

Letter from the President

Susana Narotzky

Dear EASA members,

Since the last Newsletter the Executive Committee has had to address many issues, some of them requiring difficult decisions. We also have very encouraging news in relation to some of the institutional interventions that we have undertaken on behalf of social anthropologists and of our discipline. Finally, the Executive Committee wants to open a debate in relation to membership, and we want to encourage all members to participate.

As you know through the previous Newsletter, EASA received a petition from Professor Andy Smith of the University of Glasgow asking for the support of EASA as an institution against the proposed cuts in the sociology area that would directly affect anthropologists which teach in the programme. A letter was addressed to the Principal by the EASA president on behalf of the Executive Committee. We were requested by Professor Andy Smith for permission to publicize it on facebook, but we denied such permission on the grounds that the letter was a private letter to the Principal. We are happy to say that we were recently informed by Professor Muscatelli, Principal of the University of Glasgow, that current staffing levels in Anthropology would be maintained (cf. Annex). This is excellent news not only because it will keep anthropology and the anthropologists teaching it at Glasgow in good standing, but because EASA as an institution has been able to make a difference.

On a similar vein, in response to the European Commission Green Paper which was included in the last Newsletter –Towards a common strategic framework for EU research and innovation funding—we decided to produce an institutional response to the questionnaire on behalf of EASA and also to write a letter from the President summarizing our thoughts. Both documents were sent to the Directorate-General for Research (cf. Annex). Although it is soon to know the results of this collective debate, the speech of Máire GEORGHEGAN-QUINN European Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science delivered at the British Academy London - 10 November 2011 on „The future of Social Sciences and Humanities in Horizon 2020“ <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/11/741&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> seems encouraging. This speech can be read as a response to the multiple institutional pressures that the European Commission has received which have included those of EASA. An Open Letter addressed to the European Commissioner for Research and Innovation (<http://www.eash.eu/open-letter2011/>) also underlined the need for a strong and autonomous presence of the Social Sciences and Humanities in the next European research framework Horizon 2020 and has probably enhanced the impact of smaller Scientific Associations.

Regarding the EASA biennial conference that will take place in Paris, several things should be noted. During this period the Scientific Committee of the 2012 EASA conference in agreement with the Executive Committee had to define the Theme of the conference. Two themes were proposed and “Uncertainty and disquiet” was selected by a majority vote of the Scientific Committee. We also decided on a Keynote speaker for the Conference: Caroline Humphrey was invited to deliver the Keynote and accepted. Other issues were raised and have been settled. As a result of the call for workshops the Scientific Committee received an unusual amount of proposals. This new and unexpected situation, an expression of the growth of EASA and its dynamism, unfortunately required that the Scientific Committee decide on a peer-review system that had to be put into place at short notice, due to the very tight organization schedule of the conference. The Executive Committee is conscious that this has created uneasiness and discontent. In an attempt to explain the circumstances that had guided our actions and clarify the decision-making process we have written an Open Letter to workshop proposal convenors (cf. Annex). As this situation is bound to reproduce itself in the future, the Executive Committee will have to review and clarify the workshop proposal process, and we encourage suggestions by the membership.

EASA is faced with a growth crisis in a number of fronts that needs to be addressed with participation of the membership. We would like to get members to contribute ideas in regard to the future of EASA, its structure and the best way to serve the interests of the community of anthropologists working in Europe. Therefore the Executive Committee would very much like to get feedback from the membership on three main issues that have been exercising the committee and which they would like to discuss further. We can list them as follows: 1) Sponsorship requirements for membership, 2) Voting rights of Associate Members and 3) Student Members participation (cf. Annex). We hope that you will all contribute ideas that will provide the basis for our work.

