encourage you to participate in the consultation process and let the Commission have your views on the future of SSH.

Yours sincerely,

Robert-Jan SMITS

C.c.: Mr Herbert Reul, MEP

¹ *GREEN PAPER: From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation funding - Commission Communication COM(2011) 48 9/2/2011*

Inte following we reprint the EC's Green Paper

"From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation funding"

We kindly request members of EASA to look at the EASA website to consult the FP-8 Questionnaire reagrding the Green Paper

"Online questionnaire for the Green Paper on a common strategic framework for EU research and innovation funding." (6 pages)

Statements should be sent by May 20, 2011

To: http://ec.europa.eu/research/csfri/index_en.cfm



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 9.2.2011
COM(2011) 48

GREEN PAPER

**From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU
Research and Innovation funding**

EN

EN

GREEN PAPER

From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation funding

1. PURPOSE

This Green Paper launches a public debate on the key issues to be taken into account for future EU research and innovation funding programmes. These programmes will be part of the Commission's proposals for the next Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) to be presented in June 2011. Specific proposals for funding programmes are due to be adopted by the end of 2011. **The research, business, government and civil society communities and citizens are called upon to engage in this important debate.**

Delivering on the widely supported Europe 2020¹ objectives of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth depends on research and innovation as key drivers of social and economic prosperity and of environmental sustainability. This is why the European Union has set itself, in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, the objective to increase spending on R&D to reach 3 % GDP by 2020. The Innovation Union flagship initiative² advocates a strategic and integrated approach to research and innovation. This sets the framework and objectives to which future EU research and innovation funding should contribute, based on the provisions of the Treaties³.

The Council⁴ called for future EU funding programmes to focus more on Europe 2020 priorities, address societal challenges and key technologies, facilitate collaborative and industry-driven research, streamline the instruments, radically simplify access, reduce time to market and further strengthen excellence.

The Budget Review⁵ put forward key principles which should underpin the future EU budget: focussing on instruments with proven European added value, becoming more results-driven and leveraging other public and private sources of funding. The Budget Review proposed that the full range of EU instruments for research and innovation work together in a **Common Strategic Framework**. At its meeting on 4 February 2011, the European Council discussed innovation and supported the concept of the Common Strategic Framework to improve the efficiency of research and innovation funding at national and EU levels. This Green Paper identifies key questions on how to achieve these ambitious objectives.

While this Green Paper focuses on research and innovation, there are important links to other EU programmes, as identified in the Budget Review, and notably with the future Cohesion policy Funds and Education programmes.

¹ 'Europe 2020: A European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' - COM(2010) 2020.

² 'Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union' - COM(2010) 546.

³ Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Titles XVII 'Industry' and Title XIX 'Research and Technological Development and Space'; Euratom Treaty, Title II, Chapter 1 'Promotion of research'.

⁴ Council conclusions on Europe 2020 flagship initiative: Innovation Union. 26.11.2010.

⁵ 'The EU Budget Review' - COM(2010) 700.

EU research and innovation funding and initiatives in the current programming period (2007-2013)

- The Seventh Framework Programme⁶ (FP7) with its budget of 53.3 billion euro supports research, technological development and demonstration activities across the EU. Its activities are implemented under four Specific Programmes: Cooperation, Ideas, People and Capacities; it also supports research in nuclear energy (Euratom) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC)⁷.
- The Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme⁸ (CIP) has a budget of 3.6 billion euro and aims to encourage the competitiveness of European industry, with SMEs as its main target. It promotes access to finance and supports the development of better innovation support services and policies. It funds trans-national business and innovation support services. It addresses clusters, public procurement and non-technological barriers to innovation. It helps developing the information society by stimulating take-up and use of ICT and promotes the increased use of renewable energies and energy efficiency.
- The European Institute of Innovation and Technology⁹ (EIT) is an autonomous EU body bringing together the higher education, research and business sectors to stimulate world-leading innovation. Through its highly integrated Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs) it strengthens links across the knowledge triangle. The EIT's flexibility aims at making it attractive to the business sector. A contribution of 309 million euro was provided to the EIT from the EU budget.
- Through the Cohesion policy¹⁰, about 86 billion euro (almost 25% of the total Structural Funds budget) is allocated to enhancing the capacity of regional economies to change and innovate. This investment focuses on four key elements: R&D and innovation, entrepreneurship, ICT and human capital development.

2. EU RESEARCH AND INNOVATION: FROM CHALLENGES TO OPPORTUNITIES

Europe and the world are faced with unprecedented challenges requiring innovative solutions. Returning to growth and higher levels of employment, combating climate change and moving towards a low-carbon society require urgent and coordinated action. The impact of demographic developments is increasing and our natural resources need to be used more wisely. Our societies face security challenges which are growing in scale and sophistication. Challenges such as our ageing population or our dependence on fossil fuel do, however, also provide powerful opportunities to develop innovative products and services, creating growth and jobs in Europe.

Europe also needs to meet the challenge of retaining and reinforcing its competitive position in the face of globalisation. The emerging economies are moving from cost competition and

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm

⁷ The JRC is a Commission service providing scientific and technical support for the development and implementation of EU policies.

⁸ <http://ec.europa.eu/cip/>

⁹ <http://eit.europa.eu/>

¹⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/themes/research/index_en.htm

imitation towards strategies based on innovation. Other countries are investing more than ever to safeguard their future. On the other hand, rising living standards in these countries open new markets for European products and services and their growing capabilities create new opportunities for collaboration.

We need to grasp these opportunities, build on our strengths and act swiftly and decisively to build our future, enhance the welfare of our citizens and secure the competitiveness of our businesses. Research and innovation are key drivers of this process, yet Europe is often outperformed by its competitors in these domains¹¹.

