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Foreword

Our seventh biennial report is divided into two volumes: a first volume containing contributions from the various departments, research groups and networks, including publication lists; and a second volume providing further information on the scientific activities and achievements of all researchers.

This new edition of the biennial report bears witness to significant changes in the structure of our institute and in our research themes. In March 2012, the third department, ‘Law & Anthropology’, was founded under the direction of Marie-Claire Foblets. In the corresponding chapter of the report, readers may follow the development of this department in its first two years.

The International Max Planck Research School, ‘Retaliation, Mediation and Punishment’ concluded its first phase in 2013 and, as of 2014 has been renewed for another 6 years. A second Max Planck International Research School, ‘Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia’ was founded in October 2012. Both Research Schools have their seat at our Institute.

In October 2013, a new Max Planck Fellow Group, entitled ‘Connectivity in Motion: Port Cities of the Indian Ocean’, was founded under the direction of Burkhard Schnepel, Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg. Researchers for this group have already begun to arrive and take up their work.

Members of our Institute, and many others beyond it, were saddened by the death of Franz von Benda-Beckmann on 7 January 2013. As one of the two heads of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, along with Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, Franz contributed in many ways to making our Institute what it is today. He is dearly missed. An obituary by Judith Beyer and Markus Weilenmann will appear in volume 138, number 1 of the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.

John Eidson
Kirsten Endres
Bettina Mann
Martin Ramstedt
Getting Back to the Basics

It may be advisable to listen to a teacher from time to time. Robin Fox, who belongs to the generation of my teachers and whose book *Kinship and Marriage* (1967)\(^1\) I, like many others, have long used to teach the ABCs of anthropology, made the following assessment of the state of our discipline in a recent book (from 2011, when its author was 77):

“[C]ultural anthropology becomes a writing exercise that ends up as a reorganization of fieldnotes under fashionable buzzword headings or as routinised indignation about social injustice of one form or another. Thus anthropology becomes just another ‘humanism’, subject to changing fads and fashions of interpretation”.\(^2\)

At around the same time, I engaged in some anthropological self-reflection and came to the conclusion that “innovation” in anthropology has a closer resemblance to changes in fashion than to “paradigm shifts” in the Kuhnian sense.\(^3\) Clearly, under such conditions, it is difficult to fit corroborated pieces of knowledge into larger wholes and to arrive at better and better explanations of the social world around us. A report like the present one, however, should address not only the analytical question (What makes anthropology tick?) but also the question of what we, as anthropologists, have done and what more we can do to make sure that our work in this Department and this Institute goes beyond a fashionable trade in buzzwords. How can we improve the prospects of producing reliable data, explaining them with reference to increasingly powerful theories, and contributing to a cumulative process of gaining useful knowledge? At the risk of being accused (wrongly, I hope, because I am aware of the epistemological issues that are at stake) of ‘naïve empiricism’, ‘scientism’, ‘Cartesianism’, or, even worse, ‘realism’, I lay out, in the following paragraphs, our research programme, much of which has already been put into practice and much of which still awaits realisation.

We aim at explaining things. This does not go without saying, as there are many anthropologists who aim at de-essentialising our notions or de-constructing our assumptions about society – perfectly valid aims, which fall short, however, of of-

---

ferring better explanations to replace the ones that have been deconstructed. Offering better explanations requires reflection on processes of data generation and on the ways in which bodies of data can be put into comparative perspective and related to theoretical questions. In what follows, I review recent developments in our theoretical work, then address problems of data documentation, which are, perhaps, fairly basic but which are still essential for making the process of knowledge production transparent and accessible to critical reflection.

On Comparative Methods and Theory Building

The Department aims to provide an intellectual environment that is conducive to attempts to find a common language and to compare results. We do not encourage students to participate in the cult of originality, i.e., to coin new concepts that serve less to advance knowledge than to establish trademarks for individual careers. Unless it is motivated by cogent arguments regarding the inadequacy of earlier concepts in their theoretical contexts or their empirical applications, terminological innovation is harmful. It spoils comparative analysis, which requires shared notions on a fairly broad scale.

Recent reviews of work produced within the Department’s research programme have been positive, emphasising our contribution to systematisation and our commitment to laying foundations that are strong enough to support more complex and more powerful theories. A review of my book, How Enemies Are Made, that appeared in *American Ethnologist* speaks of a “systematic and comprehensive work” on a “new theory”, the novelty of which lies less in its constituent parts than in providing “a cogent synthesis of an existing rich body of theoretical work that directs the reader to a systematic process for analysing conflict” (Straight 2011). A review in the journal *Ethnos* of the first three volumes of our series, *Integration and Conflict Studies*, published by Berghahn Books, stresses the “logical order” of our “well-organised” presentations. The reviewers also comment favourably on our emphasis on the efficiency of mental constructs in processes of identification – e.g., the variable plausibility of different options in processes of identification, their comparative power to convince, and the costs and benefits involved in selecting information intended to induce actors to identify themselves in one way or another:

4 Reflection on processes of data generation should attend, for example, to the role of our own perceptions, interests, and biases in determining what counts as ‘data’, to the perceptions with which our interlocutors confront us, to the interests that guide the production of knowledge, and to questions of the replicability and reliability of data.


7 In 2013, the sixth volume in this series appeared and the tenth was accepted for publication.
“Not only actors’ alliances and enemies, but also the corresponding cognitive products are the result of the maximization principle. This is an important innovation in Schlee’s modification of the RCT [Rational Choice Theory].”

We try to build theories with ideas that are down to earth and with explanations that have stood the test of time and experience. For example, a central point of our theorising, stated repeatedly in earlier reports and publications, is that any decision involving identification of self or other has implications for group size and that, whether by conscious reasoning or any other psychological mechanism, anticipated group size tends to influence such identification processes, leading to inclusive or exclusive rhetoric (inclusive if one wants to share costs, exclusive if one does not want to share benefits). With this formulation, we are building on one part of Max Weber’s work, which death prevented him from spelling out fully, namely, his discussion of “Open and Closed Relationships”. There, he

“reverts to his earlier statement that a cultural trait could serve as a starting point for monopolistic closure. He observes that a social relationship might be either open or closed to outsiders. The closure of a social relationship could offer individuals ‘opportunities for the satisfaction of spiritual or material interests’ (...) On the other hand, ‘If the participants expect that the admission of others will lead to an improvement of their situation, an improvement in degree, in kind, in the security or value of the satisfaction, their interest will be in keeping the relationship open’.”

Referring to the activities of our Department, Bošković and Ignjatović, in the review cited above, praise us for giving a new twist to Rational Choice Theory. Indeed, choices made by human beings, mirroring the behaviour of organisms in all species that have managed to survive until now, tend to be to their advantage and thus fit the Rational Choice model, regardless of which internal mechanism was employed in producing this result – e.g., hard thinking, ‘habitus’, socialisation, or biological adaptation. Some psychologists are interested in these mechanisms, but other theorists are mainly concerned with the outcomes. So Rational Choice Theory does not necessarily imply that people constantly think very hard, which is clearly not the case. It does assume, however, a certain conscious or unconscious utilitarianism. This utilitarianism clearly informs the choices we investigate in the

---

field of social identifications. But how about the categories and group definitions among which people choose? Our findings show that these too are shaped and transformed by ‘identity work’ in the context of competitive social games. This is not the only way in which economic principles affect categories and definitions. The purely cognitive sphere, free of material considerations – leisurely thinking, so to say – also obeys economic principles. The more parsimonious a theory or system of categories is, and the greater the consistency that it displays, the more appealing we find it. Even in the absence of materialist considerations, we cut superfluous parts with ‘Ockham’s razor’ for the sake of the elegance of our theories. Minimisation and maximisation are everywhere.

These more general economic principles should not be confused, however, with utilitarianism in a narrow sense. Fox, whom we cited above, illustrates this point in the following statement about attempts to explain the world, whether by scientists or others:

“(…) for Bacon, collecting and arranging was the beginning of scientific wisdom, and the savage mind does both as an appetitive activity. It needs no utilitarian stimulus; it feeds on the diversity of things to order them.” (Fox 2011: 38)

Since Lévi-Strauss, whose diction Fox adopts in this passage, we know that human beings do not need material incentives or any kind of pressure in order to engage in classification. They just do it. Ordering things according to similarities and differences has a long history, and it is, evidently, not even specifically human. Other vertebrates, at least, do it as well. According to the Rendille, a cow that has seen a snake at daytime will be afraid of a belt at night. This proverb tells us something about the richness of Rendille metaphors: It is a way of saying that a frightening experience may lead to over-cautiousness. But it also tells us something about cows. It is no doubt true that cows are capable of associating similar things with each other, though probably not in a disinterested fashion.

However, naming categories and discussing relations among them or among things that are variously categorised does seem to be specifically human. More than that, it seems to be deeply human and has probably been with us since the origin of our species. In their idling mode, our minds playfully engage in associations and classifications. Some of this engagement may turn out to be of practical use. By making associations between similar memories, we learn from experience. But external rewards are not necessary. Evidently, if the brain does what it likes to do anyhow, it also provides itself with its own internal rewards.

Therefore, we do not need Rational Choice Theory in order to explain why people classify subdivisions of the social world, much as they classify subdivisions of the animal, vegetable, or mineral worlds (or why sometimes their classifications cross the boundaries that separate these domains, as the classical studies of totemism have shown). Some do it professionally as anthropologists or sociologists; others
do it as carpenters or bus drivers – at any rate, as people who are not trained in the social sciences. In such cases, ‘scientists’ tend to speak rather unkindly of ‘naïve’ or ‘everyday’ or ‘popular’ systems of classification. Anthropologists, following the linguist Kenneth Pike, refer to the schemes of the people they study with the adjective ‘emic’ and (less often) to their own schemes as ‘etic’. My term for classifications and explanations of human beings and their collective life by those with no training in the social sciences is ethno-anthropology. We speak of ethno-biology when we refer to branches of knowledge among those whom we study that correspond roughly to the domain we call biology. More generally, we speak of ethno-science when referring to the broad range of classifications and explanations that our human subjects employ in their understandings of the world at large. So why not ‘ethno-anthropology’ for the ways in which the people we study discuss things that are largely equivalent to the subject matter of our discipline?

Despite our debt to Rational Choice Theory, we would never claim that the systems of knowledge in the social worlds that concern us (because they provide the frameworks for the choices that we analyse) are dictated by necessity or utility alone. Most fundamentally, they are the result of the playful activity of brains that appear to be too big for the practical tasks they had to perform as they evolved. They evolved among cooperative hunters, and cooperative hunting is something that wolves do quite well with much smaller brains. The evolutionary advantage of the large brains of humans (which may have resulted from intra-specific selection) is still a matter of debate among evolutionary anthropologists. These brains are only fully occupied by the needs of production and reproduction from time to time. They may give us an evolutionary advantage in the long run, both in our dealing with each other (in all sorts of cooperative and competitive games) and in coping with the vagaries of our non-human environment; but people who are engaged in structuring their social universe in terms of similarities and difference, and in classifying themselves and others are not guided only by consideration of utility or costs and benefits. They are just doing what human beings do anyhow. If incentives emerge that let re-identification or a reshaping of identities appear to be advantageous, identities tend to adjust to social and economic needs; but that is not the primary reason for their coming into being. Incentives and disincentives, along with costs and benefits, only start to play a role in processes of identification – and in our theorising – if we move one step further.
Recent Developments in Theory Building  
(with John Eidson)

So far, the Theory Group in our Department has produced an exploratory working paper in which we define basic terms, address critics who question the utility of the concept of ‘identity’, review the history of approaches to social and collective identities, and examine identification processes from different points of view. We are now at work on two articles, intended for publication in peer review journals, in which we refine and elaborate our framework for the analysis of collective identities and processes of identification. In the one of these articles, we offer a critical review of the most influential texts regarding social or collective identity in the recent social science literature, showing how our approach builds upon, differs from, or goes beyond them. In a second article, we focus on one aspect of our framework, namely, on the options open to individual actors in identifying with some of those with whom they interact and on their motives for doing so. Given the polyvalence of human relations, actors always have multiple possibilities in identifying with and differentiating themselves from others – with reference to various dimensions of identification such as kinship, gender, generation, locality, language, ethnicity, nationality, religious confession, etc. Options in identification processes depend on semantic relations among categories of identification, e.g., their mutual exclusivity, their degree of compatibility, or their taxonomic relations of inclusion and exclusion. With reference to such semantic relations, we differentiate various forms of identification, which, taken together, provide actors with a range of possibilities in acting in concert with members of categories or groups that vary in size, substance, and distribution in space. Variations in the way in which actors identify with others may be motivated by three factors, often in combination: situational relevance, changing circumstances, or interests – i.e., an actor’s interest in a particular collective identity as an end in itself or as a means to a related or an unrelated end.

