

12th EASA Biennial Conference

Paris-Nanterre, France | 10-13th July 2012

“UNCERTAINTY AND DISQUIET | INCERTITUDE ET INQUIÉTUDE”

Call for workshops: closes Sept. 30, 2011 (regarding rules, please see below)
Publication of accepted workshops: October 14, 2011
Opening Call for Papers:

The 12th biennial EASA Conference will be hosted by Laboratoire d'ethnologie et de sociologie comparative (LESC) at the Université Paris Nanterre. The conference is likely to attract over 1100 academics to discuss work based around the conference theme.

The keynote address will be given by Professor Caroline Humphrey of the University of Cambridge.

Along with the keynote, plenaries, workshops, poster sessions and a film stream, there will be the usual additional attractions of network meetings, book launches, an opening reception and a closing banquet. Funding will be made available to assist participation of some conference delegates facing tough economic circumstances.

The University is a two-minute walk from the RER station Nanterre Université, which is two stops from La Défense and about 15 minutes by RER and metro from the centre of Paris. This will be a very easy location for delegates to travel to and from.

THE THEME

Uncertainty and disquiet

Anxiety is a fundamental characteristic of human nature. All living entities have biological devices that enable them to face danger (escape, aggression, concealment). This is often studied by the social sciences under the heading of 'stress'. Human beings, however, differentiate themselves from other species through their reflexivity, which introduces an uncertainty that cannot be reduced to the consequences of their perception. The Biblical image of Adam and Eve driven out of Eden after eating the fruit of knowledge expresses with great symbolic power the anxiety born from this radical uncertainty that humans constantly try to deny or control. The manifestations of this uncertainty are twofold: the first is inscribed in the forms of temporal perception and representations of finality and death; the second bears on the uncertainty linked to what reality is.

The ethnographies of waiting and expectation testify to the uncertainty of the future. Not surprisingly, Mauss identified 'expectancy' as a phenomenon whereby humans can be seized in their entirety: their body, instincts, emotions, wills, perceptions, intellectual capabilities. People can build their life while waiting or with the aim of waiting (ascetic tension towards the afterlife, parousia, apocalyptic movements, waiting for the revolution) or, on the contrary, organise it against waiting (post-Fordist work organisation with its just-in-time, immediate consumption, real time information).

We call for the ethnography of radical uncertainty in contexts of catastrophe, extreme violence and the loss of significant dimensions of both individual and collective identities. The study of the manifestations of chaos opens a field of investigation of radical uncertainty in a context where all landmarks, the cognitive and normative references on which human life is built, have vanished.

Yet permanent radical doubts would render life impossible. Social interactions entail implicit agreements and tacit understandings, amply analysed by anthropology as well as by pragmatic linguistics and history. This common sense, made manifest as habitus, body techniques, balances and equilibriums emerging from interactions and routines can be seen as a way of circumventing uncertainty of what is going on in a specific context as well as in the meanings attached to action in general. Indeed, in a given context, the capacity for mastering action, or for skillfully playing with uncertainty according to the rules, is recognised as a valuable social competence. At the same time, incapacity can lead to a retreat from social life or strategies of avoidance and marginalization, but it can also render visible social strengths, competencies and capacities.

The concrete situations on which the experience of reality rests are always marked by some uncertainty, measured in attempts to apprehend 'what is going on', which often serve to identify intentions, assess situations and assign a status to beings and things. This reflexive capacity of actors and the dialogical production of internal criticism can be captured by ethnographic research. Proposing a way of looking at, explaining, or understanding is a way of instituting reality. This is a major issue in the politics of knowledge taken broadly, from the attempts to naturalise reality (from gender divisions to the capitalist system seen as 'natural' to human life) to the legislation on GMOs, human embryos, the environment, human rights and so forth. It is also about mastering uncertainty by the display and mobilisation of devices meant to calculate uncertainty. What can ethnographies of risk management and control devices teach us about this (seismic risks, crisis management, health risks)?

Paradoxically, human beings try so hard to master uncertainty and anxiety that they refuse to abolish them. Otherwise how can we explain the place given to gambling and betting in so many societies? Is not this institutionalization of uncertainty an attempt to render it less uncertain? Or at the least it is an engagement with the potentialities of uncertainties, which are the very ground on which arts and sciences are built, the domains of creativity and serendipity.

Incertitude et inquiétude

L'inquiétude est une caractéristique fondamentale de la nature humaine. Si l'ensemble du vivant partage des dispositifs biologiques permettant de faire face à une situation de danger (fuite, agression, dissimulation, etc.) qui sont prises en compte par les sciences sociales dans l'étude des formes de stress, les êtres humains se singularisent par une dimension réflexive propre qui introduit une incertitude radicale dont ne peuvent rendre compte les seules propriétés perceptives. L'image biblique d'Adam et Eve chassés de l'Eden pour avoir croqué la pomme de la connaissance exprime avec une grande force symbolique l'inquiétude née de cette incertitude que l'homme n'a de cesse de vouloir nier ou maîtriser et qui se manifeste dans une double tension. La première s'inscrit dans les formes de perception temporelles et les représentations de la finalité et du devenir. La seconde porte sur l'incertitude quant à la réalité de ce qui est.

Les ethnographies de l'attente rendent particulièrement compte de l'incertitude quant au devenir. Il n'est pas surprenant que Mauss avait identifié l'attente comme un phénomène permettant la prise en considération de l'homme dans sa totalité – son corps, ses instincts, ses émotions, sa volonté, ses perceptions, son intelligence. Les hommes peuvent aménager leur vie dans l'attente, pour l'attente (tension ascétique vers l'au-delà, parousie, mouvements apocalyptique, mais aussi, attente révolutionnaire du grand soir) ou au contraire l'organiser contre l'attente (organisation post-fordiste du travail avec le *just-in time*, consommation immédiate, information en temps réel). Dans des formes plus concrètes, on invitera à ethnographier l'incertitude radicale dans des contextes de catastrophe, de violence extrême, la perte d'une dimension définissant l'identité individuelle. L'étude des manifestations du chaos ouvrent un champ d'investigation dans le domaine de l'incertitude radicale, quand tous les repères, les appuis cognitifs et normatifs sur lesquels se fonde la possibilité de la vie humaine se dissolvent.

Le doute radical rendrait cependant toute vie sociale impossible. Toute interaction sociale suppose énormément d'implicites, de non-dits, d'appuis que la linguistique et l'anthropologie pragmatique se sont attachés à décrire. Ce sens commun ou sens pratique, qu'il se décline comme *habitus*, techniques du corps, équilibres émergents des interactions (selon le modèle économique de la main invisible), routines peut être analysé comme une manière de circonvvenir l'incertitude quant à ce qui est en train de se passer dans une situation précise et quant au sens à assigner à l'action en général. En situation en effet, la capacité à maîtriser l'action en cours, à faire « selon les règles », tout en jouant habilement de l'incertitude est reconvenue comme compétence sociale. L'inquiétude peut alors entraîner un retrait de la vie sociale, des stratégies d'évitement, de marginalisation.