Europe needs to make a step change in its research and innovation performance. As the Innovation Union pointed out, this requires research and innovation to be better linked. We should break away from traditional compartmentalised approaches and focus more on challenges and outcomes to be achieved, linking our research and innovation funding closer to our policy objectives. Developing a simplified set of instruments and rules is equally crucial, while leaving room for flexibility where it is needed.

At a time of severely constrained public budgets, the most needs to be made out of every euro. Public research and innovation funding in Europe is primarily organised at the national level. Despite some progress, national and regional governments still largely work according to their separate strategies. This leads to costly duplication and fragmentation. EU level actions provide the opportunity to generate greater efficiencies and impact. This could build on the current joint efforts between Member States, industry and the EU, as for instance in the Strategic Energy Technologies (SET)-Plan¹², the ICT Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs)¹³ and the upcoming Strategic Transport Technology Plan.

EU wide programmes are also critical for closing our gaps with international competitors. Europe's underinvestment in research and innovation, particularly by the private sector, is a major weakness. EU programmes should leverage private investment and make Europe a more attractive investment location.

EU programmes are needed to generate a higher number of world class scientific breakthroughs as they help generate excellence through European wide competition. An integration of policies and EU funding from research to market (as in the European Innovation Partnerships) will make Europe better at turning knowledge into innovation. The provision of services to support innovation processes beyond technological innovation will help seizing market opportunities for innovative solutions.

¹¹ EU-27 R&D intensity in 2009 was 2.01 % GDP, compared to 2.77 % in US (2008) and 3.44 % in JP (2007). Further information is available in the Innovation Union Scoreboard 2010, available at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/facts-figures-analysis/innovation-scoreboard/index_en.htm

¹² 'A European Strategic Energy Technology Plan (SET-Plan)' - COM(2007) 723 - and 'Investing in the development of low carbon technologies (SET-Plan)' - COM(2009) 519.

¹³ As evidenced for instance in the interim evaluation of the ENIAC and ARTEMIS JTIs - COM(2010) 752.

3. LESSONS FROM CURRENT EU RESEARCH AND INNOVATION PROGRAMMES

The landscape of EU research and innovation programmes has developed over recent decades and now constitutes a significant share of the EU budget¹⁴.

The FP7 interim evaluation¹⁵ confirmed its vital role in building and sustaining European networks, including the positive role played by the Marie Curie and research infrastructure actions and the success of novel instruments such as the European Research Council (ERC) and the Risk Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF). It also confirmed the unique contribution of FP7 in funding cross-border collaborative research. It called for better linkage between research and innovation and for a clearer focus on excellence, competitiveness and societal objectives.

The interim evaluation of the CIP¹⁶ confirmed its highly relevant objectives for EU-level intervention. It highlighted the important role of the financial instruments in support of SMEs, the Enterprise Europe Network, the eco-innovation market replication projects and the demand-driven pilots for ICT innovation. It also pointed to the need for further interlinking with other EU programmes, including the Cohesion policy Funds.

The EIT, through its first KICs, is addressing societal challenges (climate change, energy and ICT) and pioneering new innovation governance models. The EIT is due to present its Strategic Innovation Agenda by mid-2011, through which it plans to expand its activities as a showcase for innovation in Europe and map out its future activities.

However, the various evaluations have also identified a number of shortcomings and deficiencies, in particular the lack of a whole chain approach to research and innovation, the complexity of instruments, over-bureaucratic rules and procedures and a lack of transparency. Improvements for future programmes should focus on:

- **Clarifying objectives** and how they are translated into the supported activities, while maintaining flexibility to respond to emerging policy needs.
- **Reducing complexity.** Over time, EU research and innovation programmes have expanded the set of instruments leaving an impression of catering to too many objectives and spreading funding too thinly. A lack of coordination between EU and Member State funding adds to the complexity and leaves a potential for overlap and duplication, for instance as regards State Aid measures to support SMEs or to provide risk capital.
- **Increasing added value and leverage and avoiding duplication and fragmentation.** EU research and innovation funding should provide more added value, increase its leverage effect on other public and private resources and be used more effectively to support the strategic alignment and pooling of national and regional funds to avoid duplication and achieve scope and critical mass.

¹⁴ 7.41 % of the EU Budget will be devoted to research and innovation in 2013

¹⁵ FP7 interim evaluation available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=fp7

¹⁶ CIP interim evaluation available at http://ec.europa.eu/cip/files/docs/interim_evaluation_report_march2010_en.pdf

- **Simplifying participation** by lowering administrative burdens, reducing time to grant and time to payment and achieving a better balance between cost and trust based approaches. The approach used in the CIP could serve as an example.
- **Broadening participation in EU programmes.** While there is important SME participation in the CIP, the FP7 interim evaluation highlighted the need to further stimulate industry and SME involvement. It also pointed at the need to boost participation of female researchers and participants from newer Member States. A stronger involvement of third countries would offer opportunities to capture the benefits of knowledge produced outside the EU.
- **Increasing the competitiveness and societal impact from EU support.** This would require better uptake and use of results by companies, investors, public authorities, other researchers and policy makers. It also involves supporting broader innovations (including non-technological and social innovation) which are not the result of research activities. Better communication of our objectives and the relevance of our actions to a wider audience is also needed. The ultimate users of innovations (be they citizens, businesses or the public sector) should be involved much earlier in our actions to accelerate and broaden the exploitation of results and to encourage greater public acceptance in sensitive fields such as security or nanotechnology.

4. TOWARDS A COMMON STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR EU RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FUNDING

In line with the priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy and the provisions of the Treaties, the Common Strategic Framework will focus on addressing societal challenges, encouraging the competitiveness of Europe's industries and the excellence of its scientific and technological base.