At the Athens AGM the EASA book series editor James Carrier presented a report detailing the status of projects. We were very pleased to learn that there are nineteen projects that are in production or on-going, and four new projects to which must be added the manuscripts submitted to the prize competition. The EASA book prize competition received 14 manuscripts before the deadline, these will be treated in the same way as submissions to the book series before being evaluated for the prize adjudication. The Journal editor Mark Maguire presented a very encouraging report. Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale is growing and generating revenues. This has required a turn toward professionalization of the staff with the recruitment of Ms Johanna Markkula as Assistant Editor and Dr Vlad Naumescu as Book Review Editor. The challenge now is to pursue the increase in quality and visibility of the Journal. In response to the Executive Committee’s interest in increasing member’s participation, Rohan Jackson of NomadIT presented a report suggesting new forms to enhance communication with and between members through IT tools. The redesign of the EASA webpage is under way and we hope to be able to have a new website soon. Our treasurer, David Shankland had excellent news regarding EASA’s finances. As a result, more resources will be available to fund travel to the Paris Conference for those in need. Isabelle Rivaol reported on the Paris conference preparation.

Finally, I would like to publicly thank Professor Antonius C.G.M. Robben, of Utrecht University, for being our Keynote speaker at the AGM in Athens in October, and delivering a magnificent and exciting speech on the subject of “The sense of virtual violence: mimesis and immediation during nocturnal combat in modern warfare”.

I hope we will all work together in addressing the challenges that EASA faces in this new conjuncture.

Open letter to workshop proposal convenors from the Scientific Committee of EASA 2012 Conference Nanterre

Following the request by a number of workshop convenors that the Scientific Committee clarifies the process that has guided the selection of workshops for the EASA 2012 Conference in Nanterre, the Scientific Committee wants to make the following points:

In the first meeting with the local organising committee (Feb ,11), the material conditions of the venue at the Université de Nanterre (number of rooms available for workshops, delegates that could be accommodated in plenary session halls, etc.), as well as the convenient length of the conference (number of total days, number of hours per day) were considered. These aspects unavoidably set limits to the number of workshops that could be planned for.

An additional consideration was to keep the conference within the range of 1200-1400 delegates (a slight increase from the two previous conferences in Maynooth and Ljubljana) in an attempt to avoid the AAA ,mega-conference' model.

A final consideration was to retain the ,EASA model' of 20 minute presentations and a maximum of three 1h30mn periods per workshop.

All of the above considerations led to limiting the number of possible workshops to a 130-140 range, which meant an increase from the previous conferences (Maynooth 125, Ljubljana 121, Bristol 102, Vienna 76).

The call for workshops subsequently produced 242 proposals. The Scientific Committee was faced for the first time in EASA conferences' history with the need to make a selection that would be leaving out around 40% of proposed workshops.

The criteria that were agreed upon by the Scientific Committee in a second meeting (Oct. 2011) were: First, all the workshops not complying with the explicitly stated rules of having at least two co-convenors, and from different institutions would not be considered. Second, each member of the Scientific Committee would rank each workshop on a scale of 1-3 according to precedence based on quality.

The Scientific Committee considered using other criteria such as privileging co-convenors from different countries, including a balance of European regions, or including one workshop per EASA Network. Only the last criterion was retained and included as a preference criterion in the quality assessment.

Since the list was produced, we have tracked down a couple of apparent infringements to the ,rule' of convenors having different institutions which we are now addressing. It should be noted that these occur not because of lack of vigilance or uneven application of the criteria, but due to the way in which second/third convenor contact details are entered in EASA's electronic conference system, and the fact that we had aimed to turn around decisions on the workshops very quickly in order to give more time to eventual paper presenters.

The fact that the Scientific Committee is a large group of 16 scholars with different interests and anthropological backgrounds was deemed to be a balancing factor of subjective biases in the unavoidably problematic and polemic selection of workshop proposals.

After the Scientific Committee of 16 members ranked the workshops a line was drawn at 142.

This was a very difficult decision and one that we knew would cause disappointment. All members of the Scientific Committee witnessed how some of their preferred workshops were not accepted. However, the process was done in good faith, trying to preserve the qualities of size and conviviality that have made EASA conferences a particularly appraised genre.