Les situations concrètes sur lesquelles repose l'expérience de la réalité sont cependant toujours marquée par une dimension d'incertitude que l'on mesure dans l'ensemble des discours et des mises en perspective au sujet de « ce qui se passe » et dont une bonne part consiste à décrypter des intentions et assigner un statut au êtres et aux choses. Cette capacité réflexive des acteurs et la production dialogique d'une critique interne constituent la possibilité pratique de la plupart des enquêtes ethnographique. Proposer une manière de voir, de comprendre, d'explicité ce qui se passe, c'est instituer la réalité. Autrement dit, il s'agit un enjeu majeur des politiques de la connaissance, prises dans un sens large, qu'il s'agisse des tentatives de naturaliser la réalité (de la question du genre à celle du système capitalisme comme système le plus « naturel »), de statuer sur les OGM, l'embryon humain ou de constituer la nature dans une perspective écologique, etc. Plus largement, il s'agit de maîtriser l'incertitude par le

déploiement de dispositifs ayant pour vocation de la transformer en calculs de probabilités. Que nous apprennent, dans cette optique, les ethnographies d'instituts de gestion des risques (prévision des risques sismiques, cellules de gestion de crises, de pandémie), et plus largement l'ensemble des dispositifs de contrôle ?

Car paradoxalement, il semble que l'être humain cherche autant à maîtriser l'incertitude et l'inquiétude qui en découle qu'il refuse de l'abolir. Sinon comment comprendre la place que de nombreuses sociétés accordent au hasard, au coup de dé, au pari ? Ne s'agirait-il pas d'institutionnaliser l'incertitude pour la rendre moins incertaine ? Ou à tout le moins, n'est-ce pas là un jeu avec / sur les potentialités offertes par l'incertitude qui sont au fondement des arts et des sciences et le lieu de la créativité et des découvertes aléatoires.

Call for workshops

The Call for Workshops is now open. It will close on **Sept 30th 2011**.

All proposals must be made via the online form. Proposals should consist of a workshop title, a (very) short abstract of <300 characters, and an abstract of 250 words.

Proposals will be marked as pending until the Scientific Committee decisions are publicised on October 14th 2011. They will then be marked as accepted or rejected; and the conference organiser will inform you of the decisions.

- EASA requires all accepted workshops to be open to paper proposals through the website: workshops should not be organised as 'closed' sessions.
- Workshops should have at least two co-convenors from different institutions, and ideally from different countries.
- Delegates may only make one presentation, although they may also convene one plenary session, workshop, or roundtable; or be discussed in one plenary session, workshop, or roundtable. All convenors and presenters must be members of EASA (during 2012), and have paid their subscription before the conference.

Local Committee

Baptiste Buob, LESC; Sophie Chevalier, IIAC; Myriam Danon, MAE; Jean-Luc Guinot, Université of Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense; Monica Heintz, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense; Christine Jungen, IIAC; Dimitri Karadimas, Deputy Directeur LAS; Anna Laban, Administrator of Dept for Research, MQB; Gilles de Rapper, MMSH; Isabelle Rivoal, LESC; Anne de Sales, LESC; Gilles Tarabout, Directeur LESC.

Scientific Committee

Maria Couroucli, Jeanette Edwards, Abdullahi El-Tom, Thomas Fillitz, Mark Maguire, Susana Narotzky, Noel Salazar, David Shankland, Baptiste Buob, Sophie Chevalier, Monica Heintz, Christine Jungen, Dimitri Karadimas, Anna Laban, Gilles de Rapper, Isabelle Rivoal, Anne de Sales, Gilles Tarabout.

All conference correspondence: [conference\(AT\)easaonline.org](mailto:conference(AT)easaonline.org)

Timetable (may be slightly altered):

- Oct 18th 2012 Call for papers opens
- Nov 28th 2012 Call for papers closes
- Dec 9th 2012 Convenors mark-up decisions over papers online
- Scientific Committee review transfer papers
- Jan 16th 2012 Paper reallocation suggestions made; NomadIT email convenors
- Feb 1st 2012 All transfers resolved & registration opens

EASA | ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING [AGM]

Athens, Oct. 7, 2011 | 5 p.m.

École Française d'Athènes | Conference Hall

- Reports by the Executive Committee
- Information about next Biennial EASA Conference 2012, Paris-Nanterre
- Discussion of requests by members

Keynote

Antonius C.G.M. Robben, *University of Utrecht*

"The sense of virtual violence: mimesis and immediation during nocturnal combat in modern warfare."

CALL FOR AN EASA-NETWORK

"The Anthropology of Social Movements"

Objectives

In his recent volume, *Social Movements. An Anthropological Reader*, June Nash (2004) states that

"(a)nthropologists who once ignored the intrusion of national and international in their field, are now among the principal observers of social movements (...). Although the potential of these movements is often underestimated, it is in these circuits once considered marginal to global processes that the major changes occurring. Because of their cultivated peripheral vision, anthropologists are in a position to assess new directions."

The network aims to take up this methodological challenge and to bring together different scholars of movements interested in accounts and experiences of ethnographic research. It wishes to discuss the specific potential of qualitative approaches for their studies, contributing to the creation of new theoretical frameworks and studies of social movements and collective action in a broad range of diverse global settings, beyond the classical focus on indigenous movements. Thus, possible questions that are central for scholars engaged in the network may be:

- How changing movements of indigenous people, women and/or the disinherited and the relationship with national and international actors? How do they extend the limits of what seems „thinkable“?
- How can we extend classical fieldwork methodologies in order to understand movements situated in a complex woven field of wider flows?
- How make ethnographers sense of the cultural production of emerging forms of activism such as media- and internet activism?
- How do researchers distinguish between the „categories of practices“ employed by activists, and those of academic analysis? How do scholars position themselves toward activists, often caught in an ambivalent relation of academic distance and more or less open expressed sympathy for causes?
- From which reliable sources can we create common theoretical frameworks? For example, how can „new movements“ theories and their reflections on cultural production be applied in ethnography?

Background

The expression ‚social movement‘ can not be easily reduced to an observable phenomenon ‚on the field‘, but it is an expression that evokes – as remarked by Alan Touraine – ‚historical ensembles‘. To talk about ‚social movements‘ is like to talk about capitalism, renaissance or modernity: it is not clear where and when they actually start and finish. Nevertheless

an „anthropology of social movements“ can be considered as an emerging field of studies in the last decade and, although it draws inspiration from a large range of theoretical perspectives, it can be largely understood as a branch of political anthropology interested in interactions between agency (defined as the social actors' capability to act) and structure.