When viewed in terms of these variables, the categories through which actors comprehend or represent social relations in processes of identification appear as objects of conscious or unconscious manipulation: they are moved up and down in the order of importance or salience and might be relocated in taxonomies; or they are widened to become more inclusive or squeezed to become less so. Taking all these factors into account, we seek to explain social action not by elevating particular dimensions of identification to the status of causal principles but by examining the relationship between two co-variants – interests and identification. One consequence

---

9 Donahoe, Brian, John Eidson, Dereje Feyissa, Veronika Fuest, Markus V. Hoehne, Boris Nieswand, Günther Schlee, and Olaf Zenker. 2009. The Formation and Mobilisation of Collective Identities in Situations of Conflict and Integration. Working Paper No. 116. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology. This text seems to have attracted some attention outside of our Institute, as our IT Department reports that it was downloaded by outside readers 474 times in 2012, its third year online.
of this argument is that the critique of essentialism (i.e., of explaining individual action with reference to the essential characteristics of a particular group), which has been formulated repeatedly by those sceptical of the analytical value of the concept of identity, must be supplemented with a critique of the concept of self-interest, which refers less to a choice between self and other than to a choice between two different rhetorical strategies, one inclusive and the other exclusive (from the viewpoint of an observer). Each strategy may take one of two forms: first, a choice between narrower and wider categories and, second, the alteration of the definition and boundaries of any given category (making it narrower or wider, rewriting its history and re-evaluating it in terms of its relative status).

Identification and Marginality

In those fields of applied knowledge that are related to anthropology, one does not find much discussion of identity and identification; rather, these concepts seem to dominate in the academic sphere and in an atmosphere that is very critical of applied social sciences, such as development studies and policy advice. What we find there instead is the concept of marginality. This concept is related to that of ‘frontier’ in the purer (basic, non-applied) social sciences, but it has a different normative load. While ‘frontier’ has a heroic ring to it, ‘margin’ has negative connotations. The margins need to be integrated, marginality to be overcome. Leaving the concept of ‘frontier’ aside, we explore in the following the relationship between ‘margins’ and ‘marginality’, on one hand, and ‘identity’ and ‘identification’, on the other. This exercise may help us to see whether our findings about the latter can be made relevant to those who are interested in the former – to those who want to help to integrate the margins and to help the marginal.

Joachim von Braun and Franz W. Gatzweiler10 define marginality as follows:

“an involuntary position and condition of an individual or group at the margins of social, political, economic, and biophysical systems, that prevent them from access to resources, assets, services, restraining freedom and choice, preventing the development of capabilities, and eventually causing extreme poverty (...). The marginality perspective encompasses those poor who are below certain thresholds and outside mainstream socio-economic and human geographical systems, where improved access to rights, resources, and services would help enable decent standards of living. With reference to biological systems, marginality describes the state of organisms outside ranges which are necessary for living systems.”

In describing how the concept is actually used, this definition is quite convincing. ‘Marginality’ is a spatial metaphor, and the description of the concept includes many more spatial or geographical metaphors: ‘position’, ‘access’, ‘below’ (thresholds), ‘outside’ (systems, ranges), and ‘mainstream’. Other elements are borrowed from economics: ‘assets’, ‘services’, ‘poverty’, and ‘standards of living’. The normative dimension is also clearly present: ‘freedom’, ‘improve’, ‘rights’, ‘help enable’, ‘decent’, and, once again, ‘standards’. Rich in allusions, this concept is persuasive because it is composed of elements drawn from different semantic dimensions. And that is what makes it problematic for analytical purposes. Are the margins always on the outside? If so, where is the inside and where is the middle? Can the margins also be in our midst? How can we un-mix the social and geographical connotations of this mixed concept?

Maybe we cannot disentangle the tangled strands of the concept of ‘marginality’. And here is where ‘identity’ and ‘identification’ come in. These concepts too require clarification, but to a much lesser degree. First, we have to make clear that we do not mean identity in the sense of Erik Erikson. His “ego identity”, which is necessary for the development of children and adolescents, refers primarily to a coherent understanding of oneself, i.e., to the individual’s feeling that he or she is the same person that others see in him or her. Erikson’s concept of “identity” is normative: it is characteristic of a well-adjusted person who is identical with himself or herself. Here, clearly, the static elements of this concept are emphasised. Such static elements are not completely absent in our concept of collective identities, insofar as considerations such as plausibility must be taken into account. One cannot re-define one’s identities and affiliations all the time without losing credibility and without getting entangled in contradictions. But our emphasis is clearly on changing identifications and their strategic aspects.

By understanding identities and identification processes to be more or less inclusive, we can penetrate some of the domains covered by others with the notion of ‘marginality’. In their introduction to *Pastoralism and Development in Africa*, Andy Catley, Jeremy Lind, and Ian Scoones summarise several contributions (discussed more fully in an article to appear in *Nomadic Peoples*), showing that, in a number of African countries, governments favour large-scale irrigated agriculture over pastoralism, even when the damage done to livestock production exceeds the gain for the overall economy derived from ‘modern development’. For this, Catley et al. have the following explanation:

“An important reason is the interest of governments in raising tax revenue and, more generally, to exert greater control over economic and political life at the margins. By controlling economic activity in the pastoral margins through re-

---

source grabs, ruling regimes are able to capture economic wealth for national development”.

But are government decisions regarding pastoralism really motivated by the desire to promote national development?

There is no doubt that ruling regimes are able to capture economic wealth that could be used for national development. But is that what they do? Sadly, historical evidence suggests that this is not usually the case. Newly available public wealth tends to be invested not in national development and the well-being of all citizens but in costly security apparatuses serving to consolidate the supremacy of the ruling elites. In other cases, public wealth ends up in private pockets of members of the state class – a fate sometimes shared by development money provided by foreign donors. The same might happen to money generated by ‘resource grabs’. The long-term land leases to foreign investors are often so ridiculously cheap that it is hard to explain their economic logic, unless one takes into account the possibility of kickbacks to those who make these decisions.

Wisely, Catley et al. do not describe “the state” as a monolithic actor, writing, instead, of “governments” and “ruling regimes”. Arguably, however, what governments do should be examined with reference to the perceived costs and benefits that particular actions have for those who carry them out. In the case of collective decisions, each actor is supposed to take the others into account. However, if a decision goes against someone’s personal interest, often he or she will resist it and exercise all possible influence to make it more favourable for himself or herself.

Here a complication arises. The ‘self’ can be widened by the process we call identification. When making important decisions, most people take into account the effects of these decisions not only for themselves but also for their families; and some people – though, presumably, fewer and fewer, as the identification widens – will also take into account the interests of their clans, firms, tribes, universities, nations, or even humankind and its future, as they perceive it. They may identify with more inclusive categories or groups because of institutional arrangements that punish them if they do not; or they may do so irrespectively of strictly individualistic considerations. In any event, the reference group for cost/benefit calculations (i.e., the unit to which they are perceived to accrue) tends to be larger than the individual. It includes the individual plus those with whom he or she identifies – and the extent to which he or she does so. In making decisions, then, the notion of ‘others’ comes into play in two different ways. One is cooperation: I need others to implement my decisions, and, therefore, I have to share possible gains with them so that they feel happy and continue to cooperate. The other is identification, which moves away from strict individualism to a larger reference group (be it narrow or wide) for pur-

poses of cost/benefit analysis. Both narrow and wide identifications can be in play simultaneously in a single decision: I do what is good for the clan as long as it does not harm my family or me personally; I forego a bit of my profit to let others, whose help I need, participate; I help my group because I identify with it but also because helping my group improves my own standing within it or the marriage prospects of my daughter or whatever. There are no limits to the ways in which narrow and wide identifications can interplay in influencing an actor’s perceptions of the costs/benefits calculations that any given decision might entail.

Let us examine a series of options regarding the ways in which governments or state officials may identify with others. Governments often claim to act in the interest of the people, to identify with the people, so let us first take this claim at face value. If local self-regulation works well and government intervention is both costly and unnecessary, a government that identifies with the people would limit its own role. In reality, few governments behave in this way. In fact, a government that would abstain from ruling, or even just abstain from extending its rule whenever it had a chance to do so, would be hard to find.

A somewhat more realistic assumption – one that resonates with the statement made by Catley et al., quoted above – is that governments identify not with the people but with the state. To increase the importance and the splendour of the state, state revenues need to be maximised. Again, there are two screws to turn. One is the rate of taxation, and the other is the kinds of taxes that are levied. The rate of taxation represents an optimisation problem, with the highest returns falling somewhere in between two extremes. If taxation is too high, it threatens the life or the productivity of the producers and, thereby, potentially limits taxable production. High taxation also increases the costs of control and, as control always remains incomplete, leads to a rise in tax evasion and outmigration. On the other hand, if taxes are too low, the state foregoes possible income. As to the kinds of taxes, in this model one can assume that the government looks for ways to tax all branches of the economy and so should be interested in the growth of the overall economy. Therefore, to return to the scenario described above, a rational, revenue-maximising government would refrain from removing key resources from the pastoral sector, if that led to losses that were higher than the gains achieved through alternative forms of land use. If the aim of a certain government policy was maximisation of the overall economic output of all sectors, taken together, then such a policy would preserve livestock routes and access to river banks and other watering points wherever the losses to the livestock sector incurred by not doing so would exceed the benefits of competing kinds of use. It would also preserve the open range wherever the disruption to the pastoral sector and the ecological damage done by attempts to practise crop production exceeded the benefits of agriculture. This would be the case under marginal conditions where crop production was possible but risky. There, one might obtain a crop one year in two or three, but the yields would be lower than the gains obtained by allowing continued use of these lands by pastoralists, either with regard to the same surface
area or considering this area as part of a wider system without which other parts of the surface could not be used effectively.

In all of these cases, a revenue-maximising government would make careful calculations about what removing a resource from one type of use and transferring it to another would entail for both. Use of that resource would be granted to whichever sector would yield more gain for the overall economy, provided, of course, that this gain was sustainable and taxable. In this model, the reputation of nomads for being difficult to find and to tax does not help their case. In the logic of this system, however, one should enjoy the protection of a revenue-maximising state, if one provides the state with revenue, either directly or indirectly. For example, it should make little difference whether the state taxes pastoralists directly or derives revenues from some other link in the chain of production, from the open range to the urban meat market, e.g., by introducing tolls for livestock transports or by taxing butchers and other meat processors. Even without taxing meat production at all, taxable profits might be generated in other sectors of the economy by having a policy of low food prices and thus reducing the costs of labour. Be that as it may, a revenue-maximising government would have to be convinced that livestock production generated taxable wealth somewhere in the economy, or that it could save expenses in the public sector by providing cheap protein to wage earners. If, however, that were the case, one would not expect such a government to have a pro-farmer and anti-pastoralist bias. Under the assumption that governments attempt to maximise state revenues, pastoralists could expect state protection, as long as they contributed to revenues, one way or another.