We are aware that *all* selection processes are imperfect and can be bettered, and the Executive Committee remains open to suggestions for future conferences. In the present conjuncture we ask convenors with workshops that were not included to try and understand the complex considerations that guided the process and decisions of the Scientific Committee.

EASA Memberships Categories | Call for Discussion

The Executive Committee

In response to issues raised by members during the Maynooth Members Forum, the incoming EASA Executive has been discussing the existing membership categories for our association. We would very much like to get feedback from the membership on three main issues that have been exercising the committee and which they would like to discuss further. We can list them as follows:

- Sponsorship requirements
- Voting rights of Associate Members
- Student Members

The first concerns the existing sponsorship requirements for membership to EASA. As you know, at present we require two sponsors to vouch for new members before their application is accepted. There is no doubt that the founders of EASA, and subsequent executive committees, have thought long and hard about how to best grow a community of scholars with a shared stake in social anthropology from widely diverse academic traditions and conditions. It has worked. EASA has grown and flourished. The question that the current executive committee is struggling with is whether sponsorship requirements for new members are, today, an asset or a hindrance. Sponsorship requests multiply, understandably, prior to our conferences and substantial administrative effort and cost is currently expended in contacting and chasing up sponsors. Furthermore, the procedure seems to be explicitly resented by some anthropologists as unnecessarily controlling.

Arguments in favour of maintaining sponsorship include its capacity to maintain the integrity of the association and to ensure that it is what it says it is: not only a society of scholarship but also, and more precisely, a society of social anthropologists either working or qualified in Europe. Furthermore, having sponsors makes explicit one's academic and anthropological links not only as a means of verification but also as a mechanism of inclusion.

Today and in the near future, some major roles of EASA may be to represent and to defend the interests of the discipline and of us anthropologists, to voice when programmes of social anthropology or departments are threatened in academia, or when research funds seem to "forget" us. It is important to have at European level an association which has a clear profile of professional social anthropologists. This is the best position to interact and cooperate with scholars from other disciplines and to represent powerfully social anthropology vis-à-vis the politics of education and research. Membership already fluctuates heavily before and after EASA's biennial conferences. Would open applications enhance this "hop on hop off" approach to membership? If so, is it important?

Arguments against include its connotations of patronage and, perhaps, elitism. It is not clear that sponsorship 'polices' the boundaries of our discipline in ways that we think it does, or indeed, whether the boundaries ought to be policed at all in a time of interdisciplinary vocations. It could be argued that the interest and effort that becoming an active member of the EASA require should be sufficient guarantors of incoming membership. Requirements as to the professional qualifications to become a member could be maintained on CV credentials and mutual trust, without additional requirements. The benefits derived from deceptive misuse of credentials to become a member of EASA seem infrequent and irre-

maintain sponsorship practices. Moreover, the practice of requiring sponsors is unusual in other learned associations.

The executive committee is aware that some members are not happy in having to either ask for, or act as, sponsors. But how widespread is this disquiet? If other professional associations in our discipline do not require sponsorship, does sponsorship mark us out as a different kind of association? And then, what kind of difference do we want to highlight with this practice? Is that a good thing?

The second membership question we would like to solicit views on is whether Associate Members (AM) should be permitted to vote. The associate membership category acts to include colleagues who "do not meet the criteria for FULL membership, but who can show evidence of substantial and active involvement in the pursuit of social anthropology - for example those from non-European institutions with non-European qualifications". At present, AMs pay the same fees as full members and receive the same benefits; however, they may only speak in the AGM, and they may not stand for office or vote.