Furthermore, anthropological contributions on social movements were less indulgent to the temptation of wide theoretical speculation than other disciplines like sociology, because the fieldwork leads to keep alive the awareness of a complex and irreducible social life, although, by a historical point of view, study of social action and social sciences in Europe are interrelated since the beginning of the 19th century for a double reason: on one side because of the social change occurred to the emergence of working class movements in industrial societies, and, on the other side, because both these phenomena (social sciences and social movements) look at the social world as a collective construction which demands transformations.

Given the endless historical variety of forms of social mobilization, and given the different range and shapes of collaborations between ethnographers and their informants, is only possible to discuss a limited amount of approaches. Despite of this, the idea of shaping an open-space which brings anthropologists to imagine the emic and situational characteristics of individual participation in public debates and to realize the work of ‚politically active subjectivities‘ in featuring contemporary history, is, in many ways, suitable. That should be a space for theoretical (self-) reflection in which it could be possible to compare and push different cultural contests (and research experiences) close one to each other with the partial aim to promote the revision of the multiple connotations intrinsic to classical concepts of ‚activism‘ and ‚social movements‘.

Activities

The network has realised between 2009 and 2010 two international conferences (University of Muenster, Germany, and University of Milan, Italy) and is currently in the process of realizing two publications on the basis of these conferences. The aim of the network members is to continue to organize workshops and panel at the biennial conferences of the EASA and increase exchange and debate in an interdisciplinary perspective.

Members of the coordinating committee

Amalia Rossi | University of Milan | [amalia.rossi79\(AT\)gmail.com](mailto:amalia.rossi79(AT)gmail.com)
Alexander Koenler | University of Perugia | [alexanderiht\(AT\)yahoo.de](mailto:alexanderiht(AT)yahoo.de)
Elena Apostoli Capelli | University of Neuchâtel
Lynda Dematteo | EHSS, Paris

Journal of International Political Anthropology

Call for Papers for the IPA Special Issue Book Series

The IPA invites contributions for our upcoming book on the theme of beauty. The central concern is that of beauty and its role in culture, politics, and all realms of human social life. Beauty is to be considered as a central experience to human life. This, as the broad principle of the book, opens the field to allow for a variety of papers that focus on beauty across many different settings.

Beauty can be seen as a characteristic of harmonious being, so it is particularly connected to the emergence and unfolding of culture and civilisation. Papers can situate beauty in the widest possible historical framework, following the footsteps of some of the most important historically oriented social theorists, like Max Weber, Eric Voegelin, Norbert Elias and Michel Foucault. However, it might be just as rewarding to study the social and anthropological significance of beauty, not through social theory, rather through perceptions developed in ancient Greek ideals on beauty with its tension, joy and contest. Using these frames in our search for beauty might give a new kind of in-depth understanding of contemporary European society.

The centre of the book will be the consideration that the beautiful is the founding basic experience of human existence, a fundamental feature of reality, a comprehensive characteristic associated with all aspects of human life. It is present in the social and natural environment at large, in architecture, in city planning, in the household, in education; in play and contests it is closely connected to ritual or cultic activities. These considerations elaborate mostly themes also about the opposite of beauty that is not the unattractive or unpleasant but the fake or corrupted beauty, which mimics the authentic.

Our call for papers for this book intends to reconsider the rightful place of beauty, arguably central not just for art and aesthetics, but for human and social life in general as a primary category of life. Beauty cannot be reduced to the realm of art, as it incorporates the entire range

of human activities, through its affinities with gift relations, considered to be the foundation of social life by Marcel Mauss, or with the inner ethical predisposition that is necessary for us humans to have a harmonious relationship with each other and with our surroundings, that 'charming social' used by Gabriel Tarde. Beauty is in love with the social, gives solemnity and stateliness to it, the necessary good form for social bona fide.

Submission deadline: 30th November, 2011

Paper length: 3,000 to 8,000 words

Editors: Agnes Horvath, James Cuffe

www.politicalanthropology.org

Please email queries/submissions to james@jamescuffe.com with the subject heading 'CFP Beauty'

Abstracts should be 300-350 words with clearly stated thesis and brief summary of research. Papers should be between 3,000 and 8,000 words. Clearly indicate full name, affiliation, and contact information in the email only.

The editorial board reserves the right to not consider any submission that does not adhere to the submission guidelines.

James Cuffe

Department of Sociology & Irish Institute of Chinese Studies

3rd Floor, Askive,

O'Donovan's Rd.

University College Cork

Ireland



European Association of Social Anthropologists
Association Européenne des Anthropologues Sociaux

To
Directorate-General for Research
European Commission
SDME 2/2
BE-1049 Brussels
Belgium

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

president@easaonline.org
<http://www.easaonline.org/>

Barcelona, 20 May 2011

Dear Madam, dear Sir,

This written response to the Green Paper is being expressed in the name of the Executive Committee of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), Europe's leading professional Association in the discipline.

We think that Social Sciences and Humanities (henceforth SSH), and specifically our discipline of Social Anthropology, have their societal importance in Europe, particularly at a time when the project of a unified Europe is facing serious challenges. Increasingly, many of its populations express a great deal of dissatisfaction with the ways in which European institutions impact on their life-worlds and many no longer understand or agree with what the project of Europe stands for. This poses a serious challenge not only to social cohesion but also to values of equality, diversity and political engagement. We firmly believe that expertise from the SSH needs to be central to asking the relevant questions and addressing some of the major challenges of our time.

Europe's position in world research, moreover, is closely connected to its openness, its cross-borders cooperation and a strong scientific pluralism of equally considered disciplines. We envision a true and sustainable ERA on the grounds of including scholarly disciplines that investigate, from the bottom up, people (citizens and visitors): their ways of life, hopes and fears; their imagination, creativity and play; their labour, kinship and beliefs; their relation to existing institutions and their production of new ones. A sustainable ERA also requires research that can critically engage with elites: with institutions, organisations and political and economic regimes that impact on people's lives and that either enhance or detract from their well being.

Speaking in particular for our discipline, Social Anthropology, its major feature is "to bring people in". As we understand it, this was the *raison par excellence* for Jean-Michel Baer, Director of Directorate-L at the DG Research, inviting a group of Social Anthropologists to a seminar in Florence in October 2008 "Seminar on Anthropological Perspectives in a Changing Europe – 'Bringing People In'". The two days of productive discussion clearly helped emphasize and delineate the main aspects of Social Anthropology which, in our view, address the "Grand Challenges" outlined in the Green Paper, but have the potential of further opening new avenues of knowledge that will help society into the future.