This model, with its regularised forms of giving and taking between pastoralists, other sectors of the economy, and the state, is a far cry from the present situation of pastoralists, which is often marked by multiple, unpredictable forms of extortion. Nomads in northern Kenya have compared government chiefs and other state officials, who collect ‘donations’ and ‘contributions’ of all sorts, to lions. Both lions and officials wait at the water holes and prey on the animals that come to drink. In our ongoing research under the heading “Pastoralism in interaction with other forms of land use in the Blue Nile area, Sudan”, Elhadi Ibrahim Osman and I have met nomads who complain about being taxed again and again at different locations. They have shown us not only tax receipts but also membership cards for the ruling party and for a pastoralist association, IDs issued by the native authorities, and receipts from the Jihad Call Organisation (in 2009, when no jihad was being fought in the Sudan). Pastoralists with whom we spoke reported that, in addition to these membership fees, taxes, and contributions, they regularly had to buy access to formerly open land that had been converted into large-scale farms. Often, this agriculture had failed. Nevertheless, pastoralists still had to pay for the right to graze the failed crops, which had dried before maturing. In other cases, nomads were made to pay for the natural vegetation, because the new ‘owners’ of the land had not even attempted to cultivate it. Even to approximate the model depicted in the preceding paragraphs,
the state would first have to qualify, in the eyes of the nomads, as a regulative and protective agency that could, then, legitimately collect taxes. Instead, extortion takes the place of taxation, and the state is often a source of disorder, rather than an agency providing stable conditions and a reliable legal framework for economic activities, a point illustrated in John Galaty’s\textsuperscript{13} discussion of land registration.

Having seen that our first two hypotheses regarding the forms of identification underlying the actions of government officials (identification with the people or the state) have significant shortcomings, not as normative but as descriptive models, we still have not answered the question posed above. With whom do governments, or the individuals who comprise them, identify? In whose interest do they act?

Often, the actions of the powerful in northeastern Africa have been explained in terms of different ideologies and religions – Christianity in the case of imperial Ethiopia (the ‘Christian Island’), socialism in the case of the Mengistu regime, a coalition of ethnic nationalisms in the case of post-1991 Ethiopia, and Islamism in the case of Sudan. But then one wonders why it is that governments that are presumably guided by different ideologies have the same policies with regard to pastoralists, namely ignoring their rights and taking their resources. Obviously, ideological differences cannot explain similarity of action. (And then, of course, one may ask what Christianity, Islam, socialism, or nationalism – nationalism understood as acting in the interest of a nation, however defined – would have to say about taking land away from people who depend on it.) Somehow, the ideological explanation does not seem to work either.

Governments and government officials in northeast Africa do not seem to identify with a particular ideology, at least to the extent that the names of different systems of convictions effectively define actual parties and alliances. In fact, the groups to which holders of state power refer when calculating costs and benefits (i.e., costs and benefits for whom?) and making decisions do not seem to differ greatly from those of ordinary people. Like all people who survive, they are concerned, first and foremost, with self-preservation. When their lives are threatened, because of their past crimes or for whatever reason, they fight desperately and cruelly. Only in the impact of their rage do they differ from ordinary people, who have no armed units under their command. When they become wealthy, they want to become even wealthier, again like ordinary people. That ‘resource scarcity’ is a conflict-escalating factor is a myth. Neither governments and government officials nor pastoralists are ever content with what they have; they always want more of the same, be it power, money, or livestock. And fights are fought by those with fighting capacity, not by

the destitute.\textsuperscript{14} When it comes to sharing wealth, holders of state power do so with their own families and within the wider network of relatives with whom they cooperate (although, if they are of a similar status, relatives can also be dangerous rivals). Here, the logic of identification on the basis of shared ancestry or similar criteria interpenetrates with individualistic logic (I help them because they help me).

How precisely this identification with family, kin, and faction interpenetrates with wider forms of identification, such as those with region or ‘race’, is not always obvious at first glance. When, after the construction of the Aswan High Dam, Lake Nasser filled up from 1958 to 1971, the lands of Nubian farmers were flooded. On the Sudanese side of the boundary, the farmers around Halfa were affected. They were compensated with a huge new irrigation scheme below the Khashm al-Girba Dam in eastern Sudan, where the settlement of New Halfa was founded. Farmers were compensated for their lost land and could continue to be farmers elsewhere.\textsuperscript{15} Currently, as the dam on the Blue Nile at Roseiris has been raised and, as a consequence, the reservoir behind it, located in a flat alluvial plain, is expanding to cover a huge area, it is clear that many farmers will not be compensated with land elsewhere. There will be some money, and there might be residential plots; but the large tracts of land along the new coastline will be given to big companies. Politicians praise this development because “it will create employment for local people”. But how much employment will modern mechanised agriculture actually provide for former farmers turned labourers? And, even more fundamentally, at least with regard to identification, why does it seem to be unquestioned that, along the Blue Nile, farmers can be turned into labourers, while, in an earlier case further north, near the Egyptian border, farmers were compensated with land and could continue farming? Maybe in the 1960s and 1970s populations were smaller and resource competition was not as fierce. But one also may suspect that the Sudanese government – if one can construct the continuity of such an institution across the many regime changes that have occurred since 1970 – regards the Nubians as ‘real’ Sudanese. After all, most northern Sudanese are of Nubian ancestry, whatever else their Arabised genealogies claim. In contrast, the farmers south of Roseiris are regarded as ‘southerners’, ‘Ethiopians’, ‘Chadians’, or ‘West Africans’,\textsuperscript{16} depending on their various local and ethnic origins. In other words, identification may be at work here, insofar as decision makers feel closer to the northerners. Such feelings of relative closeness or distance may or not be linked to benefits that the government derives from supporting northerners and denying support to southerners. For example, government representatives may have thought that the Nubians would support them politically,


\textsuperscript{16} The labels ‘Chadians’ and ‘West Africans’ are often used to discriminate against people from the west of Sudan, especially Darfur, while other groups have actually migrated from West Africa.
and they may have suspected the people south of Roseiris of SPLM sympathies. Differences in skin colour, real and imagined, along with a rich terminology from ‘brown’ and ‘red’ to ‘green’ and ‘blue’, are also significant for social identification in the Sudan, a country where racialism is by no means unknown.

Alliances can be extended to non-relatives and even to members of other ethnic groups or religious communities on the basis of ‘give and take’, which may be supplemented by constructs of similarity (comrades, freedom fighters, former fighters for the same ‘just cause’, etc.). Such constructs are fragile, however, when the rewards for defection become too high, i.e., when the bones of contention appear more valuable than the preservation of friendship (as in the case of Eritrean and Ethiopian leaders, who were former comrades-in-arms). Such a model of self-interest, modified by limited ways of widening the ‘self’ through identification with family members, friends, and allies, provides better explanations of what is actually observed than models based on the assumption that actions are taken for the benefit of the people

17 The Sudan Peoples’ Liberation Movement (SPLM), now the ruling party in South Sudan, has been forbidden in Sudan, i.e., in the area that was called northern Sudan before the split in 2011.
or the state or for ideological reasons. The proposed model helps to explain why
governments make economic decisions that neither benefit the people or the state nor
resonate with any religious beliefs or ideological values worthy of the name. They
– and that does not mean some abstract institution but the people actually involved
in making decisions – make such decisions if they themselves and those who are
close to them benefit from them. Leasing giant fiefdoms of land at cheap rates to
foreign investors might be disastrous to the people living there, and it might be of
no benefit to the wider national economy, but it still might be explicable in terms
of more narrowly defined interests. Those who make the decisions might receive
kickbacks or shares or jobs for friends and family.

I hope to have shown that our kind of political economy, which takes identity and
identification as its starting point, can contribute to development studies, offering an
alternative to using the concept of ‘marginality’ in the analysis of similar issues. In
practical terms, we try, in our work on “Pastoralism in interaction with other kinds
of land use in the Blue Nile area, Sudan” and in our international research network,
“Lands of the Future”, to integrate natural science approaches into our analyses of
political ecology by involving agronomists and botanists. We can arrive at more

*Heightening the dam at Roseiris, Sudan, which will cause the displacement of many farmers. (Photo: G. Schlee, 2009)*
intelligent solutions to many problems of ‘development’ – solutions that provide benefits for a wider range of population groups – if different forms of production are viewed as interconnected, rather than being treated as mutually exclusive. If this is to happen, however, the emphasis in development studies on introducing new technologies of organisation and material production must be supplemented with research on collective identities and processes of identification. People act in the interest of those with whom they identify along at least one dimension of identification; and they cooperate with others, as long as cooperation is beneficial to them. Abstract appeals to humanity at large or to the equality of all human beings may be in line with modern legal thinking, but they do not correspond to decision-making processes on the ground.

Christina Echi Gabbert is the organiser of the workshop “Lands of the Future”, at which the homonymous research network was established. In a separate development, she received the Frobenius Research Award for her dissertation, Deciding Peace: Knowledge about war and peace among the Abore of southern Ethiopia (2012). Here, she and Ginno Ballo from Arbore interview Rendille elders in order to find points of cultural comparison. Location: Korr, northern Kenya. (Photo: G. Schlee, 2013)
The Empirical Dimension: reflections on the production of data, documentation, and transparency

At the beginning of this report, I stated our ambition to overcome the often exclusively deconstructive focus of anthropological research and to offer better explanations to replace the deconstructed ones. After having addressed, in the preceding paragraphs, recent developments in our theoretical work, even offering some suggestions for their practical application, I now come back to the other concern mentioned at the outset, namely, questions regarding the generation of data and their place in the production of knowledge.

If we go back to the proto-anthropology of nineteenth-century travelogues and to early anthropological writings, often about expeditions in connection with a museum, we find rich documentation of data. Given the technologies of the day, this required a huge amount of skilled manual labour. Photographs and drawings done by hand were reproduced as copperplate engravings. The writing often took the form of a narrative or resembled entries in a diary – a circumstance that still allows today’s readers to get closer to the authors (thus facilitating research on the history of anthropology) and to the past realities they describe (e.g., by assessing their interests and biases and taking them into account). Later, under the influence of disciplinary elder sisters, such as philosophy and sociology, which enjoyed a high degree of prestige, anthropology became more discursive, more purely verbal, and rather abstract. The typical modern anthropological article does not contain a single picture. The commitment to ‘words only’ also affects numbers. Due to the bias of many anthropologists against quantification, one seldom finds even a single table or basic descriptive statistics. In books, where enough space should be available, ‘vignettes’ are, usually, the only descriptive elements: artful short pieces, often celebrating the subjective impressions of the author, sometimes rendering case histories or other data in a highly edited, consumer-friendly form. That is better than no data at all, but is a far cry from the sort of documentation that would render transparent the process of knowledge production or allow us to accompany the author on her way from the data to the conclusions she draws from them.

Given today’s technologies, storing data, including high-quality audio and visual materials, and publishing substantial selections from them has become much cheaper than it was even a few decades ago. Therefore, one wonders why anthropologists almost never document and share their data. Very often, ethical considerations are cited by those reluctant to remedy this situation – e.g., the protection of the anonymity of ‘research partners’ (informants). But how about the masses of non-sensitive data or the data that can be rendered sufficiently anonymous?

Without neglecting our primary emphasis on peer-reviewed journals and book publications, we have also developed other formats that allow us to give ample space to the presentation of the data that provide the basis for our more theoreti-
cal publications. Following two Internet publications based on field diaries,\(^\text{18}\) we have reverted to books and booklets printed in-house, some of which include CDs. These publications are ‘open access’: They are distributed free of cost and are also posted as PDF-files on the Internet. Our new series, *Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Department ‘Integration and Conflict’, Field Notes and Research Projects*, comprises diary-like notes with rich pictorial illustrations, full-length transcriptions of interviews in non-European languages (with English translations), comments, and annotations.

In addition to facilitating critical evaluation of our work by members of the scholarly community, stimulating comparative research within the Institute and beyond, and providing citable references for our books and articles in which only a limited amount of data can be presented, these volumes serve an important function in maintaining links with people in our field sites and continuing their involvement in our research. For those who have helped us to collect data and provided us with information, these books and booklets may serve as small tokens of our gratitude and as tangible evidence of the results based on their cooperation with us. When we sow results back into the field, new discussions and fresh perspectives might sprout.