The executive would like to get some feedback as to the following possibilities:

- the need for a separate category of membership on the present grounds (non-European degree or non-European professional basis)
- the need for a separate category of membership on any other grounds,
- the possibility of giving Associate Members the same rights as Full members except those of being nominated for the executive committee

The third question we would like to solicit views on is how to involve the student membership more in the workings of EASA. Currently students comprise 25% of our membership. They are of course a transient category, moving on, we hope in many cases, from student to full membership and thus rights for voting and for being candidate at elections to the Executive Committee. At present, students may raise motions at AGMs/Members Forum/EGMs and they may participate in network activities. However, the Executive wants to solicit suggestions about how to involve student members more in the organisation/working of EASA. We would like to get feedback from all members in relation of how best to serve the student membership.

We feel we need to probe the membership for their views on these three issues and for further suggestions.

Please send your comments to the following address:

debate@easaonline.org

Accounts 11th Biennial EASA Conference, Maynooth 2010

Income Item	Amount in €	Expenditure Item	Account €
Funds raised	31008	University of Maynooth bill	48758
WGF grant	10000	Buses and cabs	4250
Publisher income	6400	Reception & banquet costs	11248
Entertainment ticket sales	2410	Social programme costs	9700
Regn & banquet income	111623	Presidents reception	2138
EASA travel grant funds	840	Publisher receptions	1249
		Poster, book, badges, conference materials, t-shirts	11466
		Delegate fund	13683
		Interpretation costs	1012
		EASA admin, organisation, clerical costs	5201
		Volunteer coordinator payment	1500
		Banking & accountancy costs	4198
		NUIM costs	9000
		NomadIT bill	29590
Total Income	162.281	Total Expenditure	152.993
Surplus generated	€ 9.288		
NOTES			
Exchange Rate for £ costs: GBP 1,1			

Minutes AGM | Athens, October 7, 2011

[Starts at 5:25 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.]

Participants: Executive complete, 3 members – no quorum for any decision-making!

- Reports | according to the reports given at Executive Meeting
- Information about EASA 2012
- Announcement of Search for new Treasurer and Secretary
- Requests or questions by members:
 - How many issues of Journal currently published: around 2.000
 - Regarding the search of new Treasurer and Secretary: they would need a strong institutional support
 - If EASA conferences meanwhile such a success, could it be possible to think about yearly conferences? This would, of course, require another organisational structure which is yet not given

6:30 p.m. | Around 20 participants

Keynote: Antonius C.G.M. Robben | University of Utrecht

"The sense of virtual violence: mimesis and immediation during nocturnal combat in modern warfare." (See p. 11)

7:15 – 8:15 p.m.

Reception by EASA-Executive

Reports

Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale

A report by the editorial team | Mark Maguire and David Berliner

We are delighted to have taken over the role of joint Editors following a period of sustained growth and quality output by the previous team, Helena Wulff and Dorle Dracklé. Despite the current economic climate, SAAS is doing well financially. In order to expand the journal, we made the initial decision to professionalize the editorial assistant(s) role, and in December 2010 Johanna Markkula (PhD candidate EHESS/Stanford University) was appointed as our new Assistant Editor. Dr Vlad Naumescu took on the role of Book Reviews Editor.

Over the course of our term, we intend to increase the quality and range of our issues. We will continue to emphasize the publication of high-quality peer reviewed scholarly articles, but we also aim to expand the inclusion of debates, review essays, open comments and are pleased to announce the establishment of a young scholars' forum. We encourage readers to consider submissions to all of these areas of the journal.

The journal does face a number of challenges. Over the course of our term we intend to increase the speed of manuscript processing – the timeline from submission to publication should take less than one year. To assist us, we intend to promote the journal vigorously at international events and appoint an international editorial advisory board.

Over the next number of years we are also publishing a number of special issues on key topics within the discipline.

EASA Book Series

James Carrier

The series aims to publish works that address worthwhile questions in a cogent, persuasive and fluent way that will attract a substantial readership. Works can be monographs or edited collections, concerned with any part of the world.

If you are working on a monograph or edited collection, or considering working on one, you are encouraged to communicate with the series editor, James Carrier (jgc@jgcarrier.demon.co.uk), or consult the 'book series' part of the EASA web site (<http://www.easaonline.org/bookseri.htm>).