In his introduction to the seminar, Jean-Michel Baer stated that there is an urgent need to consider, in-depth, "the relationship between European institutions, their impact and the lives and values of

its citizens". "This relationship", he noted, "has never been the object of systematic studies" (EC 2009. p. 3). It is significant that the initiative for this meeting, was a joint effort of the EASA and the Directorate-L for Science, Economy and Society "in charge of promoting collaborative social science and humanities research that aims to generate an in-depth understanding of the complex and interrelated socio-economic and cultural challenges confronting Europe, with a view to providing an improved knowledge base for policy development in the fields concerned" (EC 2009. p. 3).

Considering the Cooperation Specific Programme, we were invited to connect approaches from Social Anthropology to three activities of its agenda in FP-7 (Activity 3, 4, and 5). This led us to highlight the possible contributions Social Anthropology could make within the framework of the SSH agenda for FP-7. These produced some examples that show the fruitful and productive impact our discipline can make to generating in-depth understandings of the socio-economic and cultural challenges facing Europe (EC 2009. pp. 17-18).

It is our understanding that the increasing loss of autonomy of the SSH programme within the challenge-driven top-down approach of the new ERA framework will seriously compromise the research of social anthropologists and other disciplines. The holistic tradition of anthropology's methodology has set an example for dealing with social and more generally human problems from an integrative viewpoint. It has also underlined the need for defining and looking at problems taking into account the articulation of local specificities with general logics of development, trying to bring people –real people and their problems—into the movements driving social transformation. Having had to understand past collaborations with colonial powers, our discipline points to the complexity of human knowledge production as a political field. It is in this regard that we see a real danger of the SSH becoming a mere appendix of fields of knowledge that presently occupy positions of power which enable them to define *the* 'challenges', to access resources and to produce and overvalue particular types of knowledge (technological, managerial, formal) while undervaluing and screening out others (social, informal, personal, cultural). We do think Social Anthropology, along with other Social Sciences and Humanities, has an important role in truly multi-disciplinary projects that address grand socio-economic transformations and unprecedented cultural challenges of the future. We are however concerned about the position of our sciences in large projects of the future driven by market and technological innovation (as outlined in the Green Paper and the Europe 2020 agenda). Indeed Social Anthropology can have a significant impact on visions guiding present and future policy making, but the conditions for our contributing knowledge, according to our methodologies, theoretical frameworks and disciplinary specificities have to be acknowledged, maintained and enhanced.

It is our fear that curiosity-driven, bottom-up defined research in the SSH will be strongly marginalized in favour of agenda-driven, top-down defined 'challenges' that might represent the interests and understandings of what valuable knowledge is for policy makers as well as economic and political elites, rather than those of the large majority of European citizens and residents. We see this as a potential restriction of European knowledge production and a serious challenge to the creative potential of freedom of research.

The Green Paper stresses innovation as the leading objective of research. If this concept is to be used as an argument for the ERA agenda in the next years, it is important to conceive of innovation in broad terms. Innovation is not only technological, organizational or financial but very centrally "social" and its objective is to enhance the integral wellbeing of "humanity". The above understanding is in line with contemporary approaches to innovation (e.g. OECD OSLO Manual). It is our belief that we need to think about challenges facing humanity in the 21st century more broadly than has been identified in the Europe 2020 strategy (including, for example, the rise of xenophobic neo-nationalism across Europe, degradation of urban landscapes, mistrust of political institutions, global flows of labour, crises in livelihood provisioning, entry of asylum seekers, legal pluralism, and the rise of uncertainty and anxiety). We also need to look at these challenges, more specifically, on the ground, as they are happening and affecting diverse communities.

It is noteworthy that the representatives of the Directorate-L for Science, Economy and Society within the DG-Research at the seminar “Anthropological perspectives in a changing Europe” acknowledged that “... anthropology’s specificities, and in particular its methodology, can contribute greatly to the issues around the European project by shedding light on the behaviour of its main focus and *raison d’être*: the European citizen. In fact what matters the most to this discipline is to bring in the local, the particularistic, the critical reflection, the context, the element of comparison and most of all the *people!* [and] Anthropologists can study the cultural dimension of globalisation and the impact it has on European societies confronted with the permanent interference between the national, the European and the global dimension” (EC 2009. p. 19).

The Executive Committee of the European Association of Social Anthropologists appreciates these insightful remarks and would like to build on them creatively and constructively. We need however to express our deep concern that the space for Social Anthropology’s expertise and its ability to contribute to current and future understandings of diverse human societies and complex individual and collective endeavours, is diminished within the future ERA Social Science and Humanities framework.

To conclude we would like to highlight, as Social Anthropologists, some of our views and suggestions:

- SSH research addresses the initial question of how to define a societal challenge: who defines it and for what purposes? These are clearly complex questions that are at the heart of a diverse and interrelated society.
- Social objectives, once defined, can only be attained with social analysis. A great deal can be learned from the SSH which shows that research that has focused on challenges facing society has not necessarily been agenda-driven research.
- We do not accept the implication in the Green Paper (p.11) that social innovation is a residual or marginal category. Social innovation needs to be put on the same footing as technological innovation for the success and sustainability of European society.
- The SSH therefore need to be central to the EU research agenda as they have the ability to highlight and leverage ongoing social creativity and also the opportunity to expand and transform the scope of certain forms of social innovation.
- The SSH are in a unique position of expertise to address the broad nature of innovation. It is worth noting that social innovation and cultural creativity can yield a formidable impact in, for example, wellbeing, political stability, and social cohesion.
- Material culture and intangible values are central to human flourishing and need to be kept central in the EU research and innovation agenda.

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), Europe’s leading professional Association in the discipline, I kindly request that you take into consideration our views in the future design of the European Research programme.

Yours sincerely,



Prof. Susana Narotzky
President
European Association of Social Anthropologists
president@easaonline.org

Dept. Antropologia Cultural, Història d’Amèrica i Àfrica
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ Montealegre 6-8
08001 Barcelona, Spain

Consultation on Green Paper – towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding

Meta Informations	
Creation date	15-05-2011
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	742892028122113511
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N
Language	en

Your details	
I am answering as	on behalf of an association
My/ my organisation's country of location is	European level organisation
My/ my organisation's main activity is	Other
The name of my organisation is	European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA)
Have you or your organisation received funding in the last three years from	The 7th Framework Programme Another EU Programme A Research or Innovation Support Programme in my country
Have you or do you intend to submit a separate written response to this consultation	Yes

Working together to deliver on Europe 2020

1. How should the Common Strategic Framework make EU research and innovation 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?