Especially in their electronic form, these volumes can also be used in producing PowerPoint presentations for teaching purposes; and, as they are open access and free of charge, they can serve an important ‘outreach’ function by kindling the interest of a wider audience in our research.


*Covers of the Departments Series on Field Notes and Research Projects.*
Research Group: Integration and Conflict along the Upper Guinea Coast (West Africa)

Jacqueline Knörr

The Research Group continues to focus on local, regional and (trans-)national dimensions of processes of integration and conflict in the Upper Guinea Coast region of West Africa. Current members are Jacqueline Knörr (Head), David O’Kane (Senior Researcher), Maarten Bedert, Anaïs Ménard (PhD students), Markus Rudolf, Christian Højbjerg, Wilson Trajano Filho (Associates), and Christoph Kohl (research cooperation).

Accomplishments and News

Markus Rudolf and Nathaniel King have successfully concluded and defended their PhD theses. Anaïs Ménard and Maarten Bedert have returned from field research in Sierra Leone and Liberia, respectively, and are in the process of evaluating their data and writing their dissertations. All the members of the group have been conducting field research for different lengths of time.

The co-edited book on The Upper Guinea Coast in Transnational Perspective (Knörr and Kohl) has been submitted to Berghahn, where it is now under review. My own monograph on Creole Identity in Post-colonial Indonesia (Berghahn) should be published by the time this report is distributed. In September 2012, the fourth “Upper Guinea Coast” conference took place in Halle and a book comprising revised versions of most of the papers presented there is currently being prepared for publication (Palgrave Publishers). Several working papers have been written (jointly) by different members of the Research Group. They continue to focus on empirical findings concerning specific comparative dimensions of our research. The endeavour of co-writing working papers has been quite rewarding in that it induces us to focus on comparative issues over longer periods of time and through different stages of individual research processes.

During the past two years, we also organised two “Workshops in the Field” (Ghana and Sierra Leone) as well as two retreats and a series of meetings. All members of the group presented papers at various international conferences.

I am involved in several cross-institutional research activities, including projects funded by third parties. In terms of outreach activities, I have given some interviews (concerning developments in the UGC, gender and migration issues) and have been involved as an expert in asylum cases. Two Facebook pages (one concerning research on the Upper Guinea Coast, the other research on Southeast Asia) have now become rather popular among members of the international research community. In November 2013, the group organised a panel at the AAA meeting in Chicago and was invited by Northwestern University’s Program of African Studies (Wil-
Summary of Ongoing and Recently Concluded Research Projects

Anaïs Ménard’s PhD project focusses on autochthony discourses in Sierra Leone (Freetown Peninsula). With a case study on Sherbro identity, which, due to its particular history, plays an important role as a mediating force in interethnic and rural-urban relations, she explores the relationship between claims of autochthony and the contestedness and flexibility of ethnic identities in a post-conflict context of national (re-)integration. She addresses three focal points of autochthonous discourses: the relationship between Krio and native identities, land disputes resulting from different conceptualisations of citizenship, and dynamics related to traditional secret societies. Her analysis shows that claims of autochthony conceal social mechanisms of integration between groups that are usually described as separate or antagonistic; and it also shows that ethnic identities play a constitutional role in the making of the larger nation.

Maarten Bedert investigates the politics of belonging in a Liberian border region. With a case study among the Dan of northwestern Liberia, he focuses on (1) the persistence of genealogical idioms and kin relations in the wake of recent episodes of civil conflict and (2) the emergence of new secret societies and witchcraft discourses. He explores how identities are negotiated in a local (intra- and interethnic), national (nation-state), and regional (cross-border) perspective and how these discourses are connected to social and cultural continuity and innovation. Contrary to the common notion of ‘post-war reconstruction’ – which implies the breakdown of social relations and institutions during war and, hence, the need for reconstruction after war – Bedert’s data suggests that social relations and institutions tend to be resilient and continue to have a strong impact on perceptions of social cohesion and processes of inclusion and exclusion in the aftermath of war.

Markus Rudolf’s dissertation deals with conflict and integration in the Casamance. He explores how and why the Casamance’s status of being in a situation of neither war nor peace perpetuates itself. His analysis focusses on recurring hostilities, their roots and manifestations, and dissects the apparent incapacity of single actors to broker peace. He shows that actors have nevertheless succeeded in maintaining a relatively low level of violence and that a complex equilibrium has been established within a framework of traditional mediation mechanisms. Markus Rudolf argues that the Casamance case is an example of a peculiar dialectic, namely a process of integration through conflict.

Despite being Sierra Leone’s first private university, the University of Makeni (UNIMAK) must operate under the Sierra Leonean state’s general policies for national education in the post-war context. David O’Kane deals with the consequences of these policies in the local context in which UNIMAK operates: a northern region
Department ‘Integration and Conflict’

which was historically deprived of educational opportunities but is now experiencing rapid change. UNIMAK is being connected in many ways to the national level and the external world, while at the same time maintaining links to local-level communities in Makeni city and its rural hinterland. In this field of local, national and global interaction, contestations occur concerning social and cultural practices, identifications, discourses of local and national elites, and religious beliefs.

Wilson Trajano Filho’s work on creole proto-nationalism and mutual-aid institutions in processes of integration and conflict focusses on Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde at the beginning of the twentieth century. He is currently analyzing data from Portuguese and Guinean archives concerning the creation and dissolution of the *Liga Guineense*, a mutual-aid institution around which the creole elite of Guinean settlements assembled to assert their political and economic interests in a context of increased Portuguese power. Trajano Filho seeks to understand how proto-nationalist and mutual aid institutions are related to current conceptualisations of the nation in both countries and to the present situation of deep crisis in Guinea-Bissau on the one hand and relative stability in Cape Verde on the other.

Christian Højbjerg has continued his work on the significance of the historical imagination for the construction of ethnic identity, for ethnic groups’ perceptions of each other and for their ways of interrelating, whether peacefully or violently. His approach concerns not only history as part of an ongoing social experience and practice of coming to terms with violent interaction; using fieldwork data, he also shows how memories of the past have influenced recent episodes of armed conflict in the Liberia/Guinea border region and between the Mandingos and co-existing ethnic groups in southeastern Guinea and northwestern Liberia.

Christoph Kohl, who now works at the Peace Research Institute in Frankfurt, continues to collaborate with the group as a research partner. His current Upper Guinea Coast research focusses on the cultural effects of global norm transmission for security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau. In contrast to other largely normative and top-down analyses, he applies a largely bottom-up perspective, exploring how the reforms are perceived and communicated by different local groups.

I have been busy finalising several publications and have begun to (re-)engage in two (partly interrelated) projects, focusing (1) on the role of lingua francas in the construction and transformation of (trans-)ethnic and national identification and (2) on the role of diasporas in the (re-)making of the nation in a field of transnational and global interaction.
Example of Research in Progress:
Creole lingua francas in processes of (re-)integration (Knörr)\(^\text{19}\)

In large parts of the Upper Guinea Coast region, creole languages have served as lingua francas for hundreds of years and – like creole identities – continue to play an important role in the relationship between different types of identities and the construction of transethnic and national identifications in a highly heterogeneous environment.\(^\text{20}\) In the following, two creole languages will be highlighted with regard to processes of (re-)integration, namely Kriol in Guinea-Bissau and Krio in Sierra Leone. This serves to give an impression of how the position, role, and meanings of creole languages are related to the conceptualisation, situation, and evaluation of creole groups and identities in a given society.

*Kriol, Guinea-Bissau*

A Portuguese-based creole language developed along the West African coast as early as the late fifteenth century, when the Portuguese settled in the hitherto uninhabited Cape Verdean archipelago and traded along the West African coast, abducting large numbers of Africans of various origins to the Cape Verdean islands as slaves. This resulted in the emergence of a creole language in Cape Verde and littoral West Africa.\(^\text{21}\) At that time, the language was spoken only by the (new) inhabitants of Cape Verde and minorities living in a handful of trading posts along the Upper Guinea Coast.\(^\text{22}\) Kriol made a nation-wide breakthrough only when the war of independence began in 1961. The independence movement – having creoles as spearheads – employed

---

\(^{19}\) I thank Christoph Kohl for his valuable contribution and comments, particularly where Guinea-Bissau is concerned.


The spread of Kriol as Guinea-Bissau’s lingua franca and its transformation into a powerful symbol of national unity was facilitated by the fact that Bissau-Guinean creoles shared the same national identity as other Bissau-Guineans and that Kriol was not associated with any specific ethnic group. Both Kristons and Cape Verdeans – the creole categories of people who spread Kriol in Guinea-Bissau – are considered to be the result of ‘mixing’ (*mistura*), i.e., including Bissau-Guineans of different ethnic backgrounds and belongings. They continue to identify themselves – and to be identified – with specific, yet different mixtures of background, which, however, are (partially) shared by their (less mixed) compatriots. Likewise, the language originally distributed by them – or rather, their ancestors – is conceptualised as a language of different origins and as a national rather than an ethnic language. The same is true for other representations of creole identity in Guinea-Bissau, such as carnival and the *manjuandadi* (voluntary mutual aid associations), all of which were restricted to creole categories of people before spreading nationwide to become symbols of national identity.\footnote{Kohl, Christoph. 2012a. Nationale Integration in Guinea-Bissau: Das Beispiel der Manjuandadis. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 137(1): 71–96.}

**Krio, Sierra Leone**


In the nineteenth
century Krio was used among the Krio, who by then had also integrated people of local descent into their group. Local people who were newly integrated had to give up their original ethnic identity and their ethnic language when converting to “creoledom”. The Krios came to be an elite that spread its language throughout Sierra Leone and beyond. The Krios generally emphasised the differences – in terms of religion, culture, and language – rather than the similarities between themselves and the indigenous population, pointing out what, in their view, made them superior to the latter.

The majority of Krios resisted independence, which contributed further to the contestedness of their status as native citizens of Sierra Leone after independence had been achieved in 1961. However, despite the critical attitude that many Sierra Leoneans still have towards the Krios, they largely appreciate the role that the Krio language plays as a national lingua franca. It seems somewhat ironic that the Krio language is considered one of the major unifying factors among Sierra Leoneans, insofar as the Krios, as a group, have in many ways been experienced as separatists. Especially since the end of the civil war, which raged in Sierra Leone for more than 10 years, the Krio language is gaining in status. It is seen as having a reconciling effect in that it “brings our people back together” (informant of Knörr). At the same time, many, especially younger Krios are (re-)discovering the integrative potentials of creole identity and emphasising the mixed and native, rather than the exclusive and foreign dimensions of their identity – a move that is widely appreciated in a post-war society still struggling to heal and reconcile.

In our future research concerning the relationship between creole languages and processes of (re-)integration we shall explore further the latter’s impact on the formation and transformation of collective – e.g. ethnic, local, (trans-) national – identities in contexts of (postcolonial) diversity and transnational/global interaction.

---


Centre for Anthropological Studies on Central Asia (CASCA)

Peter Finke and Günther Schlee

In 2012, the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ and the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology of the University of Zurich joined together to create the Centre for Anthropological Studies on Central Asia as a forum for distinguished anthropological engagement with the region. We use the term Central Asia broadly to include the former Soviet Republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, the Autonomous Region of Xinjiang, the Mongolian and Tibetan-speaking areas sometimes referred to as Inner Asia, and adjacent regions in northern Afghanistan, northern Iran, and southern Siberia. Research is also conducted on the new and old Central Asian diasporas, e.g., in Moscow and Istanbul. This gives credit to the many geographical, historical, and cultural similarities that have shaped the life of the people in the region, which include an arid continental climate, an economy traditionally based on irrigated agriculture, pastoral nomadism and trade, as well as similarities in social organisation and religious practices. As a crossroad linking various parts of the Eurasian continent, Central Asia has always been both a source and a destination of cultural and political influences far beyond its boundaries.