4.1. Working together to deliver on Europe 2020

At EU level, various programmes support research and innovation, covering activities across the innovation cycle, yet often operating independently of each other. The Budget Review identified a way forward in this respect through the development of a **Common Strategic Framework**. This would cover all relevant EU research and innovation funding currently provided through FP7 and CIP and EU innovation initiatives such as the EIT on the basis of coherent goals and shared strategic objectives.

The Common Strategic Framework offers large potential for making EU funding more attractive and easy to access for participants. It would allow the development of a single entry point with common IT tools¹⁷ or a one stop shop for providing advice and support to participants. Furthermore, it would enable the development of a simpler and more efficient structure and a streamlined set of funding instruments covering the full innovation chain in a seamless manner.

The Common Strategic Framework also offers clear possibilities for administrative simplification through the development of a more standardised set of rules covering all

¹⁷ Building on the development of the FP7 Participant Portal:
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/appmanager/participants/portal>

participants in EU research and innovation programmes. These rules should seek commonalities between the different types of activities whenever possible. This should build on ongoing progress towards simplification¹⁸, yet consider additional measures such as a wider use of lump sums or the general acceptance of beneficiaries' own accounting practices¹⁹.

Allowing for flexibility will be necessary to cater for the diversity of funding needed to cover the full innovation cycle or for requirements linked to specific conditions. Flexibility and speed of delivery are also essential to attract business stakeholders (in particular SMEs). This may justify distinctive mechanisms and implementing rules as, for example, in the case of the EIT.

EU programmes operate in an environment in which most public funding for research and innovation is administered by Member States. Yet still too often this fails to take proper account of the trans-national nature of research and innovation, leaving synergies with the programmes of other Member States or those of the EU largely unexploited.

Experiences with pooling Member State resources (through the Article 185 Initiatives, ERA-Nets and the first steps towards Joint Programming Initiatives) have demonstrated the potential impact and efficiencies offered by leveraging other public sources of funding. Their effectiveness does, however, depend on strong commitments, also in financial terms, from national and regional public authorities.

An important role needs to be played by the future Cohesion policy, which serves to build research and innovation capabilities at the regional level through smart specialisation strategies, yet within the context of the EU's broader policy objectives. The Commission Communication on the future of Cohesion policy²⁰ points to reinforced strategic programming, increased concentration of resources and greater use of conditionality and incentives to enable a stronger impact on Europe 2020 priorities including research and innovation. The Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding should therefore build strong complementarities with the future Common Strategic Framework for cohesion policy.

In addition, Rural Development funding currently provides for a broad range of measures fostering innovation in agriculture. The Communication 'The CAP towards 2020: meeting food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future'²¹ points to innovation as one of the guiding themes of rural development besides environment and climate change.

¹⁸ 'Simplifying the implementation of the research Framework Programmes' - COM(2010) 187 and Commission Decision C(2011) 174 of 24 January 2011

¹⁹ The Commission has proposed a review of the Financial Regulation - COM(2010) 815 - that allows for more radical simplification in the next financial framework, including an extended use of lumps, reimbursement based on accounting practices of the beneficiary and an 'ideal house' for public-private partnerships.

²⁰ 'Conclusions of the fifth report on economic, social and territorial cohesion: the future of cohesion policy' - COM (2010) 642.

²¹ COM(2010) 672

Questions:

1. How should the Common Strategic Framework make EU research and innovation funding more attractive and easy to access for participants? What is needed in addition to a single entry point with common IT tools, a one stop shop for support, a streamlined set of funding instruments covering the full innovation chain and further steps towards administrative simplification?
2. How should EU funding best cover the full innovation cycle from research to market uptake?
3. What are the characteristics of EU funding that maximise the benefit of acting at the EU level? Should there be a strong emphasis on leveraging other sources of funding?
4. How should EU research and innovation funding best be used to pool Member States resources? How should Joint Programming Initiatives between groups of Member States be supported?
5. What should be the balance between smaller, targeted projects and larger, strategic ones?
6. How could the Commission ensure the balance between a unique set of rules allowing for radical simplification and the necessity to keep a certain degree of flexibility and diversity to achieve objectives of different instruments, and respond to the needs of different beneficiaries, in particular SMEs?
7. What should be the measures of success for EU research and innovation funding? Which performance indicators could be used?
8. How should EU research and innovation funding relate to regional and national funding? How should this funding complement funds from the future Cohesion policy, designed to help the less developed regions of the EU, and the rural development programmes?

4.2. Tackling societal challenges

Europe 2020 and its flagship initiatives formulated ambitious policy objectives in areas such as climate change, energy security, demographic ageing or resource efficiency. The Innovation Union called for linking future EU funding programmes more closely to these objectives by putting a stronger focus on tackling societal challenges. However, careful consideration is needed to identify those challenges where EU level interventions can truly make a difference, while avoiding overly prescriptive scientific and technological choices.

Current EU funding programmes have put considerable effort in tackling societal challenges, predominately through a thematic technology push. Bringing researchers from across Europe together in collaborative networks has been at the heart of this approach and will continue to be vital in sustaining a European research fabric. Experience has shown, however, the limitations of this approach in achieving the necessary flexibility, creativity and cross-disciplinary research needed.

The Innovation Union introduced the concept of European Innovation Partnerships to bring together supply and demand side measures in addressing societal challenges. They have an important role to play in coordinating efforts and focusing activities across the innovation cycle. The strategic approach of the SET-plan with its clear priorities, well-defined governance structures and progress assessment function can serve as an example here.

Questions:

9. How should a stronger focus on societal challenges affect the balance between curiosity-driven research and agenda-driven activities?
10. Should there be more room for bottom-up activities?
11. How should EU research and innovation funding best support policy making and forward-looking activities?
12. How should the role of the Commission's Joint Research Centre be improved in supporting policy making and addressing societal challenges?
13. How could EU research and innovation activities attract greater interest and involvement of citizens and civil society?