The series editor is happy to provide advice and guidance in the preparation of proposals for the series, and to answer any questions that potential contributors may have.

The series draws on the efforts of many people. Prime among them is those who comment on the proposals and manuscripts that people submit, and without their thoughtful effort the series could not operate. In recognition of that effort, the series editor acknowledges the following people, and thank them for their assistance:

Hayder Al-Mohammad | Ruy Blanes | Geert De Neve | Brian Durrans | Paola Filippucci | Henri Gooren | Narmala Halstead | Mark Harris | Peter Hervik | John.Hutnyk | Bruce Kapferer | Jacqueline Knorr | Werner Krauss | Claudia Liebelt | Jeremy Macclancy | Leonard Mars | Jon Mitchell | Anand Pandian | Peter Phillimore | David Picard | Alison Shaw | Moshe Shokeid | Gavin Smith | Luis Vivanco | Jeremy Wallach | Pnina Werbner



European Association of Social Anthropologists
Association Européenne des Anthropologues Sociaux

The President

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

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

To

Prof. Anton Muscatelli
Principal of the University
University of Glasgow

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,



Prof. Susana Narotzy
President
European Association of Social Anthropologists

e-mail response from Professor Anton Muscatelli

De: Anton Muscatelli [mailto:postbox@glasgow.ac.uk]
Enviado el: viernes, 08 de julio de 2011 17:20
Asunto: Anthropology
Importancia: Alta

Further to our correspondence, I am writing to let you know that the University Court at its meeting on 22 June in considering the report and recommendations from the Consultation panel agreed that the current staffing levels in Anthropology should be maintained in order to support the interdisciplinary development of teaching and research across the School of Social and Political Sciences and in the Research Institute for Health and Well-Being.

May I take this opportunity of thanking you for your interest in the University and for your continuing support.

Anton Muscatelli FRSE AcSS
Principal
University of Glasgow

The University of Glasgow, charity number SC004401

AGM — Athens Keynote Speech

The Sense of Virtual Violence: Mimesis and Immediation during Nocturnal Combat in Modern Warfare¹

Antonius C.G.M. Robben
Utrecht University

The twenty-first century is witnessing a technological revolution in warfare. Soldiers have become mediated soldiers through the use of advanced electro-optic devices that turn combat missions into virtual operations. Thermal and enhanced night vision equipment, satellites, and unmanned aerial vehicles or drones are providing a comprehensive visual, almost panoptical, overview of battle space through mediated images. Night vision technology in particular is profoundly affecting the sensory perception of soldiers fighting today's wars. Image intensifiers turn night into day, allow soldiers to engage enemy combatants unawares, and give them an illusion of real-life ocular vision. These developments invite an anthropological analysis because of the cultural and ideological interpretation of the virtual images, the complex interaction of agency and technology, and the visual practices or skilled visions of soldiers engaged in nocturnal combat².

The US armed forces have been at the forefront of the development of optical media in combat operations. This is not to say that sound, smell, taste and touch have entirely lost relevance in contemporary warfare. Sound and chemical detectors, movement sensors, and war dogs are still being used, but optical devices outnumber them by far because sight and mediated images occur at light speed, irrespective of the spatial distance between observers and observed.

Thermal imaging systems detect the infrared radiation from heat sources, while image intensifiers amplify weak ambient light from the moon and stars to see objects. Both devices run the risk of optical tunnel vision and misinterpretation. Unlike the sniper's telescope that leaves the distant object optically intact and visually accessible in its context, night vision goggles produce a limited field of vision of 40-60° and display monochromatic images that enhance the possibility of interpretive error. The large number of civilian casualties of nocturnal raids in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan has demonstrated the pitfalls of such mediated warfare.