Given its history of politically conditioned inaccessibility, Central Asia is still a little known part of the world, even among scholars. In recent years, however, a number of studies have been conducted on current transformation processes. Anthropologists have often focussed on local economic relations and social stratification, new forms of social cooperation, ethnic identification and alliances, as well as religious revival and reconfiguration. The aim of CASCA is to promote empirically grounded research on these and related topics and to strengthen the position of Central Asian studies within the discipline. CASCA members work in close cooperation with colleagues in academic institutions around the world. Beyond its research agenda, CASCA is also committed to developing teaching facilities for BA, MA, and PhD programs, especially in Zurich; and it will also organise international summer schools.

CASCA within the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’: intra- and inter-regional comparisons

Research in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ is based on the principle of cluster formation. Having several researchers working in the same region facilitates controlled comparisons, which allow us to discern which changes in some variables entail alterations in other variables. Looking at variation and co-variation yields knowledge about how things are connected, which is the kind of knowledge theories are made of. The three regional project clusters – West Africa, Northeast
Africa, and Central Asia – have a number of things in common: first, much of their territories lie in the arid belt of the old world; second, Islam plays an important role as the religion of the groups under investigation or of their neighbours; and, third, social dynamics are currently shaped by interactions between nomads and settled populations or have been in the past. These similarities suggest that comparison should be possible not only within each region but between the different regions. While the Department itself provides a framework for regional and interregional comparisons, the work of colleagues from other Departments and research groups at the Institute also provides inspiration.28

An example of intra-regional comparison is provided by the new CASCA project on “Ethnic Differentiation, Interethnic Relations and Conflict in Central Asia: the case of the Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan” (see below). Inter-regional comparison will take precedence in a planned comparison of Uzbeks and Fulɓe, to whom much research in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ has already been devoted.29

At first glance, the comparison between Fulɓe and Uzbeks seems arbitrary. On closer examination, however, it becomes evident that these two groups share precisely the kinds of similarities and differences that make controlled comparison fruitful:

1. In both cases there is a level of differentiation, consisting in named sub-ethnic groups, above the clan or village but below the ethnic classification as ‘Uzbeks’ or ‘Fulɓe’.
2. Practically all Uzbeks and all Fulɓe are Muslims, at least nominally.
3. Both Fulɓe and Uzbeks are scattered across numerous nation states, albeit for different reasons.30


30 Before the advent of modern states, Fulɓe groups crossed the entire breadth of the African continent on their pilgrimages to Mecca; thereafter, they continued to traverse the same area – as pilgrims, nomads, and transnational wage labourers. Uzbeks, on the other hand, have a long sedentary tradition. Their scattered presence is mainly the result of the division of their settlement area among the different Soviet republics, which later became independent states. Thus, the presence of these groups in different nation states is due largely to two different processes: the Fulɓe crossed boundaries, while in the Central Asian case, it was the boundaries that crossed the Uzbeks.
4. Both Fulɓe and Uzbeks are ethnic groups on the edge of language families. The Fulɓe speak a language of the West-Atlantic branch of Niger-Congo, but they live in the neighbourhood of speakers of languages belonging to other language families across Africa; and the Uzbeks are Turkic speakers on the edge of the distribution area of Iranian languages.

Comparison of these regions yields a typology of interethnic contact situations that will shed light on central research questions of the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’.

Current Research on “Ethnic Differentiation, Interethnic Relations, and Conflict in Central Asia”

Taking Peter Finke’s work on Uzbek identities within Uzbekistan as a point of departure, this project examines processes of ethnic differentiation and interethnic relations in four states where Uzbeks form a significant minority. In recent years, three of them – Kyrgyzstan, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan – have experienced conflicts in which Uzbeks have been more or less strongly involved. Kazakhstan, which so far has been spared serious interethnic tensions, will serve as a kind of control case. The aim is to compare patterns of conflict and political mobilisation through appeals to shared ethnicity. In particular, we intend to examine the relationship between strategic behaviour, social expectations, historical and political frameworks, and cultural models that influence people’s perceptions of the world and structure their interactions.

With ambitions to formulate a synthetic theory, the project combines classic approaches to ethnicity with ideas borrowed from Rational Choice Theory, cognitive anthropology, and political economy. The underlying hypothesis is that groups owe their existence to the benefits they can provide to individuals, in particular their ability to reduce transaction costs. They achieve this by constituting institutional frameworks within which people can make reasonable assumptions about future strategies of other actors. Groups attract new members when, in particular political environments, they are more successful than others in providing such frameworks.

In each of the four countries, one site will be selected for field research focussing on three issues: (1) the conceptualisation of Uzbek identity in relation to the local ethnic configuration; (2) patterns of social interaction and of the distribution of political and economic resources; and (3) strategies of mobilisation by political leaders and ethnic entrepreneurs. The major objective of this project is to provide new insights into processes of ethnic relations and conflict management in contemporary Central Asia and northern Afghanistan. This is of tremendous importance for a better understanding of the region in a period of rapid change following the collapse of the socialist regimes.

---

The project, which began in mid-2013, is supported financially by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). Cooperating partners include the universities of Zurich (Peter Finke), Geneva (Alessandro Monsutti), and Halle-Wittenberg (Jürgen Paul), as well as the Max Planck Institute (Günter Schlee). Research will be conducted by Khadija Abbasi, Indira Alibayeva, Wolfgang Holzwarth, and Baktygul Karimova.

**Individual Projects in Halle and Zurich**

*Contested Identity of Sart-Kalmaks in Contemporary Kyrgyzstan (Aida Alymbaeva)*

This doctoral project examines processes of identification in Chelpek, which is identified by insiders and outsiders as a Kalmak or Sart-Kalmak village. The Sart-Kalmak occupy a contradictory position within Central Asian systems of classification. The designation ‘Kalmak’ points to their supposed origins among the Kalmyk, originally nomads speaking a Mongol language and practicing Buddhism; while the term ‘Sart’ indicates that they are sedentary Muslims. As long-time residents of Kyrgyzstan, the Sart-Kalmak are now largely Kyrgyz-speaking; and, especially since Kyrgyz independence in 1991, they feel compelled to emphasise their Kyrgyzness. Nevertheless, they are still viewed by Kyrgyz – and sometimes by themselves – as members of an ethnic minority; and they are wooed by nationalists in the Russian Republic of Kalmykia and in Mongolia who view them as fellow Kalmyk or Mongols. Alymbaeva examines these complexities with reference to the dynamics of ethnic relations in Kyrgyzstan and Central Asia today.

*Re-Negotiation of Local Identity under Global Influences: the case of Tajikistan’s Pamir communities (Małgorzata Maria Biczyk)*

The goal of this doctoral dissertation on Ismailis in Tajikistan’s Pamir region (Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province or GBAO) is to discover how social and economic transformations have been experienced by local communities that differ in significant ways from the Tajik majority, most notably by adhering to the Shia branch of Islam and speaking an Eastern Iranian language differing from Tajik, which is West Iranian. For almost a century, the GBAO has been subject to successive modernisation projects (Soviet, neoliberal, and that of the new nation-state), which have affected the culture and identity of the people. This impact has been mediated, however, by the province’s autonomous status, historically within the Soviet Union and currently within independent Tajikistan.

*The Kazak oralman: comparing migratory decisions, integration patterns and transnational ties in three different settings (Tabea Buri and Peter Finke)*

This project compares the fate of Kazaks in and from three different diasporic settings: China, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan. In 1991, Kazaks made up barely forty per
cent of the total population of the newly independent state. Subsequently, the Kazak government appealed to the Kazaks living in other states to immigrate to Kazakstan, and, so far, roughly one million have responded to this appeal. Upon their arrival, these immigrants are called oralman (repatriates). The project will examine transnational social networks, motives for and against immigrating, and the integration of immigrants in Kazakstan. Tabea Buri, currently an assistant and a PhD student at the University of Zurich, will focus on Kazaks remaining in or leaving China, while Peter Finke will cover Mongolia. The researcher for the Uzbek case study is yet to be determined.

History and Culture of Southern Tajikistan since the Late Nineteenth Century (Wolfgang Holzwarth)

Wolfgang Holzwarth, a senior scholar in Social Anthropology and Iranian Studies, is a CASCA member based at the Oriental Institute of the University of Halle and associated with the Max Planck Institute. In his current project, he is tracing long-term developments in multiethnic milieus of southern Tajikistan from the days of the Bukharan Emirate through the Soviet period to independent Tajikistan in order to understand the impact of changing political and economic arrangements on local society and culture.

Squatter Settlements in Bishkek (Eliza Isabaeva)

In recent years, Kyrgyzstan’s capital and largest city has been expanding rapidly, both physically and demographically. Its population is now estimated to have surpassed one million, a number exceeding the capacity of the municipal infrastructure. This explosive population growth, largely attributable to migrants seeking better economic opportunities, has led to the emergence of squatter settlements along the city’s periphery, which locals call zhany konush (Kyrgyz) or novostroika (Russian). The goal of this doctoral project, based at the University of Zurich, is to show how squatters in Bishkek, who have essentially been left to govern themselves, organise their life and cope with challenges and difficulties by relying on formal rules and creating their own informal rules.

Cultural Adaptation of Dungan Migrant Communities in Kazakstan (Soledad Jiménez Tovar)

This doctoral project examines the cultural exchanges and adaptations by which Dungan (Muslim Hui) people have established local identities in the region of Kordai (Kazakstan) and Tokmok (Kyrgyzstan), following various displacements between the 1870s and 1960s. A major objective of this research is to problematise existing ideas regarding the perceived ease with which Dungan and other ethnic groups are able to adapt to a multi-ethnic setting in a quasi-national context of shifting territorial identities.
Khojas in Central Asia: construction and transformation of identity (Azim Malikov)

Azim Malikov, a senior scholar from Samarkand State University in Uzbekistan, is working on identity transformations of the Khojas, a privileged religious status group, which can be found today among Uzbeks, Kazaks, Turkmens, and Tajiks. Khojas are divided among numerous subgroups or lineages, which often carry specific names and keep written genealogies, tracing and emphasising their descent from a saintly figure. Some of these lineages also occur in two or more ethnic groups. In this project Malikov analyses these interethnic descent group relationships and identity issues by combining the evaluation of historical accounts and cultural comparison.

Those Left-Behind: mobility and immobility in rural Tajikistan (Meltem Sancak)

Meltem Sancak, who became a postdoctoral fellow in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ in 2012, is now focusing on Central Asian labour migration. In today’s Tajikistan, more than 5 percent of the total population and over 16 percent of its economically active population have moved to Russia alone as international labour migrants. This project focuses, however, on aspects of labour migration that, so far, have been understudied, namely, its impact on home communities. In the case of Tajikistan, it is mostly men who leave and women who stay behind. Besides family members who are left behind, there are also people who decide not to migrate but who are also affected by the consequences of migration.

Disputing Amidst Uncertainty: procedures of dispute management in ‘post-war’ times in Bamyan, Afghanistan (Friederike Stahlmann)

This dissertation focuses on procedures of disputing under the special circumstances of ‘post-war’ times, accounting for and analysing disputing parties’ assessments and practices. The project follows disputing parties through their dispute management and analyses their decision-making processes with regard to questions crucial for the realisation of procedures of disputing. In each case, it is important to ask who is regarded as a party in the dispute, how the decision to blame someone is made, how the aims of the disputing process are defined, how third parties are handled, and how the various parties deal with the results and the at least temporary ending of disputes.

Pastoralism in Western Mongolia (Linda Tubach and Peter Finke)

The northern part of the province of Khovd, used almost exclusively as seasonal pasture for sheep, goats, cattle, horses, and a few camels, is characterised by great ethnic diversity. This project examines the impact of ethnic diversity on pastoral land allocation. Furthermore, it seeks to discover the effects of different economic and social strategies, including migration, on formal and informal social institutions. Linda Tubach, a doctoral candidate and assistant at the University of Zurich, will focus on Mongols, while Peter Finke will continue his research on Kazaks in this region.
Department ‘Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia’

Director: Chris Hann

Highlights

- **May 2012**
The 2012 Goody Lecture was given by Peter Burke: *A Case of Cultural Hybridity: the European Renaissance*.