4.3. Strengthening competitiveness

Europe needs to step up its performance in creating impact from research and innovation funding. Obstacles remain in transferring research outcomes from the laboratory through to the development, commercialisation and application phases. As indicated in the Innovation Union, this requires an essential role for industry in setting priorities and through public private partnerships. It also involves broadening support across the full innovation cycle (including proof of concept, testing, piloting and demonstration), including covering issues such as post-project follow-up, pre-normative research for standard setting, support to patenting and to non-technological innovation.

Securing a strong position in key enabling technologies such as ICT, nanotechnology, advanced materials, manufacturing, space technology or biotechnology is of vital importance to Europe's competitiveness and enables the development of innovative goods and services needed for addressing societal challenges.

FP7 introduced novel approaches to strengthen industry participation. The European Technology Platforms (ETPs) helped define industry relevant priorities. The Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs) put industry in the driving seat through establishing formal public private partnerships. The European Economic Recovery Plan introduced more informal public-private partnerships (PPPs) in key sectors. Experience shows that their success depends on strong commitments from the stakeholders involved, and simple and efficient governance and implementation structures.

Within the framework of its Strategic Innovation Agenda, the EIT will continue to strengthen its business-driven approach through a focus on generating results and impact but also on leveraging substantial funds from the private sector. In the context of the SET-plan, European Industrial Initiatives were launched to allow the public and private sector to jointly develop technology roadmaps. The CIP aims to strengthen the competitiveness of Europe's industry, with a particular focus on SMEs. It takes into account the fact that innovation requires many

competences and activities other than research, which are non-technological in nature, such as design, creativity, standard setting, exploitation and new combinations of existing technologies, new business models, user involvement or capturing the many and diverse possibilities offered by social innovation.

Through their flexibility and agility, SMEs play a pivotal role in developing novel products and services. Outstanding and fast growing SMEs have the potential to transform the structure of Europe's economy by growing into tomorrow's multinational companies. The CIP has been successful in reaching SMEs (100,000 SMEs received loan guarantees, 70 % of beneficiaries of eco-innovation market replication projects are SMEs) and although particular attention has been paid to increasing SME involvement throughout FP7, SMEs are still finding it challenging to participate. A strengthened approach to SMEs could learn from the experience gained with the current SME actions, take into account the innovation and growth needs of different types of SMEs and the fact that the needs of many SMEs are best served through support provided at the regional level, including through the Cohesion policy Funds.

Open, light and fast implementation schemes would enable SMEs and other stakeholders from industry and academia to explore new ideas and opportunities as they emerge, in a flexible way, hereby opening new avenues for innovation. This could for example build on the current use of open calls and simplified application procedures in the Future and Emerging Technologies (FET) actions in the FP7 ICT Theme as well as on the CIP eco-innovation market replication projects.

Intellectual property rights governing EU research and innovation funding are decisive for efficient exploitation and technology transfer, while at the same time they need to ensure access to and rapid dissemination of scientific results. They are also of relevance for international cooperation in areas of strategic interest.

The low level of private finance for research and innovation is a major bottleneck in Europe. The FP7 Risk Sharing Finance Facility and CIP financial instruments have demonstrated how the EU budget in partnership with the European Investment Bank Group can succeed in overcoming market gaps in this area. Building on this experience, future EU research and innovation programmes should make full use of financial instruments (through the EU Equity and Risk Sharing Platform mechanisms proposed in the Budget Review) to support the commercialisation of research results, the growth of innovative businesses and investments in major infrastructures.

New approaches could also be considered, particularly those stimulating the demand side and aiming to involve public and private end users earlier and more closely in the innovation process²². The Innovation Union calls for unleashing the public sector's purchasing power to spur innovation through public procurement including pre-commercial procurement²³. This could build on pilot actions in the CIP and FP7. The US has a long standing tradition in this²⁴, while in the EU this opportunity is left too largely unexploited.

²² See policy recommendations recently published by the European Research Area Board, http://ec.europa.eu/research/erab/pdf/erab-2nd-final-report_en.pdf

²³ The Commission adopted on 27 January 2011 a Green paper on the modernisation of EU public procurement policy 'Towards a more efficient European Procurement Market' (COM(2011)15), consulting on whether public procurement rules should be modified to allow other policy objectives such as promotion of innovation.

²⁴ See e.g. the Small Business Innovation Research initiative (<http://www.sbir.gov>)

Similarly, inducement prizes incentivise researchers to achieve stretching targets through the prospect of obtaining a financial award. They have a long history as a tool for policy makers, but have virtually not been used within EU programmes.

Questions:

14. How should EU funding best take account of the broad nature of innovation, including non technological innovation, eco-innovation and social innovation?
15. How should industrial participation in EU research and innovation programmes be strengthened? How should Joint Technology Initiatives (such as those launched in the current Framework Programme) or different forms of 'public-private partnerships' be supported? What should be the role of European Technology Platforms?
16. How and what types of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SME) should be supported at EU level; how should this complement national and regional level schemes? What kind of measures should be taken to decisively facilitate the participation of SMEs in EU research and innovation programmes?
17. How should open, light and fast implementation schemes (e.g. building on the current FET actions and CIP eco-innovation market replication projects) be designed to allow flexible exploration and commercialisation of novel ideas, in particular by SMEs?
18. How should EU level financial instruments (equity and debt based) be used more extensively?
19. Should new approaches to supporting research and innovation be introduced, in particular through public procurement, including through rules on pre-commercial procurement, and/or inducement prizes?
20. How should intellectual property rules governing EU funding strike the right balance between competitiveness aspects and the need for access to and dissemination of scientific results?

4.4. Strengthening Europe's science base and the European Research Area

Europe's science base is among the most productive in the world, yet it does not contain sufficient pockets of world class excellence where ground-breaking research results are generated which are able to drive structural change.