- The CSF should make its communication strategies more transparent and engage in a more direct dialogue with European scholarly organizations and networks. - To ensure full and equal uptake across Member States, awareness of language handicaps inherent to the pluri-language realities of the EU is crucial, considering the mandatory use of English and the need to learn a specific EU bureaucratic jargon in a foreign language.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Of some importance

2. How should EU funding best cover the full innovation cycle from research to market uptake?

- The Green Paper highlights technical innovation mostly oriented towards market competitiveness. There is much important and ground-breaking research that is not geared toward the market but addresses social challenges and governance issues on the ground. - It is important to conceive of innovation in broad terms. Innovation is not only technological, management or financial but very centrally "social". The above understanding is in line with contemporary approaches to innovation (e.g. OECD OSLO Manual). - We need to think about challenges facing humanity in the 21st century more broadly than has been identified in the Europe 2020 strategy (e.g. rise of xenophobic neo-nationalism across Europe, degradation of urban landscapes, global flows of labour, entry of asylum seekers in Southern Europe, rise of legal pluralism, etc). We also need to look at these challenges, more specifically, on the ground, as they are happening and affecting diverse communities. - In the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH), actual knowledge transfer often depends on the willingness of policy makers and entrepreneurs to take into account the results of the research; this kind of knowledge transfer could be supported more by the EU. - EU funding should acknowledge that some research outcomes do not enter the market. End users are diverse: e.g. citizens, institutions, public organisations (national and international), civil society (and not only industry or commercial organisations).

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

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?

- One of the great advantages of EU funding is that it fosters the creation or strengthening of research collaborations across national borders. Encouragement of multidisciplinary and cross-border collaborations should be enhanced. - Project evaluation at European levels, with reviewers assigned by the Commission, can bypass local networks which may be unfavourable to excellent research of high impact. - Given the difficult economic climate it is essential to combine as many funding sources as possible. This requires a creative approach. - Private as well as public involvement in research should be actively supported whenever possible but funding should not depend on finding additional sources. Scholars -- researchers and university staff in particular -- should become neither fundraisers nor entrepreneurs. If high level scholars are obliged to spend more and more time fund-raising, project writing and networking, it will diminish the quality of research output. This is not the best way to maintain internationally competitive standards of research and publications.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Important

4. How should EU research and innovation funding be used to pool Member States' research and innovation resources? Should Joint Programming Initiatives between groups of Member States be supported?

- The redistribution of funds through EU research programmes should be monitored closely in order to make a proper evaluation of different manifestations of power in the production of knowledge. EU and national funding are complementary. EU funding has enhanced cooperation between countries in very different positions of power, which has broken down previously existing boundaries and has been a very positive aspect of EU funding - We are not in favour of JPIs. One of their pitfalls is that they can lead to Joint Technology Initiatives type programmes where recruitment and selection activities are not transparent and collusion remains undetected. JPIs in their current form are not transparent. Differences in the availability of funds across the EU results in many states being marginalised by JPIs.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

5. What should be the balance between smaller, targeted projects and larger, strategic ones?

- The size of a project should always suit its objectives. - For SSH, in terms of budget and cost efficiency, small and medium projects should be emphasised and larger projects kept to the necessary. - The balance overall should favour smaller targeted projects because they tend to be more focused and their impact is larger. - A challenge for the future is to find ways to let smaller and larger projects collaborate with one another.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Important

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?

- SSH are a diverse set of disciplines that have requirements that are different from the natural and experimental sciences. This implies a specific (and, thus, flexible) approach and the need for keeping a specific SSH programme, and strand of funding, within DG Research and Innovation. - We fully support radical simplification as long as it does not compromise the specificity of SSH disciplines.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

7. What should be the measure of success for EU research and innovation funding?

Which performances indicators could be used?

- Different areas of research require different measures. Defining universal measures of success will not help reaching the specified goals. - In a competitive global research context, it is important to assess how EU projects advance basic scientific knowledge. This is best assessed by global expert peers. - Success cannot always be measured instrumentally and the value of research cannot always be measured in terms of immediate impact and quantitative indexical terms. Some of the main contributions of the SSH are their enrichment of civil society and public life. They provide reflexive and critical understanding of fundamental relationships in societies past and present. - Responding to predefined 'challenges' is but one indicator. - Forward looking orientation on innovation does not take into account knowledge about the past and runs the danger of ignoring examples from across the world. It can screen out very valuable Historical, Social and Cultural analysis made by SSH research. We think historical and cultural perspectives on social change are crucial for understanding and addressing contemporary societal challenges. - Collegial peer review is the obvious indicator of success. - SSH have a research expertise regarding many of these societal challenges as they are experienced both locally and globally: one of the assets of SSH is their ability to connect across scales. Measuring success over this aspect requires qualitative complex evaluation.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

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 fund?

- The EU should strategically complement national funding to allow innovative research on a larger and collaborative scale. - It needs to expand its targeted funding to 'riskier' areas of research that national funding does not or cannot support, following the ERC model. - We support the expansion of the current strategy that gives priority to excellent young researchers. - We see the need for some kind of programme that would specifically enhance the capabilities of smaller, less well resourced academic institutions that have strong academic records in their own country and language but which does not translate into, for example, mainstream citation evaluations. - One of the main responsibilities of EU funding is to redistribute funding fairly and to take into account unequal opportunities across countries and institutions: affirmative action should be considered. - Research funding should be kept separate from Cohesion Policy and Rural Development funds. While some projects might be linked to such structural

funds, they should not be dependent on each other.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

Tackling Societal Challenges

9. How should a stronger focus on societal challenges affect the balance between curiosity-driven research and agenda-driven activities?

- SSH research addresses the initial question of how to define a societal challenge: who defines it and for what purposes? These are clearly complex questions that are at the heart of a diverse and interrelated society. - Social objectives, once defined, can only be attained with social analysis. A great deal can be learned from the SSH which shows that research that has focused on challenges facing society has not necessarily been agenda-driven research. - Politicians should not monopolize decisions over the agenda. Scientists are also concerned by societal challenges, and less driven than politicians by populist politics. Therefore, scientists (social and natural) as well as civil society actors should participate in defining the agenda. - Stronger focus on the challenges facing society should not affect the balance between curiosity-driven research and agenda-driven research. The balance should always be in favour of curiosity-driven research because it has a proven record of providing creative, innovative, sustainable knowledge (e.g. Benjamin Franklin).

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

10. Should there be more room for bottom-up activities?

- Yes. Bottom-up approaches are the most appropriate for social research because they are more flexible and adaptable to changing challenges and environments. Bottom-up activities should be given a larger share of attention than top-down, as they are the ones with a higher potential for groundbreaking advances. - A range of agendas and social actors should be taken into account. EU research funding will be more effective and competitive if it incorporates more perspectives and interests in setting the agenda for innovative research than it currently does. This would reveal that people define challenges differently from those in the green paper (e.g. social fragmentation, conflict and stability, crises of liberal democracy, post-industrial anxieties, etc.).