- **June 2012**
Chris Hann and David Wengrow presented the foundations of their cooperation in the analysis of civilisation(s) at a conference in London organised jointly by University College London and the Max Planck Society (*Research Collaboration in the European Union*). This was followed by an interdisciplinary conference in Halle, convened by Hann and Johann P. Arnason.

- **September 2012**
A Research Group was launched in economic anthropology, *Industry and Inequality in Eurasia*, led by Hann, Catherine Alexander, and Jonathan Parry.

- **October 2012**
A new International Max Planck Research School ANARCHIE (ANthropology, ARCHaeology, and HIstory of Eurasia) was inaugurated in partnership with archaeologists and historians of the Martin Luther University.

- **April 2013**
An international workshop, *The Transformation of Public Markets in Contemporary Vietnam*, was organised in Hanoi by the Minerva Research Group led by Kirsten Endres, in cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology of the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences.

- **June 2013**
Gonçalo Santos and Stevan Harrell convened a large international conference, *Chinese Patriarchy: Past, Present, Future*.

- **July 2013**
The 2013 Goody Lecture was delivered by Martha Mundy: *The Solace of the Past in the Unspeakable Present: the historical anthropology of the ‘Near East’*.

- **October 2013**
Christoph Brumann was elected as a member of the Academia Europaea.
Introduction:
Hierarchies of Knowledge and the Gold Standard for Anthropology in Eurasia

Chris Hann

The primary purpose of this publication is to report on the years 2012–2013 for the April 2014 meeting of the Institute’s Advisory Board. However, the expanded character of the forthcoming meeting provides an opportunity to look back and reflect on the long-term programme since our establishment in 1999. The first Focus Group, “Property Relations” completed its work in 2005. Our second such Group “Religion, Identity, Postsocialism” published a final report in 2010. Progress reports on four current Groups, plus Kirsten Endres’s “Minerva” Group, which enjoys a special status, are presented below. In this preface, I shall outline the framework which holds these Groups together. I begin with the name of the Department.

Resilience and transformation form a pair: in our approach to social change, the one presupposes the other. Our very first Focus Groups provided graphic illustrations of this interdependence. The collapse of Soviet socialism in the years 1989–1993 was undoubtedly a rupture, one that brought sudden changes to the lives of hundreds of millions of people. We explored these transformations in fields largely neglected by other scholars. Agricultural collectivisation was a hallmark of most socialist states (not all), and the process of its reversal through privatisation was in many ways exemplary of the chaotic conditions of the first postsocialist decade. Yet within collective farms, which had been for the most part coercively imposed, with little regard to local specificities, anthropologists have long been aware of the persistence of the older values and habits of rural communities. Comparable continuities are evident in the realm of religion, which we began to investigate with a new programme in 2003. Repression in the name of scientific atheism was nowhere completely successful. The patterns we observe in the postsocialist decades are by no means a straightforward revival of the presocialist religious communities. They are the product of successive ruptures and multiple strands of continuity. All of these projects on postsocialist property relations and religion have been based on intensive field research and contributed to the social science analysis of our moment in world history.

Memories of socialism continue to shape the lives of many of the people we study. Younger generations have no direct memories; but we have found that socialist ideas and practices have a resilience of their own, albeit different from that of other faith communities. Our interest in transformation was never confined to the former USSR and its allies in Eastern Europe. From the beginning we have also had projects in China, where momentous changes have taken place in a framework which remains at least nominally socialist and indebted to a European revolutionary tradition. We have recently initiated new projects in states which have never embraced any form
of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, in South Asia and elsewhere. This expansion of scope is a natural development of our fundamental commitment to comparison. It also reflects the obvious fact that the term ‘postsocialist’ (which we never promoted as a theoretical tool) is of dwindling relevance as the decades pass.

Logically, comparisons can be extended worldwide and across all historical periods. However, in practice we have largely confined our work so far to recent centuries and to Eurasia. This last term is sometimes still a source of confusion so let me clarify its usage in this Department, which has not changed over the years. Eurasia is the Old World, the landmass between the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, including the southern shore of the Mediterranean and the large islands of Britain and Japan. The evolution of civilisations across this landmass since the urban revolutions of the late Bronze Age exhibits a substantial degree of unity. We thus reject the idea that Europe warrants the designation continent, an equivalent of Asia. Europe has been a remarkably productive region of the world over many centuries, but so too has China; given the extraordinary diversity of Asia, it seems appropriate to break it down into smaller units for comparative purposes. This is important because so much theory in the social sciences has been based on the experiences of Europe in recent centuries. Contemporary postcolonial theories derive largely from the expansion of North Atlantic power to all parts of the globe. In this sense, these theories represent the resilience of the scholarship of Western European exceptionalism rather than a shift of paradigm. However, imperial expansion also took place in somewhat different time frames contiguously, within the Eurasian landmass. Tracing these other variants of empire is central to the research programme of Dittmar Schorkowitz, who reports below on his comparisons of ‘ethnic minority management’ policies in the Russian and Chinese Empires and elsewhere. Together with the International Max Planck Research School ANARCHIE, also introduced below, the Focus Group led by Schorkowitz, “Historical Anthropology in Eurasia”, demonstrates our commitment to rebuilding close links with historians, historical sociologists and archaeologists – links which atrophied in the twentieth century, when many socio-cultural anthropologists came to define their discipline too narrowly with reference to the methodology of fieldwork.

Some of the most influential traditions in anthropology have been shaped decisively by the centuries of Western expansion overseas. Ethnographers concentrated on ‘peoples without history’, i.e. societies lacking any written records of their past. When anthropologists in the second half of the twentieth century again began to pay more attention to societies in Eurasia possessing their own textual traditions, they had to adapt their theories and methods. Foreign researchers still tended to seek out ‘the other’ in remote places (and there was no shortage of aboriginal, non-literate peoples in Eurasia), but they could hardly ignore the ‘local’ traditions of scholarship, including work of obvious pertinence to anthropological endeavours. It would be myopic to pretend that these scholarly relations can become perfectly egalitarian, or that the dominance of English as a lingua franca now provides for a ‘level playing
field’ across Eurasia. But it is both scientifically fruitful and ethically imperative to open up more conversations with scholarly communities in the countries where we carry out research, regardless of whether these communities identify with a discipline called ‘anthropology’. Sometimes in the frame of formal agreements but more often in very informal ways, such as inviting key partners to sojourn in Halle, our aim is to contribute to the emergence of more cosmopolitan anthropological communities throughout Eurasia. In this way, Eurasia provides us with more than an alternative lens through which to understand world history. It pushes us to adopt a critical perspective on the history of anthropology, and to work hard to overcome the problem of “hierarchies of knowledge”, to borrow a phrase used by Michał Buchowski in criticising some Western anthropological writing about Eastern Europe.

Of course, agendas and research conditions may be very different. In some countries, scholars encounter restrictions in publishing their work. In these cases, too, we seek to improve collegial relations. Differences should be respected, on the basis of maximal transparency of communication. In the past, encounters between socio-cultural anthropology and Western social thought have been fruitful. For example, I have found it useful to draw on the Central Europeans Karl Polanyi and Friedrich Hayek in analysing the dilemmas of global capitalism. But it is possible that new intellectual encounters will be more productive in the future. If such dialogues are to continue to serve a useful purpose, their results must be communicable to scholars at home in other textual traditions. If the Anglophone literature on Eurasian postsocialism becomes mired in the quicksand of postcoloniality jargon, this cannot be healthy for the development of the anthropological field.

**Five Hallmarks**

Collegiality and clear communication at every stage of the research process are thus prerequisites. Whether our interlocutors are subsistence-oriented farmers, factory workers, or urbane intellectuals, competence in local languages is the indispensable key to understanding other views of the world. The reinvigoration of historical research will not displace fieldwork as a hallmark of our projects. Many will involve combinations of ethnographic and archival data. We intend to do more than we have managed in the past to make raw data available for the benefit of wider communities. If field research is one enduring feature of our work, a hallmark of equal significance from the very beginning has been comparison. Instead of the blunt contrasting of ‘the other’ with ‘us’ (which for far too long meant an arrogant ‘us, enlightened Western Europeans’), directing attention to Eurasia obliges us to rediscover comparison, rather than contrast, as the prime epistemological foundation of a mature, cosmopolitan anthropology. Comparison begins with the understanding (or translation) of other societies; the enquiry is not left at this level, but must proceed to systematic investigation at multiple levels of analysis.
One such level is the civilisational. If we are interested in the larger patterns of human history, whether in Eurasia or anywhere else in the world, we need concepts to facilitate macro-analysis. This level faded from view with the emphasis on ethnographic research in the last century. The troubled past of the concept of civilisation is well known. Imperial powers have all too often invoked notions of a ‘civilising mission’ to justify their oppression of subject peoples. For this reason, we have proceeded very cautiously over the past several years. Following a workshop in 2010 and a larger meeting in Halle in 2012, both organised with the leading sociological exponent of civilisational analysis, Johann Arnason, we have established a solid foundation on which to build. This is the Maussian view of civilisation as a “family of societies”. Like Arnason, we are particularly interested in inter-civilisational encounters, both past and present. We focus on a wide range of variables through which differences are expressed and less powerful groups are kept under control.
One dimension to be addressed in our analyses of civilisational encounters is the rhetorical invocation of civilisation to legitimate domination. More generally, we explore ideologies and their origins and underpinnings in diverse domains, from secular political doctrines to religious symbols and myths of origin. The concept of ideology is to be understood broadly. It is not restricted to the state power, or to such well-known ideologies as socialism and (neoliberal) capitalism. We have devoted a lot of attention to these two very influential ideologies and we continue to do so in the new “Industry and Inequality in Eurasia” Research Group, which is introduced below. The term ideology can, however, be applied in other contexts, for example to the religious ideologies which we investigated between 2003 and 2010. Christoph Brumann is currently examining UNESCO’s cultural heritage ideology. In my own continuing work in rural Eastern Europe I have shown how a diffuse ideology of private property in land has an elective affinity with nationalist ideology; this combination proved highly resilient and re-emerged strongly following the demise of socialist collectivisation.

Ideologies depend for their efficacy not only on the actors who adopt and transmit them but also on their institutions. This is the final cornerstone of the edifice I wish to present in this brief Preface. Institutional research in anthropology can take many forms. In the “Economy and Ritual” Research Group, which completed its work in 2012, Stephen Gudeman and I, together with our six postdocs, investigated the institutions of the domestic domain in the context of ritual. In doing so, we opened up large fields of economic activity which remain largely invisible to mainstream economists. The domestic domain is also central to our work on social support in East Asia. By contrast, Dittmar Schorkowitz and his Group draw on archival data to reconstruct the functioning of institutions at quite different levels, such as the agencies through which the Chinese state controlled the non-Chinese populations it encountered in the course of imperial expansion. Kirsten Endres and her Minerva Group researchers illuminate the inchoate institutions of the informal economy and its imperfect regulation by the Vietnamese state in the era of socialist market economy. Christoph Brumann does fieldwork on cultural heritage at the highest institutional levels of UNESCO, but he and his students also document the implementation of these policies, and occasional resistance to them, ‘on the ground’, where the focus shifts to the local institutions.