The main responsibility for building a competitive public science base lies with the Member States. EU support can clearly add value as it has in the past through various initiatives contributing to the construction of the European Research Area (ERA). It is essential to consider how funding provided through the Common Strategic Framework can be used to speed up progress towards a genuinely unified ERA.

The setting up of the ERC was a major step forward in raising the excellence of Europe's science base²⁵. A strengthening of its role could involve both the weight it occupies and the instruments it uses. Important lessons must be drawn from the experience of those regions and countries which have managed to nurture the world's most excellent public research institutions, through concentration of funding and a combination of project grants and institutional support schemes.

In the long term, world class excellence can only thrive in a system in which all researchers across the EU are provided with the means to develop into excellence and eventually compete for the top spots. This requires Member States to pursue ambitious modernisation agendas for their public research base and sustain public funding. EU funding, also through the Cohesion policy Funds, should assist to build up excellence where and as appropriate.

A major achievement in training and transfer of knowledge are the EU Marie Curie actions, which have boosted cross-border mobility and research collaboration by many thousands of researchers. Marie Curie actions have also played an important role in equipping the next generation of researchers with innovative skills, in particular through industry-academia exchanges.

Through the actions of the research infrastructures programme and building on the work of the European Strategy Forum for Research Infrastructures (ESFRI), a strong impetus has been given to the planning, preparation and construction of large scale research infrastructures, and to ensuring access to existing infrastructures. In this context, the further deployment of e-Infrastructures is important to allow remote and virtual access to research facilities and to scientific information.

The approach to international cooperation has evolved considerably since the launch of FP7. The EU's funding programmes are amongst the most open in the world, but this openness should be reciprocated. This concerns not only access to funding, but also market access and IPR protection. The work of the Strategy Forum for International Cooperation (SFIC) has strengthened the strategic approach to international cooperation and the complementarity between the activities of the Member States and those of the Union. For future programmes, consideration is needed on a more differentiated approach according to the specificities of different types of third countries and also to striking the right balance between the goals of strengthening Europe's competitiveness and solving global challenges.

Funding measures to support ERA have over the past years been complemented with a range of non-funding policy initiatives, such as the five ERA initiatives launched in the wake of the ERA Green Paper²⁶ or actions aimed at stimulating a stronger participation of women in science. The Innovation Union stated the ambition to put the necessary measures in place for achieving ERA by 2014, including through legislation. A careful reflection is needed on how funding measures can assist in this respect and how they can be made more efficient. This requires better articulation, complementarities and synergies between funding and non-funding measures.

²⁵ This complements other schemes aimed at raising scientific excellence such as the FET flagship initiative: <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/programme/fet/flagship/>

²⁶ 'The European Research Area: New Perspectives' - COM(2007) 161.

Questions:

21. How should the role of the European Research Council be strengthened in supporting world class excellence?
22. How should EU support assist Member States in building up excellence?
23. How should the role of Marie Curie Actions be strengthened in promoting researcher mobility and developing attractive careers?
24. What actions should be taken at EU level to further strengthen the role of women in science and innovation?
25. How should research infrastructures (including EU-wide e-Infrastructures) be supported at EU level?
26. How should international cooperation with non-EU countries be supported e.g. in terms of priority areas of strategic interest, instruments, reciprocity (including on IPR aspects) or cooperation with Member States?
27. Which key issues and obstacles concerning the ERA should EU funding instruments seek to overcome, and which should be addressed by other (e.g. legislative) measures?

5. PUBLIC DEBATE AND FURTHER STEPS

The Commission believes that the issues and questions raised above are the key aspects to be considered in further developing a common strategic framework for EU research and innovation funding and its related instruments.

Member States, the Parliament, and other countries are invited to promote the debate with their stakeholders. To support the debate on these questions, a variety of social media will be used, including a public consultation website (<http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union>).

The Commission asks organisations who wish to submit comments in the context of public consultations to provide the Commission and the public at large with information about whom and what they represent. If an organisation decides not to provide this information, it is the Commission's stated policy to list the contribution as part of the individual contributions. (Consultation Standards, see COM(2002) 704, and Communication on ETI Follow-up, see COM(2007) 127 of 21.3.2007)

The consultation will close on **20 May 2011**. The broad debate on this Green Paper will be complemented by targeted consultations, such as on the ERA framework and the EIT's strategic innovation agenda. It will also draw on the results of the public consultation on the future of the CIP²⁷.

On 10 June 2011, an event will be organised to wrap up the public consultation and discuss the results with the stakeholder community. The Commission plans to put forward its formal legislative proposals for a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation

²⁷ Information available at http://ec.europa.eu/cip/public_consultation/index_en.htm

funding by the end of 2011. These proposals will be accompanied by ex-ante impact assessments, providing the necessary evidence base for the proposed options.

The Commission believes that research and innovation are central to people's future livelihoods, and thus require better public understanding and debate. It will therefore pursue a broad communication strategy to accompany this public consultation and the subsequent inter-institutional debate and ultimately the implementation of the next EU funding programmes.

This should show to the public at large how EU funding matters to them, making use of audiovisual and written media, organising public events, and exploiting to the full the possibilities offered by new social media.

TAN Teaching and Learning Anthropology Network

Jakob Krause-Jensen | University of Aarhus

Most university anthropologists think of themselves primarily as researchers. Teaching is rarely embraced with the same energy and close identification. Even if we in fact often spend most of our professional lives teaching and supervising, university anthropologists revealingly talk of 'buying themselves out' from teaching commitments or of 'freeing up time for research'. Indeed it is hard to be enthusiastic about teaching, when weighed down by administrative loads, ever-increasing numbers of e-mails and when incentive structures point almost unanimously to peer-reviewed publications as the avenue to career advancement. This conspicuous inattention is understandable but unfortunate, because such attitudes can prevent us from seeing teaching as a space for disciplinary development and creativity.