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

11. How should EU research and innovation funding best support policy making and forward looking activities?

- Curiosity-driven research should remain central to EU research funding. This is because future challenges cannot be predicted and curiosity-driven research is able to anticipate future needs (as it often has done). - Transference of knowledge is a reciprocal project. As SSH are urged to communicate their research, so EU funders, public institutions and private enterprises should also be proactive in their efforts to understand and engage with research in the SSH. - European universities are central to forwarding the EU agenda on research and innovation. Excellence will not be attained without strong support from the EU of the universities which are themselves currently challenged by structural adjustment policies.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

12. How should the role of the Commission's Joint Research Centre be improved in supporting policy making and forward looking activities?

The JRC could be made more widely known and its outputs more easily accessible.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Don't know

13. How could EU research and innovation activities attract greater

interest and involvement of citizens and civil society?

- As anthropologists our work is predominantly premised on the involvement of citizens and civil society. Intense involvement through ethnographic methods, in specific communities, provides much of our qualitative data. - The EU research and innovation activities should support in-depth forms of communication and engagement with local communities over time. This will facilitate responsible and trustful relationships between the EU and its stakeholders. Such ethical relationships will attract greater interest and involvement from citizens and civil society.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

Strengthening competitiveness

14. How should EU funding best take account of the broad nature of innovation, including non technological innovation, eco-innovation, and social innovation?

- We do not accept the implication in the Green Paper (p.11) that social innovation is a residual or marginal category. Social innovation needs to be put on the same footing as technological innovation for the success and sustainability of European society. - The SSH therefore need to be central to the EU research agenda as they have the ability to highlight and leverage ongoing social creativity and also the opportunity to expand and transform the scope of certain forms of social innovation. - The SSH are in a unique position of expertise to address the broad nature of innovation. It is worth noting that social innovation and cultural creativity can yield a formidable impact in, for example, wellbeing, political stability, and social cohesion. - Material culture and intangible values are central to human flourishing and need to be kept central in the EU research and innovation agenda.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

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 Programmes) or different forms of "public private partnership" be supported? What should be the role of European Technology Platforms?

- JTI & ETP, while clearly underscored in the EU Green Paper, should not dominate the discussion of the Research and Innovation agenda or the allocation of research funds. - We recommend that SSH maintain an independent budget and administrative infrastructure within forthcoming EU funding regimes. - The interim FP7 report indicates that SSH projects reached the highest evaluation scores both in the average total evaluation score and in scientific excellence. Despite these outstanding results, SSH projects represented less than 2% of the Cooperation budget in FP7 and many did not get funded. Because of the unequal allocation of funds to a large and active scientific community, SSH have the smallest success rate in FP7 leading to some of Europe's best researchers seeking careers out of Europe. This clearly compromises EU endeavours at excellence and competitiveness.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

16. How and what type 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?

- It is important here to include a very wide range of SMEs, preferably in close collaboration with already existing schemes on other levels. Companies that show an active role involving the community and contributing for it should be favoured.

How important are the aspects

Unimportant

covered in this question?	
---------------------------	--

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?

How important are the aspects covered in this question?	Don't know
---	------------

18. How should EU level financial instruments (equity and debt based) be used more extensively?

- Financial instruments are based on the assessment of risk by the loan providers. However, knowledge generation and research geared to the sustainability of society and to European wellbeing and development are a political responsibility of the EU.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?	Important
---	-----------

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?

- We need further debate and analysis of existing approaches to funding before exploring alternative possibilities. - Generally speaking we do not see the advantage of brokerage in promoting excellent research. In addition it raises serious issues of monitoring in order to ensure transparency and fairness in procurement.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?	Very important
---	----------------

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?

- There is an intrinsic contradiction between knowledge production and patent protection to promote a competitive edge in the market. In SSH research creative advances come from shared and pooled knowledge, and require free and expansive dissemination.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?	Important
---	-----------

Strengthening Europe's science base and the European Research Area

21. How should the role of the European Research Council be strengthened in supporting world class excellence?

- We favour strengthening the ERC programme. PI driven, curiosity driven, high-risk aspects should be supported and expanded. - ERC could expand by encouraging one strand of ERC funding for individual PI driven, small international collaborative work.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?	Very important
---	----------------

22. How should EU support assist Member States in building up

excellence?

- More small, bottom-up projects with less onerous application procedures to allow for immediate and flexible responses to challenges should be encouraged. - Existing programmes that facilitate mobility of young researchers (such as Marie Curie training networks) have proven to be very successful in building up excellence, they should be strengthened. - More funding is needed to support universities as teaching and research centres which incubate the excellence of the future. Without strong and viable universities, Europe cannot compete in a global knowledge economy.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

23. How should the role of Marie Curie Actions be strengthened in promoting researcher mobility and developing attractive careers?

- The Marie Curie Actions are successful and should be maintained and strengthened. At the same time, it is important to recognize that greater mobility needs also to be married to stable career opportunities in the long term. - The EU should provide opportunities for stability and long-term perspectives of researchers by working collaboratively with universities and supporting permanent posts.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Important

24. What actions should be taken at EU level to further strengthen the role of women in science and innovation?

- EU should take seriously existing SSH research on gender in the workplace. Funding targeted research on the contours of gender imbalance across different member states should be kept as a transversal theme in research agendas. Affirmative action might be required to redress imbalances (gender, but also race, ethnicity, linguistic origin) in EU research funding. Monitoring research teams regarding gender imbalance (e.g. where PIs are male and RAs female, or where single authored publications are differently distributed) might be required.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

25. How should research infrastructures (including EU-wide e-Infrastructures) be supported at EU level?

- There is a need to assess current infrastructures before launching new infrastructure plans. Maintenance of existing infrastructures, for example in the Universities, is more important than continual 'innovation'. - Expanding and enhancing electronic infrastructures is fashionable. However further research on the real benefits should be assessed before incurring costly investment in e-infrastructures. Other, less costly, investments might prove more useful. - European wide access to e-journals and other e-sources might be an efficient and equalizing investment worth pursuing. In general, those infrastructures that reach the widest audience (e.g. universal access to web resources) should be supported the most. - Creative thinking about new uses of existing infrastructures, e.g. media, books, networking, internet, etc. should be encouraged.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Important

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?

- Anthropology requires international collaboration. Much of anthropological research occurs in non-European countries, and the history of our discipline is enmeshed with issues of political and economic relations between Europe and the World. Knowledge flows and creativity are strongly dependent on our collaboration with non-European colleagues. - Again, this is topic-dependent. Such cooperation should certainly be supported and enhanced in those areas where a great part of the expertise lies outside the EU.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Important

27. Which key issues and obstacles concerning ERA should EU funding instruments seek to overcome, and which should be addressed by other (e.g. legislative) measures?