Electro-optic engineers have been improving night vision devices steadily, making soldiers feel closer to the real experience of unmediated combat. Paradoxically, this technical advance caused immediation as a detrimental side effect. Immediation is the process by which users no longer realize that sight and interaction are electronically mediated³. The better the visual mediation of reality by night vision devices becomes, the less soldiers will realize that reality and image are conflated. Watching will seem like seeing because immediacy naturalizes the artificial sight by mistaking the night vision goggles for the human eyes themselves. The trouble with this mimetic mediation is that soldiers enwrapped in life-threatening and attention-demanding combat forget that the reality they perceive is mediated, making soldiers mistake a person's image for the living human being.

The mediation of natural vision with high-tech devices does not imply an autonomous technological dynamic that overtakes people's power of intervention, as Paul Virilio and Friedrich Kittler have suggested, because vi-

sion is always culturally shaped and politically constructed, as noted by Michael Herzfeld⁴. Technology is infused with human agency that sets and can reset the controls of technical devices. Still, the virtual sensorium is not neutral before human agency. New technical capabilities interact with the user's visual spectrum, and thus yield new actions and meanings⁵. How soldiers look through night vision devices influences whether people are seen as harmless or threatening, and whether they are identified with one social group, insurgent organization or another⁶. Combatants perceive the people occupying a war zone—whether through natural or mediated eyesight—in a social, political, and emotional framework. This framework is transformed when natural eyesight is mediated by night vision devices because the soldiers' field of vision is optically altered. Vision during combat turns into a hostile gaze because of how soldiers look at human beings as potential targets, the intent with which they judge the behavior and appearance of people in the war zone, and the troops' power to inflict harm on others. The interpretive framework of enmity leads to a hostile gaze which reviews the visual images in its own terms because the immediacy of technical devices makes them unaware of the selective technical mediation.

Manichaeism was the cultural framework that influenced the hostile gaze of American troops during the Iraq War, especially after September 2003 when the Iraqi hostility towards Coalition forces grew substantially. George W. Bush represented the so-called global war on terror as an epic confrontation between good and evil, between those who stood on the side of freedom, democracy and justice for all and those intent on creating a global caliphate ruled by sharia legislation⁷. This Manichaean mind-set carried the force of authority for the US military fighting in Iraq by coming from the commander-in-chief's mouth, and made combat troops prone to moral disengagement. Political leaders and military commanders defined the armed conflict as a just war against an evil force, while troops were facing combatants who were living among the people and believed to pose an existential threat against the American way of life. The Manichaean cultural framework blurred the boundaries between combatants and civilians, dehumanised them both, and confirmed the racial stereotyping and demonization inculcated during basic training. The dehumanization process took an additional step in the Iraq War through the visual mediation of enemy combatants and Iraqi civilians by night vision equipment.

Night vision devices produced an immediation of combat that mistook night for day and virtual human representations for the people themselves. US soldiers observed their targets up close during the Iraq War, as if in face-to-face combat, but they spotted the people unawares through electronically mediated image-realities. This advanced spectral technology revolutionized nocturnal operations. The life-threatening combat zone, the just war rhetoric, and the dehumanization of Iraqi civilians and insurgents influenced how soldiers saw and acted upon the green and white silhouettes produced by image

intensifiers and thermal imaging equipment. The ambivalent sight of people as both human and virtual, and the emotional distance of a mediated battle space, arose from a mimetic process through which images became realities. The mediated hostile gaze created images that through their very materialization produced a perceived threat and evoked hostile emotions. The killing was virtual because of the hostile gaze, yet real because of the immediation of the night vision goggles.

Notes

¹ Abbreviated version of the keynote speech at EASA's Annual General Meeting held in Athens, Greece, on October 7, 2011.

² Cristina Grasseni, ed. 2007 *Skilled Visions: Between Apprenticeship and Standards*. New York: Berghahn; Tim Ingold, 2000 *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.

³ Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, 2000 *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

⁴ Paul Virilio, 1994 *The Vision Machine*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press; Friedrich Kittler, 2010 *Optical Media: Berlin Lectures 1999*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Michael Herzfeld, 2007 'Envisioning Skills: Insight, Hindsight, and Second Sight', in *Skilled Visions*. Grasseni, ed., Pp.207-218.