The aim of the EASA Teaching and Learning Anthropology Network is to 'put the issue of diversity in European Anthropology teaching on the table and to start a discussion of what teaching and learning anthropology could be at the start of the twenty first century'(Dracklé et al. 2004: 3). In other words, the vision is to establish a space for anthropologists to exchange ideas and experiences about their practice of teaching. Discussion can range from how to put together a curriculum that is challenging and exciting, to sharing inspiring pedagogies and analyzing how political reforms are affecting the conditions for learning and teaching anthropology in different European countries.

During the past decades the discipline of anthropology has changed, universities in Europe have been transformed, and the conditions and practices of teaching and learning anthropology have been dramatically altered. Previously anthropology was a small discipline geared to studying societies abroad. Now, an increasing number of students are attending anthropology courses. Not all of them are doing fieldwork abroad. In fact — and for many reasons— fieldwork periods are considerably shorter than they used to be, and the majority of our students do fieldwork closer to 'home'. An increasing university enrollment over the past decades also means that the majority of anthropology students are not going to be academic researchers.

Yet, people construct and conceive their lives partly through their educational experiences (Antikainen et al. 1996). So, even if only a minority of graduates of anthropology will get to work under the designation of anthropologist, the opportunity provided by the discipline to consider their own society and culture in relation to others is likely to broaden outlooks and alter perspectives in significant ways. So, as Ulf Hannerz once wrote in a seminal TAN address, a key question is 'what we want the students to take from the courses to their working lives, to their imaginative resources?' (Dracklé et al. 2003: ix).

TAN intends to meet these challenges by taking seriously the experience of teachers and students of anthropology, rather than just following the imperatives of imposed policies and externally defined accreditations and measures of 'quality'. The network's primary task is to help anthropologists share ideas of how to face up to these changes at the same time as we retain core ideas of the discipline resting in interconnected notions such as theoretical imaginativeness, serendipity and criticality.

Regarding the future organization of TAN, the baton has now passed to Jakob Krause-Jensen, who is an Associate Professor in Educational Anthropology at the Danish School of Education. He will be forming a coordination group of people who would like to play an active role in discussing and sharing the organization of TAN's activities.

Future activities include the following:

- We intend to host two workshops on teaching and learning at each EASA biannual conference.
- We will collaborate with the journal *LATISS*, (Learning and Teaching: the International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences, published by Berghahn <http://journals.berghahnbooks.com/ltss/>
- We collaborate with the American sister organization under AAA.

If you are involved in teaching in higher education and have suggestions, ideas or comments – or want to be registered on our mailinglist, or would be interested in joining the coordinating group please contact TAN by sending an e-mail to: jakj@dpu.dk

CALENDAR

Conferences at Cambridge

Debt: Interdisciplinary considerations of an enduring human passion
Thursday 12 May - Saturday 14 May 2011
Clare College, The Gillespie Centre, Cambridge

This conference brings together papers that engage with the theme of debt as a broad and enduring human passion via the study of particular debt formations.

Debt, considered in interdisciplinary terms, expands beyond financial and economic definitions (although these remain salient) to include the often ambiguous terrain of what is owned and what is owed. It encompasses a consideration of humans as physical beings in relationship to material resources, as social and political beings in a struggle with one another over resources more generally, and as ethical beings engaged in evaluative debates and morally charged encounters. It characterises the intimacies of family relationships just as much as those of the market or the law enforcer. Debt implies compulsion of one kind or another, such as duty, obligation, or indeed force. However, conceptualisations of debt vary across historical and cultural contexts. Debt must be approached through considerations of particular cases of debt and its compulsions, moralities and politics. For the full programme and online

registration, please see www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/events/1339/.

Sri Lanka at the cross-roads of history
Friday 3 June - Saturday 4 June 2011
Location: CRASSH, 17 Mill Lane, Cambridge

The aim of the conference is to find out to what extent the island has been impacted by its placement at the centre of criss-crossing webs of empire, travel, ideas and religion. Sri Lanka lies at the centre of the Indian Ocean, where it has served as a node between Indian ocean trades: to the west, to West Asia and Africa, and to the east, to the Bay of Bengal and South-east Asia. Its location at the southern tip of India has ensured that it has received waves of conquerors, settlers, traders, dynasties and holy men.

Sri Lanka has also been a major participant in the Theravada Buddhist ecumene extending to Southeast Asia. And its strategic location was partly why it was colonized by three successive imperial regimes: the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British. Yet Sri Lanka's history has remained marginal to debates in world and imperial history. The island provides a good opportunity to reconsider questions of locality and generality, connection and comparison, from a specific place. For more information and online registration, please see www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/events/1403/.
Surviving our origins: violence and

the sacred in evolutionary-historical time

Friday 27 May - Saturday 28 May 2011
Location: St John's College, Cambridge

René Girard's 'mimetic theory', insofar as it addresses the role of mimesis and violence in the constitution of human culture and social order, has been increasingly acknowledged as one of the most striking break-through contributions to 20th century critical thinking. In particular, its power to model and explain violent sacralities, ancient and modern, is cogent and insightful: from Crusade and pogrom to Dreyfus and the Holocaust; from gospel apocalyptic and environmental crisis to the religious wars, suicide bombers and culture clashes of our fast-globalising world.

The present conference sets this power of explanation to work in a Darwinian and evolutionary framework, to observe and explore how it modifies our understanding of evolution, both at a human and cultural level, and as a total process, while projecting itself in historical time. How and how well do we 'survive our origins', and how far do the symbolic and sacralising mechanisms of controlling violence, which allowed humankind to survive and develop in evolutionary terms, still represent a 'default setting' that threatens to destroy us? Further details and a provisional programme are available at the following link: <http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/events/1405>.