**Conclusion: the gold standard**

The Department is committed to a dynamic research programme based on innovative themes and implemented in changing regional clusters throughout Eurasia. It has extended its coverage in space to include regions outside the former Soviet bloc, both single-party states which continue to espouse socialism and others that were never socialist. It has also expanded its coverage in time. Historical anthropology, along with economic anthropology, will remain central to our work in years to
come. Our interests in the past and present of Eurasia reflect our passionate interest in its future. Anthropology as we practise the discipline is the very opposite of an Orchideenfach, the antiquarian pursuit of the exotic. In my own recent work I have suggested that Eurasia stands today at a crossroads. It needs to choose between the socio-economic models of Karl Polanyi and Friedrich Hayek. The vision of the former has the stronger grounding in the history of Eurasia. The institutions of a Eurasia united politically and monetarily would necessarily be very different from those we observe in Beijing and Brussels today. Anthropologists can help to prepare the ground for an historic unification, as the prelude to forging a genuine world society. The focus on Eurasia as an unusually ambitious variant of ‘area studies’ will then realise its universal significance.

Fieldwork, comparison, civilisation, ideology, institution: the features I have outlined above (with the exception of civilisation, which still needs to be brought in from the cold) are the familiar gold standard of social anthropology. This standard has been contested in recent decades. Critical scrutiny of past ethnographic writing and the exposure of political and other forms of bias in many classical works have been salutary; but it is now time to move forward and to re-engage both with the world that is out there today and with the big questions of world history.

This is an apt moment in history to play with monetary metaphors. The gold standard that regulated global finance until 1931 disguised the entrenched domination of the West, notably Britain. Attempts to maintain this standard in the 1920s had highly regressive consequences for income distribution. The analogy to today’s global crisis is obvious: policies of deflation and ‘austerity’ are again lowering real wages and employment in many parts of Europe. Unstinting loyalty to the euro may not be the best way forward.

By a further analogy, it is healthy if anthropologists continue to question their received standard and strive to reach agreement on a disciplinary core that does not entrench the old hierarchies of knowledge. Dialogue and debate are essential. In our case, communication takes place within the Department at our weekly seminar. Group leaders devise their projects independently. We tolerate a lot of theoretical diversity at the level of individual projects. On the basis of this internal pluralism within a social anthropological frame, we seek to join conversations with other strands of anthropology, irrespective of their labels, and with an array of adjacent disciplines. Ultimately, we reflect on how our own scholarly traditions fit into the civilisational pluralism of Eurasia and into world history. We think that this stance is the best way to expand knowledge in the anthropological field. If we can accomplish this within Eurasia, we shall be better placed to pursue more symmetrical forms of knowledge production for the whole of humanity.
Kinship and Social Support in China and Vietnam

Head of Focus Group: Chris Hann

Senior researchers: Meixuan Chen, Minh Nguyen, Gonçalo Santos, Roberta Zavoretti
Associates: Ildikó Bellér-Hann, Markus Schlecker, Xiujie Wu
Doctoral students: Saheira Haliel, Sarah Schefold, Ruijing Wang

Introduction

This Group was launched in 2006. The themes were selected to fit in with the expertise available at the time in the Project Group Legal Pluralism and also to build on the experience gathered in the EU Project entitled “Kinship and Social Security in Europe”, coordinated by Dr Patrick Heady, which ran between 2004 and 2007. The application of these approaches to the largest socialist states of East Asia entailed the recruitment of new researchers for both China and Vietnam, primarily at the postdoctoral level. Individual projects have been both rural and urban, located in both central and peripheral locations, engaging with both ethnic minorities and majority groups. While the evolving political economy of ‘reform socialism’ provides the basic context for this Focus Group, our projects dig deep into beliefs, practices, and realms of contemporary social history where economic models are insufficient for understanding.

Socialism, Markets, and Social Support

Since the radical reform of their economic mechanisms more than a generation ago, China and Vietnam have recorded remarkable rates of growth. Urbanisation and industrialisation have proceeded apace. Although much decision-taking power has been decentralised to enterprise managers, state officials retain control in key sectors such as energy and banking. Privatisation has not been pushed through as comprehensively as in countries of the former Soviet bloc and agricultural land remains overwhelmingly in the hands of those who cultivate it. Blanket diagnoses of ‘accumulation through dispossession’ are therefore misplaced.

The Head of this Group has been fascinated by the affinities to the ‘market socialism’ pursued in the Soviet bloc by Hungary after the reforms of 1968. These experiments, like the somewhat different mechanisms institutionalised in socialist Yugoslavia, were ended abruptly around 1990 as the entire region was integrated into neoliberal capitalism. Although both China and Vietnam have been drawn into global flows of people and capital, the fact that a great deal of economic as well as political power is still exercised by the Communist Party suggests that they represent something other than another variety of capitalism. It can also be argued that these
states continue to represent the most significant alternative to democratic market capitalism. Their performance since the introduction of the reforms compares favourably with that of rivals, such as India. Even if growth rates have slowed significantly of late, they have defied the predictions of Western experts for decades. It is only a matter of time before China overtakes the USA as the world’s largest economy. Performance is also impressive in terms of living standards: indicators for education, health, and longevity all tell essentially the same positive story.

Yet this success is not unsullied. It has been accompanied by severe challenges as hundreds of millions of villagers find new jobs and ways of living in the urban sector. Minh Nguyen has investigated these processes in the case of the Vietnamese capital, Hanoi. She and her colleagues working in China have documented many new forms of social inequality within both urban and rural sectors, as well as a widening gulf between them. This is consistent with the critique of those who allege that the original socialist transformatory vision of Mao Tse Tung and Ho Chi Minh has long given way to corrupt oligarchic rule. For many Western observers, these countries exhibit an endemic lack of transparency which can only be overcome through political democratisation.

This is the context in which the Group investigates social support. Rapid economic growth has been accompanied by institutional changes in many domains, including the domestic. The first decades of socialism had already transformed a great deal. Both in the countryside through cooperatives, brigades, and later the people’s communes, and in the cities through the work-unit, collectives took over many of the responsibilities previously assumed by family and kin. The Maoist state took symbolic charge of social support when it issued its famous “five guarantees”: food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and funerals. This commitment has little salience in today’s market socialist society, because the prime responsibility is clearly back where it had been previously: with kin. But which kin exactly? Do daughters nowadays have the same rights and duties as sons? How do changing economic conditions affect intergenerational flows of goods and services and the inheritance of property?

It is common to use the language of economics when answering these questions, e.g. when we say that parents ‘invest’ in their offspring by supporting their educational expenses as well as through nurture more generally. The market principle can apply directly nowadays, e.g. when those who can afford to do so pay cash for care services, whether in the home or in an institution. However, the majority of actions pertinent to social support, as we understand the term, cannot be reduced to a commercial, profit-maximising logic, nor to a logic of evolutionary fitness. More complex accounts are needed.

From the beginning, this Group has thus looked to expand its comparisons beyond socialist East Asia and to engage with theoretical issues concerning basic concepts such as support, care, and the self or person. The zigzag path from traditional agrarian society through Maoism to reform socialism contrasts markedly with the gradualist expansion of state capacities in most parts of Europe, and also with the
patterns of capitalist countries in East Asia such as Japan and South Korea. The individualisation noted by recent scholars (notably Yunxiang Yan) suggests that China’s current trajectory has come to resemble that pioneered elsewhere. Yet many factors remain distinctive. In spite of the wealth now generated by Chinese industry, wages and consumption remain relatively low (much of the surplus continues to flow into the purchase of Western debt). China is only just beginning to develop health and pension entitlements comparable to those pioneered in Europe in the nineteenth century. The age structure of the population has changed dramatically as a result of the one-child policy. Finally, restrictions on charitable organisations and the absence of religious freedoms are factors with significant implications for the provision of support.

A first conference to explore these issues theoretically and comparatively was convened in Halle in 2008 by two postdoctoral researchers of the first cohort, Friederike Fleischer and Markus Schlecker. A selection of the papers was published in 2013 by Palgrave under the title *Ethnographies of Social Support*. Markus Schlecker theorises the concept of “support encounter” in his introduction to the volume and deploys it in his own empirical chapter with reference to memories of the Vietnamese wars and notions of sacrifice. Friederike Fleischer draws on her data from Guangzhou to show how new spaces are opening up in Chinese civil society, in which especially young people seek to realise new visions of society while concomitantly transforming themselves into ‘modern’ citizens. In both countries, overlapping and at times contradictory ideologies of personhood and sociality turn the social sector into a complicated arena for the negotiation of personal aspirations, social expectations, and kin obligations.
Is Chinese Patriarchy Over?

One key synthesising concept in the anthropological literature on China is that of patriarchy. It is a term which has also been deployed in socialist ideology and policy making. To overcome the distortions of ‘feudal patriarchal society’ was central to the goals of the Chinese Communist Party, which signalled its intentions in the Marriage Law of 1950. Yet in spite of the legislation and the creation of new institutions, gender and generational relations proved stubbornly resistant to socialist transformation. As in other socialist countries, participation in the labour force did not mean that women were freed from bearing a disproportionate share of domestic labour, including care work, but it did mean the implementation of policies (for example, in terms of provision of childcare support) aimed at allowing women to cope more easily with the dual burden of employment and family life. The end of Maoism threatened to reinforce existing inequalities, as well as to bring about the restoration of certain older patterns. For example, it was widely predicted that confirming the rural household as the key unit of production and consumption would strengthen patriarchal bias; and a bias in favour of sons has been vividly and notoriously demonstrated since the introduction of strict birth control policies in both rural and urban sectors. At the same time, the increased spatial and economic
mobility of the reform period has given the younger generations a higher degree of autonomy. Joint family arrangements remain common, but the middle generation often has more say than the senior generation in family matters. Gender relations were also significantly transformed, as women seem to have improved their earning power, but the evidence in this respect remains mixed. When it comes to educational investments, the previous work of this Focus Group has shown that discrimination against daughters has declined; in poor rural communities, parents want both sons and daughters to escape from the land, and tend to see daughters as the more reliable providers of long-term parental care, and especially emotional support (see the summary of Helena Obendiek’s doctoral project in Gansu Province, in the MPI Report for 2010–2011).

In order to explore recent empirical trends further and to reassess the theoretical utility of the concept of patriarchy, an international workshop was convened by Gonçalo Santos in June 2013 together with Stevan Harrell (University of Washington) entitled: Is Chinese Patriarchy over? The decline and transformation of a system of social support. Fifteen pre-circulated papers were intensively debated over three days. Participants included sociologists and historians, who helped to place the ethnographic evidence of the anthropologists (including past and present members of the MPI) in wider spatial and temporal frames. The invited discussants included distinguished specialists in other regions of Eurasia, who opened up new, sometimes surprising avenues of comparison (e.g. with the Mediterranean). The workshop was launched by a keynote lecture by Rubie Watson (Harvard University), who reviewed the ways in which the concept of patriarchy has been employed among Chinese reformers and social scientists for generations.

The starting point of the workshop – as outlined by its organisers – was the idea that social scientists ever since Engels have characterised China as a ‘patriarchal society’, in the sense that power is exercised by senior males over women and younger generations through control of productive property, and through an officially sponsored ideology of filial obedience and devotion. The title of the workshop, Is Chinese patriarchy over?, was intended as a provocation as much as an invitation to think about the dramatic changes that have occurred in family and gender relations in the last five to six decades. As expected, most papers presented at the conference pointed in the direction of a reconfiguration rather than a collapse of patriarchal structures. And yet, while most paper-givers agreed that present-day patriarchal formations are very different from those associated with the period before the Communist era, there were no clear-cut agreements over the general direction of this historical transformation, in part because there were significant theoretical differences in the usage of the concept of ‘patriarchy’, in part because the transformation in question displays great diversity along axes such as urban/rural, Northern/Southern, and coastal/interior. To illustrate this diversity, the papers presented at the conference focused on themes as different as premarital sexuality and pregnancy, patterns of post-marital residence, intergenerational power relations within the family, son
preference and birth planning, strategies of educational investment, management of family earnings, childbirth and motherhood, childcare practices, deviant regimes of sex and gender, and models of masculinity. The final session of the workshop saw a radical questioning of the value of patriarchy for comparative anthropological analysis, but most if not all participants agreed that it continued to provide an illuminating lens through which to look at contemporary Chinese society. Stevan Harrell and Gonçalo Santos are currently compiling a selection of the papers for an edited volume, which they intend to introduce with the outline of a new theoretical approach to family and gender relations in China and elsewhere.