⁵ Bruno Latour, 1999 *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

⁶ David Howes, 2003 *Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

⁷ Alexander Laban Hinton, 2010 "'Night Fell on a Different World': Dangerous Visions and the War on Terror, a Lesson from Cambodia", in *Iraq at a Distance: What Anthropologists Can Teach Us About the War*. Antonius C.G.M. Robben, ed., Pp.24-56. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Antonius Robben is Senior Professor of Anthropology at *Utrecht University*, the Netherlands, and past President of the *Netherlands Society of Anthropology*. His most recent books include *Political Violence and Trauma in Argentina* (2005), which won the *Textor Prize* from the *American Anthropological Association* in 2006, and the edited volumes *Iraq at a Distance: What Anthropologists Can Teach Us About the War* (2010), and *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader* (2012, 2nd edition; co-editor Jeffrey Sluka).

Report of the Mediterraneanist Network (MedNet) of EASA

Jutta Lauth Bacas and William Kavanagh

As conveners of the EASA Mediterraneanist Network (MedNet), we are pleased to announce the recent publication of a special issue of the *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* (Vol. 20/1, 2011) edited by William Kavanagh and Jutta Lauth Bacas (in cooperation with Paul Clough) and published by the Mediterranean Institute of the University of Malta. This special issue of the *JMS* with the title 'Unfolding Perspectives in Mediterranean Anthropology' is based on papers presented by EASA members at the 2nd MedNet workshop which took place in Athens in the autumn of 2009. The contributions to this special issue follow a threefold approach to the anthropology of the Mediterranean region, investigating questions of locality, social networking and identity formation in different countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea.

The next important event of the EASA MedNet network will be our workshop on 'Reflecting Anthropological Fieldwork in the Mediterranean Area' at the University Ca' Foscari of Venice, which will take place from 27 to 29 October 2011. Dr Lidia Sciamia of Oxford will be giving a keynote speech on 'Rethinking the Mediterranean: Topos or Mirage?' and a further twenty-five papers are scheduled to be presented by the workshop participants.

The Mediterraneanist network (MedNet) consists of one hundred members of EASA who are carrying out ethnographic fieldwork in at least ten countries of the Mediterranean basin. More information and a documentation of activities can be found on our website: <http://www.easaonline.org/networks/mednet/index.htm>

Calendar

Dear Colleagues,

Information about upcoming conferences will be published in the future also on EASA's website.

Thomas Fillitz, Newsletter Editor

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
Fruzsina Cseh [cseh\(AT\)etnologia.mta.hu](mailto:cseh(AT)etnologia.mta.hu)

June 2012

Anthropology in the World' Conference

The Royal Anthropological Institute,
British Museum Centre for Anthropology
British Museum, Clore Centre, London
June 8 – 12, 2012

The aim of the conference is to explore the manifold ways in which anthropology in its widest sense has been influential outside academia. It is aimed therefore to having a widespread appeal to the general public, to those anthropologists who are working in careers outside the university, to academic anthropologists who are interested in the way their subject is diffused and used in a wider society, and to those students who are interested in applying their anthropological skills outside the academic field.

Panels may be conventional in format, or they may be fluid, for example round-tables, film showings, or debates. Please see further details and the online-form for submitting a panel on our website: <http://www.therai.org.uk/conferences/anthropology-in-the-world/>

The call for panels is now open until 28th October 2011 (call for papers will be running from 11 November – 6 January 2012)

Contact: [rai_event_admin\(AT\)noma-dit.co.uk](mailto:rai_event_admin(AT)noma-dit.co.uk)
RAI International Festival of Ethnographic Film: <http://raifilmfest.org.uk>