May 2011

Parimaanam: Images, Embodiments and Contestations

Sixth Annual Tamil Studies Conference
University of Toronto
May 12 - 14, 2011

The conference organizers invite papers and panel proposals on the ways in which images, aesthetic representations and constructs of various kinds have played a significant role in constructing and destabilising ways of being Tamil. The conference organizers welcome papers and panels that discuss, from the perspec-

tives offered by different disciplines and fields, how notions of Tamilness have been imagined, identified and embodied in historical, political, cultural and aesthetic practices that engage intellectual perception and subjective response through a range of materials, technologies, visions, models and movements which help fashion ways of being Tamil.

Guiding questions would include:
Constructing and Reinforcing: What role do aesthetics and performances play in the intervention within and the shaping of political debate? How are aesthetics and the body theorised within the context of Tamil poetics? How do either text or performance establish normative ways of seeing,

looking and moving and, thereby, shape canonicity and mythology? How do artists, their publics and their mediators, how do theorists, teachers, and consumers of objects, photographs, movies, installations, fetishes and lifestyles contribute to experimenting, imagining and experiencing what it is that embodies being Tamil?

Destabilising and Deconstructing: How does public performance of protest or dissent interrogate the binaries of the local and the global, the modern and the medieval, national and the transnational, the "homeland" and the diaspora? What are the ways in which pre-modern Tamil conceptual categories disrupt

or interrogate the binaries of mind and body or local and foreign? How is gender performed and disrupted with Tamil spaces and geographies? What are the sociocultural matrixes of Tamil bodies? Is there a specifically Tamil history of vision which mediates between the observer and the objects visualised

We welcome individual or panel proposals from all disciplines, and from scholars, students, artists, writers and activists, including proposals that address questions that are not listed here. Papers on the diaspora, can range beyond the theme of the conference, though preference will be given to those that do engage the theme more directly.

Submission Deadline: August 31, 2010

Requirements

Submission of an abstract and biographical statement, or the full details of a panel by August 31, 2010 to: info@tamilstudiesconference.ca

Confirmation of participation by registering and paying the registration fee within two weeks of the organizers official acceptance in September/October 2010.

Ability to meet costs of the registration fee, travel and accommodation costs.

Attendance and participation during the full duration of the conference.

Paper Proposals: Abstracts and Biographical Statement A 300 word abstract stating the argument to be presented.

A one paragraph biographical statement, including: current affiliation, publications and research interests. Please note that this will be the biographical information used in conference publicity and introductions. Even if you have submitted a biographical statement in past years, please resubmit it along with your abstract. (See sample statement, p.4).

Abstracts must be submitted in the language in which you intend to present, English or Tamil. Tamil abstracts, should be accompanied by a Tamil bio, and an English translation of the abstract and bio.

Panel proposals must include an abstract for the whole panel, and the abstracts and bios of each individual presenter and the chair.

For further details information contact: treasurer@aisls.org

The conference begins with a reception on the evening of Thursday, May 12, 2010 at 7.30 p.m. and it will

end approximately at 9.00 p.m. on Saturday, May 14, 2010.

Academic Organizers
Chelva Kanaganayakam, Professor,
Department of English, University of Toronto

R. Cheran, Assistant Professor,
Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Windsor

Francis Cody, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Toronto

Sudharshan Duraiyappah, Instructor,
Department of Religion and Art History, University of Toronto

Srilata Raman, Assistant Professor of Modern Hinduism, University of Toronto

Contact:
Email: info@tamilstudiesconference.ca

Website: www.tamilstudiesconference.ca

June 2011

4th European Conference on African Studies

Panel 148: Radio trottoir revisited
Tilo Grätz (Univ. of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany) and
Katrien Pype (Univ. of Birmingham, UK)
Uppsala
June 15 – 18, 2011

Please note:
The deadline for the submission of paper abstracts is Wednesday 22 December 2010.

The panel aims at discussing the relationship between the well-known, but in the last years perhaps a little bit neglected concept of radio trottoir (informal public spheres & popular modes of expression & communication; such as rumours, gossip, backstage talks, urban legends; small media; cf. Ellis 1989), and (mass-) media-related public spheres. The concept of radio trottoir has been often used to demarcate a deviating and liberal realm of free communication in hegemonic systems in colonial and post-colonial times, and to conceptualise popular expressions of resistance. Following the writings of Mbembe, Geschiere etc, any clear-cut differences between "official" and "non-official" or "popular" spaces of communication are difficult to maintain, as there are various interrelations and blurring between "popular" and "official"

discourses. This holds especially true today, after the introduction of policies of media liberalisation and since the growing plurality of electronic media and ICT. Examples include witchcraft accusations against politicians, partly expressed in some tabloids or informal mailing lists; rumours on corruption voiced in popular morning phone-in-shows; allusions to matrimonial conflicts (the president's wife beats her husband) in soap operas; and nicknames of politicians used in commentaries etc. These contemporary forms of radio trottoir playfully blur boundaries between genres, media and spheres of communication, sometimes brought forward by the necessary opening especially of competing commercial media. The panel proposes to deal with immediate "political effects" of these practices of communication, and also with the more general consequences and theoretical challenges of these developments. This may, among others, require a wider concept of political communication that includes the permanent circulation, re-medialisation and multiple re-appropriation & transformation of news, ideas, commentaries and images across various spheres, forums & communication spaces where current changes in African mediascapes may probably add a new dimension, to challenge previous models e.g. developed by Spitulnik (2002).