- Emphasis on technological innovation geared to market competitiveness should not become hegemonic - Agenda-driven, 'societal challenge' top-down defined research should not marginalize curiosity-driven, bottom-up initiatives in research - SSH are central to any forward looking policy design. More funds should be allocated and independent budget and administrative infrastructure should be maintained - Simplification of bureaucratic processes and a trust based relationship with researchers should be enhanced. - The EU should turn the scientific visa a reality not only a good idea. - Universities have to be supported and their budgets cannot be downsized if excellence in research is to be maintained and enhanced.

How important are the aspects covered in this question?

Very important

Closing question

Are there any other ideas of comments which you believe are important for future EU research and innovation funding and are not covered in the Green Paper?

- Increased bureaucratization of research is inimical to proper research - Increased mistrust between funding agencies and researchers creates an environment of discomfort that does not help research - Research objectives cannot be defined by market interest without becoming mainstream and politically partial - Market imperatives induce quick rhythms that are often a hindrance to some areas of research - Different disciplines and research projects have different requirements that should be taken into account - The SSH have much to contribute and should not be marginalised in the push for market-driven innovation - Cutting-edge research is risky and its outcomes unpredictable, it is difficult to frame in applied objectives

Gender Summit and the results of the public consultation on DG Research Green Paper (EASA)

Elizabeth Pollitzer

Director, Portia Ltd (genSET lead and coordinating partner)

You are receiving this communication in your role as R&D leader and member of EASA. Many apologies for any possible duplication. Your patience is much appreciated.

"Next to the gender balance, the gender dimension of the research content is an important aspect to be taken into account. Sex and gender methodology potentially open up new fields of research and brings innovation by asking new questions." (submission from a government representative to the public consultation on EC Green Paper)

"The Commission should provide more specific direction and guidance regarding what they expect to be considered in proposals on the subject of 'Gender Issues'. Participants often do not understand the purpose of this section." (submission to public consultation from a leading research university)

"The gender dimension should be seen as horizontal in all areas of R&D&I and throughout all support and policy measures" (form a leading engineering institution)

I am writing from the FP7 funded project genSET, www.genderinscience.org with information that I very much hope will be relevant to you and to your organisation.

Firstly, I would like to bring to your attention the forthcoming 1st European Gender Summit, which is being organised by genSET, ESF and COST. It will take place on 8-9 November in Brussels. Discussing how the gender dimension in science influences research and innovation cultures, and how policies for structural change impact on gender equality and science excellence will be 55 science leaders, with an expected audience of 800 participants. This is the best opportunity to learn from experts about the impact of the gender dimension on scientific endeavour, and find out how gender may be accommodated in the plans for FP8. I very much hope that you and other representatives from your institution will be able to attend and contribute to the discussions and to the drafting of the policy manifesto, which will be the major outcome of the Summit.

I attach with this email the Summit leaflet. Registration and programme details can be found on www.gender-summit.eu. I would be most grateful if you could help us promote this event to the science communities you are involved with.

Secondly, I would like to ensure that you are aware of one of the key deliverables of the genSET project, namely the consensus report on the gender dimension in science. The report was produced by a panel of 14 science leaders from across Europe. It contains an integrated strategy for gender equality work in science institutions and 13 evidence-based, practical recommendations for improving how women and gender issues should be addressed in institutional processes and in science knowledge making. These recommendations are field independent, and provide a coherent approach - from science leaders to science leaders - on how to tackle gender equality issues.

It is my pleasure to attach a copy of the consensus report here. It can be downloaded from the genSET website, together with all the supporting research evidence. In arriving at their conclusions, the science leaders panel considered evidence from over 150 research reports, and consulted world renowned gender experts, during a series of three 2-day consensus seminars.

Another outcome of the science leaders' deliberations has been a special issue of the Interdisciplinary Science Reviews journal, on Gender in Science. I attach the table of contents and the guest editorial. It is an excellent overview of how the gender dimension is relevant to all aspects of research, innovation and scientific endeavour.

Very relevant to the genSET report are the results of the recent public consultation on the DG Research Green Paper, on the future of R&D funding. This has produced interesting outcomes regarding Question 24, on strengthening the role of women. We have been analysing answers to Question 24 and one striking observation is the very large number of the submissions that have recommended actions relevant to Q24 - 40% of the 2000 submitted responses felt that further action was needed.

Critically, in their own report on the results of the public consultation, with regard to Q24, the DG Research and Innovation has chosen to quote from the submission made by the European Research Area Board. I include below the full answer from ERAB and from the ERA Steering Group on HR. The latter has specifically identified the genSET recommendations as the best practice for institutions to follow.

"Europe needs excellent science and innovation to tackle the Grand Challenges. All resources are needed. Irrespective of age, race or gender, ERA should exploit all available talents and to that end, specific instruments should be employed. EU should actively encourage Member States

- 1- to develop their tertiary education so that also science and technology are attractive to all,
- 2- to put in place all measures to help the daily life of women in charge of young children when they have the ambition of a successful scientific career,
- 3- to require from their Research institutions to put in place a plan and strategy to raise share of women amongst academic staff, and monitor their development.
- 4- when equally competent applicants compete for a post or resources, the one representing the minority gender should have priority.

The EC should ensure adequate female representation in all Committees under its responsibility."

"The Commission should encourage participating institutions to take full account of the recommendations from the genSET report and from the Helsinki Group contribution to the consultation on the CSF in developing their strategies."

I would be happy to discuss details of the Summit and of genSET with you. Many thanks for any assistance that you may be able to offer to help disseminate the genSET report and the Summit information through your own networks.

www.genderinscience.org (FP7 SiS project), www.gender-summit.eu
Report "Recommendations for Action on the Gender Dimension in Science" to be downloaded from easa website: [geSET_Consensus_Report_3_9_2010.pdf](http://easa-geSET_Consensus_Report_3_9_2010.pdf)

CALENDAR

September 2011

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>

December 2011

RAI Huxley Lecture | Bruce Kapferer
Close Education Centre, British Museum
December 16, 2011 (5:30 p.m.)