Migration und Demokratie/Migration and Democracy 12th International Conference

Centre de Documentation sur les Migrations Humaines (Dudelange/Luxembourg)
Centre de Documentation sur les Migrations Humaines CDMH (Dudelange, Luxemburg)
Institute for Regional and Migration Research IRM (Trier, Germany)
Alpen-Adria-University Klagenfurt, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Intercultural Education (Klagenfurt, Austria)
Institute of Integration and Participation at the School of Social Work FHNW (Olten, Switzerland)

June 14 – 16, 2012

In democratic societies, decision-making is based on the political and social participation of their members. As a normative reference, democracy implies a demand that all individuals be able to realize their destiny while being responsible for their own choices. Hence, the decision about who is a member of a society and accordingly, who can take part in its decision-making, is a central problem in democratic societies. In modern nation-states, citizenship is governed by laws that define who is allowed to participate politically; For the most part, migrants are excluded from political decision-making processes. At the same time, the question arises to what extent political affiliation qua citizenship is sufficient to allow appropriate participation in democratic societies. Despite the liberal granting of citizenship to migrants, as the example of France, for instance, shows, social and cultural distinctions still operate that can lead to their devaluation and exclusion. Do societies now also need new strategies for social and cultural equality alongside political participation in order to enforce democracy in its institutional as well as extra-institutional forms?

While European nation-states have governed access to citizenship very differently from and have not envisioned themselves as immigration societies, this represents a core component of the socio-cultural self-image of typical immigration nations such as Australia, Canada and the United States. This difference is a serious one: Where societies lack a self-understanding of being immigration societies, migration is perceived as a special case. In contrast, where it constitutes an important part of the national self-image, migration is socially and politically self-evident. Social and political consequences arise for the design of migration policies.

In recent years, the relationship between migration and democracy has been characterized by contradictions: On the one hand, migration policies are increasingly adjusted to the needs of the labour market; i. e. migration is judged favourably and supported if an economic demand can thereby be met. This is apparent, for instance, in discussions regarding the demand for skilled labour and the shortage of nurses. On the other hand, migration is regarded as a special case politically, which we see where immigration and settlement are made difficult despite labour market demands, and where border control measures are tightened. In ad-

dition, populism is growing in many European countries, directed against immigration and the naturalisation of migrants. Thus, popular votes on the ban on building minarets and deporting delinquent foreigners obtained a majority in Switzerland. From this point of view, majority rule is a democratic form of decision-making that can be criticised with respect to the legal rights of minorities. Here, alternative interpretations of the democratic communal life beyond institutionalised democracies are at risk of disappearing from view.

Against the background of these disparate developments, questions arise about the meaning and effects of migration for democratic societies and the implications of different democratic demands for migration societies: What different kinds of development appear in this context? Of what importance are the missing participation rights of migrants in democratic societies? In migration societies, individual and collective rights often compete with each other – how do democratic societies address these contradictions? What religious matters and topics have gained political and social importance in recent years? How important is the gender gap in the context of migration and democracy? How is political participation to be improved at all political levels and what developments are discernible in different societies? What concepts of democracy are articulated in migration policy? How are populist tendencies to be interpreted vis-à-vis migration in democratic societies?

This conference will discuss the relationship between migration and democracy. We invite proposals for papers on the following topics:

- § Theoretical perspectives on democracy and migration
- § Empirical findings concerning social marginalisation and participation of migrants
- § Objectives and legitimacy of migration policies in democratic societies
- § Political and social rights of migrants and minorities in democratic societies
- § Citizenship law, civil society and migration: New perspectives on political participation?
- § Resistance and political involvement by migrants and (self-)organisation by migrants as a democratic form of articulation

§ Migration and democracy in memory cultures

If you are interested in presenting, we kindly ask you to submit a short summary (500 words max.) with the title of your paper, a short biographical notice and a contact address (e-mail, telephone, and postal address).

Please use the online-form on www.irm-trier.de

Deadline for proposals: 30th of December 2011

Feedback by the program committee: 10th of February 2012

Conference languages: German and English

Information and contact: www.irm-trier.de; Tagung2012@irm-trier.de

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