Please use the abstract submission system:

<http://login2.axaco.se/C12574660023E8EF/registrationForm?openagent&unid=89DC52C9B04C7AFBC12577B50035D734>

Contact:
tilograetz@yahoo.de

Eighteenth Meetings of Europeanists

The Council for European Studies
To be held at various university venues in Barcelona, Spain
June 21 – 23, 2011

For decades, scholars interested in Europe have concentrated their attention on state comparisons and on the institutionalization of the European Union. As the second decade of the second millennium gets under way, we can no longer neglect the deep transformations in Europe's society that have followed the joint

processes of globalization and European integration. Transnationalization is the word that arguably best captures these transformations, for it encapsulates at once the broadening of the Europeans' economic, political, social, and cultural experiences that has taken place in the last two to three decades. The rise of these transnational pressures and vectors of political pressure stands in tension with the political organization oriented around nation-states in Europe. Transnationalization on today's scale is a recurring phenomenon in Europe's history, however, and it works as well as a metaphor for previous periods in which local walls were destroyed and replaced by economic, political and social re-organization on a greater geographic scale. In examining today's transformations we are thus well-advised to revisit previous processes of transnationalization, so that the analysis of the present helps us understand the past and the analysis of the past helps us illuminate the present.

For the 2011 conference, the Council for European Studies (CES) welcomes proposals for panels, roundtables, book discussions and individual papers on the study of Europe broadly defined. This year, for the second time, we are also entertaining the submission of panel clusters around a theme, giving participants the opportunity to create a mini-symposium within the conference (please no more than 4 panels per theme). Each panel proposal will be reviewed individually by the Program Committee, and each panel belonging to a cluster will be acknowledged as such in the conference program.

We encourage proposals in the widest range of disciplines; in particular, we welcome panels that combine disciplines, nationalities, and generations. The Committee will accept only two submissions per person. Panel proposals need to be submitted stating a chair and a discussant (can be the same person).

The Council for European Studies fosters and recognizes outstanding, multidisciplinary research in European studies through a range of programs, including conferences, publications, special events, and awards. The Council's international conferences bring together scholars from a multitude of countries and a variety of fields for discussion and interdisciplinary exchange.

Deadlines and Submission

Procedures:

Please submit all your proposals on the conference website between **September 1, 2010 and October 10, 2010**. Note that each panel proposal must include abstracts for all individual papers, as well as a general description, a chair and a discussant.

More information:

www.ces.columbia.edu

CES newsletter. You may subscribe to the newsletter here: www.ces.columbia.edu/members/indiv_members.html

Cathie Jo Martin, CES Chair, Boston University

Pepper Culpepper, Programme Co-Chair, European University Institute
Juan Díez Medrano, Programme Co-Chair, IBEI - Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals

Programme Committee

Jürgen Gerhards, Committee Member, Freie Universität Berlin

Virginie Guiraudon, Committee Member, Lille Center for Politics, University North of France

Douglas Holmes, Committee Member, Binghamton University, State University of New York

Konrad H. Jarausch, Committee Member, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Sophie Meunier, Committee Member, Princeton University

Levent Soysal, Committee Member, Kadir Has Üniversitesi

Francesca Trivellato, Committee Member, Yale University

12th RAI International Festival of Ethnographic Film

University College London

June 24 – 26, 2011

Contact:

film@therai.org.uk

www.raifilmfest.org.uk

July 2011

Knowledge and Value in the Globalizing World: Disentangling Dichotomies, Querying Unities

IUAES | AAS | ASAA|NZ – Joint Conference

University of Western Australia, Perth

July 5 – 8, 2011

www.glocol.osaka-u.ae.jp/iuaes

The Futures of Cultures

IUAES Annual Conference
Stellenbosch University, South Africa
September 3 – 6, 2011

www.iuaes.org

Vital Powers and Politics: Human Interactions with Living Things

ASA 2011

University of Wales, Trinity St.

David, Lampeter Campus

September 13 – 16, 2011

www.theasa.org/conferences/

Wa(h)re "Kultur"? Kulturelles Erbe, Revitalisierung und die Renaissance

der Idee von Kultur

Conference of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde (DGV)
Organised by: Dept. of Social and Cultural Anthropology | University of Vienna

Institute of Social Anthropology |

Austrian Academy of Sciences

Museum für Völkerkunde Vienna

Vienna

September 14 – 17, 2011

Contact:

dgv.tagung@univie.ac.at

www.tagung2011.dgv-net.de/home.html

November 2011

Traces, Tidemarks and Legacies

AAA 110th Annual Meeting

Montréal Convention Center

Montréal, QC, Canada

November 16 – 20, 2011

www.aaanet.org/meetings

The Eric Wolf Lecture | Vijayanthi Rao

New School of Social Research (New York)

Dept. of Social and Cultural

Anthropology, University of Vienna

Institute for Social Anthropology,

Austrian Academy of Sciences

International Research Centre

Cultural Studies (IFK)

University of Vienna, Campus AAKH

November 21, 2011 (Keynote: 6

p.m.)

IFK

November 22, 2011 (Discussion: 4

p.m.)

<http://www.univie.ac.at/ksa/html/inh/aktu/wolf.htm>

2012

September 2011

April 2012

Arts and Aesthetics in a Globalizing World

ASA Annual Conference
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
April 3 – 6, 2011
www.theasa.org/conferences/

Children and Youth in a Changing World

IUAES Inter Congress
KIIT University, Bhubaneswar, Orisha
November 26 – 30, 2012
www.iaaes.org

November 2013

AAA 112th Annual Meeting

Chicago Hilton
November 20 – 24, 2013
www.aaanet.org/meetings

November 2012

AAA 111th Annual Conference

San Francisco, Hilton Towers, California
November, 14 – 18, 2012
www.aaanet.org/meetings

2013

August 2013

Evolving Humanity, Emerging Worlds

17th IUAES World Congress
University of Manchester
August 5 – 10, 2013
www.iaaes.org