2012

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/

May 2012

Visual Encounters with Alterity: Representing East-Central and South-Eastern Europeans in the Nineteenth Century and the First Half of the Twentieth Century
Cooperation:
The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw;
The Institute of Ethnology, Slovakian Academy of Sciences, Bratislava;
The Institute of Ethnology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Praha;
May 24–26 May 2012

With our first conference on stereotypes in caricatures in Warsaw (2010) behind us, we would now like to engage and challenge scholars to further enhance the study of how group distinctions and differentiations between self and the "constitutive Other" are elaborated and visually marked. We plan to highlight processes and products of "encounters" and try to understand how images of alterity are constructed, used, and integrated into one's own cultural practices. We intend to explore how various groups of people (e.g., ethnic, social, gender, age, and occupational groups) of East-Central and South-Eastern Europe (from the Baltic states—Russia, Poland, Germany, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Austria—to the Balkan states) had been represented in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century. The subject of analysis can be drawings, paintings, photographs, or prints, as illustrations, caricatures, posters, postcards, commercial graphics, and so on, or popular images applied on other devices such as objects of textile. We welcome papers discussing the different kinds of stereotyped representations ranging from negative to positive (e.g., diminishing, mocking, satirizing, excluding or ostracizing, demonizing, exoticizing, orientalizing, heroizing, or romanticizing) that exist side-by-side within a particular time period. We also welcome examples of "de-Othering" as stereotyped expressions of comradery. We are looking for multi-disciplinary, transnational comparative approaches that lead to the exposure of a variety of local cultural contexts.

The Other as a wider category, but with reference to a particular group and based on specific local content, is a result of a process of essentialization through the characteristic depiction of an undifferentiated entity without individual features and reduced to a few iconographic signs. In the process these images juxtaposed various societies and groups that coexisted as close or distant neighbors but were contrasted with each other for political, economical, religious, and cultural reasons. The image of Other as part of an artistic code can be a result of a belief, truth, or the imagination; on the other hand, it can be produced intentionally to address and embarrass someone. The differences between groups were categorized vis-a-vis cultural distinctions, and this way achieved a new quality—stereotype. Thus the representation of Other can result from the existence of dominant ideologies and cultural values, and the practice of Othering can derive from the processes of domination, expansion, and the historical narratives of confrontation and progress.

An idea of Otherness can be present during the processes of shaping and re-shaping identities through everyday framing, joking, and teasing, to ridiculing and provoking. It can be a component of broader discriminatory practice, reflecting anxieties, suspicions, prejudices, or even exclusions, as social commentary to insecurities and inequalities and to economic, social

and political change. We are also interested in mainstream and underground depictions of the Other through visual representations.

Our conference debate will address the following points by separate panels:

- Theoretical perspectives of experiencing and labeling cultural distinctions
- East-Central and South-Eastern European visual representations of oneself, one's neighbors, and distant Others
- East-Central and South-Eastern Europeans as seen from outside
- Comparative conclusions relating to regional ways of Othering, productions of difference (creative, individual, local, and regional application of ready-made visual representations as part of the "process" of Othering)
- Expressions of de-Othering and "being together" in visual material, when distinct peoples who belong in specific spaces develop closeness with one another.

We invite original papers from various disciplines such as anthropology, art history, sociology, and history. The deadline for submitting proposals is 15 September 2011.

To be held at:

Jakobinus Hall of the Academy, H-1014 Budapest, Országház u. 30,
Institute of Ethnology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest

Please send all proposals and other inquiries to Fruzsiná Cseh
[cseh\(AT\)etnologia.mta.hu](mailto:cseh(AT)etnologia.mta.hu)

June 2012

Anthropology in the World
RAI Conference
Clare Centre, British Museum
Contact: [rai_event_admin\(AT\)nomadit.co.uk](mailto:rai_event_admin(AT)nomadit.co.uk)

November 2012

AAA 111th Annual Conference
San Francisco, Hilton Towers, California
November, 14 – 18, 2012
www.aaanet.org/meetings

Children and Youth in a Changing World
IUAES Inter Congress
KIIT University, Bhubaneswar, Orisha
November 26 – 30, 2012
www.iuaes.org

2013

August 2013

Evolving Humanity, Emerging Worlds
17th IUAES World Congress
University of Manchester
August 5 – 10, 2013
www.iuaes.org

November 2013

AAA 112th Annual Meeting
Chicago Hilton
November 20 – 24, 2013
www.aaanet.org/meetings

OBITUARY

Walter Dostal | 1928-2011

Walter Dostal represented one of the most eminent representatives of German-speaking socio-cultural anthropology after 1945. His family's experience as bilingual citizens of Czechoslovakia before and during WW II, their anti-Nazi orientation and the communist takeover at the end of the war profoundly shaped Dostal's engagement as a student and scholar in a field which at Vienna University still called itself "Voelkerkunde" during the 1950's. Those formative years in Dostal's career resulted in his clear rejection of speculative historicism and diffusionism, and in his priority for ethnographic fieldwork and solid historical evidence.

After his doctoral degree at Vienna University, his early empirical studies in the Arab Gulf countries during the 1950's, and in southern Yemen (early 1960's) in fact made Dostal the world's first professional socio-cultural anthropologist to carry out ethnographic fieldwork in eastern and southern Arabia. He established his reputation as an excellent analyst of ethnography and history already through his first book on the Bedouins in Southern Arabia. In 1965, he left his position as curator of the Vienna Museum for Ethnology's Middle Eastern Department to become the founding professor at Bern University's Seminar for Ethnology, which he helped to build up throughout the subsequent decade. In 1975, he returned to Vienna to take over Chair I of what today is the University's Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology.

His study of the market of San'a, and his co-editorship (with Georg Gruenberg) of the results from the first Barbados conference on native Americans' rights highlighted his growing interest in socio-economic topics, and in what then were relevant new issues such as indigenous struggles, gender issues, and questions of political power. As chair of the Vienna department, he further elaborated these interests through his publications on the intersection between environment and society, his edited volume "On Social Evolution", and his studies on tribal organization and development in Arabia. Those years also showed that in several important ways, Dostal for some time pursued a German-speaking version of what was contemporary neo-evolutionism in North America and in western Europe.

After becoming a corresponding (1977) and a full member (1993) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Dostal re-invigorated the field's institutional unit there as well. Through the Academy's Commission for Social Anthropology, he promoted new fieldwork projects in Tibet and the Himalayan areas, in Southeast Asia, and in southern Arabia. Several generations of contemporary socio-cultural anthropologists in Vienna, Berne and elsewhere were his doctoral students, benefitting from his wide ethnographic expertise and his competent reading of the disciplinary production in several languages other than German, including English, French, Italian, Russian and Arabic. During his later years, Dostal continued his prolific publication activities, which included his book on equality and hierarchy in Arabia, his two volumes on the Czech-Austrian 19th century Yemeni scholar Eduard Glaser, and his two edited books on the southwestern provinces of Saudi-Arabia. After his retirement from the University Department in 1996, Dostal continued at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in helping to build the current Institute for Social Anthropology there. Walter Dostal will be remembered as one of the pioneers in post-war German-speaking socio-cultural anthropology who decisively contributed to its re-connection and integration into today's global discipline.

Andre Gingrich, *University of Vienna*