Workshop: Beyond the Global Care Chain Approach. Boundaries, institutions, and ethics of care (10 – 12 July, 2014)

This Workshop will be convened by Minh Nguyen and Roberta Zavoretti at the Max Planck Institute. The aim is to subject key concepts of the Focus Group, notably ‘care’, to theoretical critique in the light of ethnographic studies covering many other parts of the world, complementing the work that Group members will present concerning China and Vietnam. The call for papers, posted in June 2013, specified the following provisional themes:

• Boundaries – the ways in which care practices push, and/or reproduce common analytical boundaries such as private/public, individual/society, gender/sexuality;

• Institutions – the changing relationship between the market, the state and the ‘third sector’ including non-governmental and religious institutions, and its implications for care practices and relations;

• Health and body – how care practices produce, challenge, and/or subvert conceptions of health/body and the relationship between human body and society;

• Technologies of care – technologies for the production of subjectivities, including those of nurturing and disciplining, that are part of care;

• Ethics of care – power relations underlying the politics of care needs and inequalities in care provision, moral issues in the often unequal relations of care, and the division of caring burdens in the household and society.
Historical Anthropology
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Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia

In 2012 and 2013, this Focus Group continued its project “Ethnic Minorities and the state in Eurasia”, which explores the forms, practices, and structures of interdependencies, dominance, and resistance in various parts of Southeast Asia, China, and Russia. This multi-sited approach provides ample opportunities for comparing different forms of colonialism (continental, internal, and overseas) in time and space, including cross-epochal legacies as well as synchronous interferences and influence. For a better understanding of contemporary state-minority dynamics it is important to know how the shifting formats of colonialism resulted in differing modes of integration and to what extent these variables depend on factors of \textit{longue durée} in society, nature, and history. Notwithstanding the huge diversity of forms and transformation processes involved, there is consistency and common ground in the group in that all projects are positioned within the framework of or related to imperial formations (either large ones as in the case of China and Russia or in miniature as in the case of Laos), of multi-national states, or multi-cultural societies.

Research Results and Achievements

Imperial formations in Eurasia have developed lasting strategies to integrate cultural diversity resulting from an immense variety of ethnic minorities they have absorbed in the course of their expansion. While in pre-modern empires (Byzantine, Mongol, Muscovy, Ottoman, Mughal) ‘difference’ was still the prevalent mode of integration, this pattern changed radically with the ‘well-ordered’ state and the final stages of continental colonialism when ‘belonging’ and ‘sameness’ became the dominant mode leading to ideologies of nostrification, homogenisation, and unification. Since then, some empires (Ottoman, Habsburg) have transformed into nation-states, while some large (Russia, China) and smaller formations (Laos) are still struggling to find ‘unity in diversity’.

Though integration strategies vary in time according to their historical background, their ends remain almost the same as the obvious timeless challenge: to maintain cross-epochal cohesiveness in a multi-national state and to guarantee certain rights of national self-determination. In the case of Russia, the urge to have 18th-century enlightened scholars from Western Europe take stock of the empire’s
riches, peoples, and languages led to an assiduous counting and classification paving the way for a *mission civilisatrice* and the modern nationalities question.

In Ming-Qing China, on the other hand, a surprisingly lesser interest in defining ethnic groups (other than Han) can be observed. Here we can see a robust tradition of clustering them under ethnocentric stereotypes instead (Fan, Meng, Hui, etc.) and the belief that Confucianism is instrumental to promote the ‘barbarians’ from a lower ‘raw’ to a higher ‘cooked’ status. Both empires, however, invented and developed, independently of one another, central institutions needed even today to structure ethnico-cultural diversity, to govern the civilisational frontier, and to implement various strategies of integration for the sake of imperial cohesion.

Quintessentially for continental colonialism and in contrast to corresponding agencies of overseas colonial powers, these institutions were never officially called or recognised as ‘colonial offices’. This also holds true for Southeast Asia where traces of French overseas and pre-modern internal colonialism still play an influential role today. What these formations (Russia, China, Laos) do have in common is a shift from ‘indirect’ to ‘direct’ rule, in the latter case stimulated by French colonialism. Territorial contiguity of both the Russian and Chinese empires with their Central and Inner Asian peripheries can thus hardly be used as a counter-argument against classifying their rule as colonial and contrasting their continental formations with overseas variations.

**Why Some Institutions Do Not Die**

Colonial continuities as petrified in institutional structures, cross-epochal habitus, and transformed ideologies are key issues in a comparative research project on governmental agencies in Qing China and Russia by Chia Ning, Heuschert-Laage, and Schorkowitz. Focussing on the role of the *Lifanyuan* (Court for the Regulations of the Frontier) colonial administration, Heuschert-Laage, in her source-based research project, explores Mongolia-related Qing integration strategies and analyses the impact of these processes on Mongolian societies. Having once been a powerful player in Eurasia, the Mongols underwent many changes and were, by the end of the Qing Dynasty (1912), in a state reminiscent of that of colonised peoples in other parts of the world. To explain the changing modes of their integration into an administrative system with the emperor at the top, Heuschert-Laage investigates the political techniques of patronage with their formalised language and expressions of courtesy. She shows that the Qing, by re-interpreting the obligations of gift exchange, transformed the network of personal relationships with Mongolian leaders into a system with clearly defined rules to the effect that, during the late Qing, the façade of a patronage-clientele relationship was maintained in order to legitimise increasingly unequal power relations. Whereas techniques of patronage were developed long before the Qing came to power, it was the *Lifanyuan* which now monitored and modified its performance: the emphasis in gift exchange shifted...
from recording what was received to recording what was given, thus stressing the kindness and generosity of the emperor and relegating the Mongols to a subordinate role at the Inner Asian frontier.

Similar shifts towards inequalities in power relations and direct rule are documented in the changing concepts of territory, especially when land rights and the use of nomadic pastures became challenged by in-migrating Chinese farmers, and with regard to the legal sphere, in which controversies over jurisdictional competence played an important role in re-defining Manchu-Mongolian relationships (see her MPI Working Paper No. 138). What becomes evident from this analysis is, first, the change from a multi-jurisdictional legal order towards greater coherence and consistency. Like the changing formats in gift exchange and patronage, this drift towards incorporating the Mongols into the Qing Chinese legal system corresponds to the general trend towards formalisation and assimilation in other parts of Mongolian and Inner Asian cultures. Secondly, the formation of the Lifanyuan was contested along jurisdictional and administrative lines and its functions were permanently re-interpreted through the interplay between coloniser and colonised, centre and periphery – a feature attested for many colonial institutions.

The positioning of the Lifanyuan within this empire-wide perspective is instrumental for a better assessment of its general role in Qing colonial governance and particularly its engagement with non-Chinese groups in Inner Asia. Guided by her source-based research Chia Ning gives a precise description of the Lifanyuan’s differentiated procedures of indirect rule, employing various ‘social systems’ to govern different ‘social entities’, thus preserving ethnic identities, traditions, and local political orientations for a long time (see her MPI Working Paper No. 139). Since its establishment in 1636, the Lifanyuan functioned as an institutional pillar in Qing empire-building even when indirect rule in the operative social systems was later converted into forms of direct governance and decision-making processes were increasingly centralised.

Complementary to the analysis on Lifanyuan’s involvement in Mongolian affairs, Chia Ning’s research not only corroborates the idea of changing colonial formats but also enlarges our analytical framework by including the Libu (Board of Rites) into a comparison of institutions in charge of Qing colonial affairs. Taking the ethnic-culturally diverse population of the Qing Empire and its Ming predecessor as a starting point, she examines three different types: 1. the Lifanyuan, introduced by the Qing, for Inner Asia; 2. the Libu in its Ming-Qing forms; and 3. the Six Boards for China proper. Lifanyuan and Libu responsibilities overlapped in some regions (Amdo, Qinghai) and with regard to particular patronage-clientele activities (pilgrimage, court rituals, tribute), the processing of imperial examinations, and the supervision of Buddhist and Muslim affairs, leading to forms of close cooperation in colonial management.

Both agencies, however, represent but two formations in a series of institutions dealing with the legacy of ethnic diversity in imperial China. Relieved of its respon-
sibilities in foreign affairs, the *Lifanyuan* continued to exist as *Lifan bu* (a revised name of the *Lifanyuan* since 1906) until 1912 and was soon re-established initially as the Board (1914) and later Commission (1928) of “Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs”, which is still active in Taiwan today and has a parallel ‘twin’ agency in the People’s Republic of China (“State Nationality Affairs Commission”), founded in 1949. It is because of this continuity and the thick structure of China’s internal colonialism that trends of integration, from ‘difference’ to ‘sameness’ (see Schlee, *MPI Working Paper No. 143*), and rule, from ‘indirect’ to ‘direct’, can be brought into continental perspectives when compared with and contrasted to similar developments in Russia, which is the focus of Schorkowitz’s research. Here the *longue durée* picture looks similar, though the evolution of political institutions is quite different. While there was a “Department of Asian Affairs” (1797) and the “Asian Department” (1819, being the de facto colonial office) as a prominent part of Russia’s foreign office supplemented by a number of indigenous self-governments and steppe dumas (indigenous self-administration), institutional centralisation took shape rather late with Stalin’s “People’s Commissariat of Nationalities”. The urge for ethnic-cultural integration surfaced in Russia especially during caesura-like ruptures (1917, 1989-91) mirroring the oscillation in imperial cohesiveness often described as ‘dynastic’ or ‘administrative cycles’. It remains atop the agenda even today as the “Presidential Council for Intra-National Relationships” shows, founded in May 2012 by a presidential ukase (decree) with the aim of forming a ‘single political nation’. Results from these three projects have been presented at international conferences in Beijing, Bonn, Halle, and Paris, at the German Anthropological Association’s convention in Mainz, and have also been published in prominent Chinese and Japanese series.

**Laos and Vietnam: multi-ethnic empires in miniature**

Both Laos and Vietnam, prime examples of ethnic-cultural diversity, can be portrayed as excellent laboratories for the exploration of colonial transformations of political and sociocultural configurations, and the making of a frontier between upland and lowland societies. Tappe in his recent research shows that before French colonial intervention in Southeast Asia, Lao and Vietnamese rulers were content with mere indirect control over upland people, mainly to guarantee the flow of goods from the mountain forests. While in pre-colonial times, Lao rulers maintained tributary and marriage relations with certain groups, the Vietnamese offered titles and ranks to co-opted upland elites. Some groups, such as the Tai Deng, however, constantly moved and mixed and thus created the kaleidoscopic appearance of this specific upland context which challenged the French colonial gaze at the turn of the 20th century.

While developing integration strategies of its own, the French colonial administration adopted lowland ‘imperial’ strategies such as the co-optation of local elites, thereby reinforcing interethnic hierarchies and socio-political tensions. Under French
colonialism, ethnic minorities emerged as a distinct social category, namely as upland societies outside the dominant Lao and Vietnamese cultural mainstream. As an internal frontier in French Indochina, the upland regions dividing Laos and Vietnam entered a new stage of political and economic integration. By taking this perspective ‘from above’ and yet critically engaging with James Scott’s upland-lowland opposition, Tappe emphasises the internal dynamics and frictions of the frontier and uncovers new aspects of historical upland life-worlds. He argues that this ethnically heterogeneous region must be considered not as a periphery, but as a zone of contact and exchange, of mutual interpenetration of different cultures, and of mimetic appropriations similar to the Inner Asian frontier.

Postcolonial nation-building in Laos was characterised by tensions between Buddhist cultural hegemony and the project of creating a single national identity, thus facing an analogous challenge of maintaining cohesiveness as large imperial formations do. This cross-epochal legacy of Buddhism as a mediator of interethnic relations has been in the focus of Ladwig’s research on Buddhification strategies and practices in the two Lao provinces of Attapeu and Salavan. Though exchange and intermarriage with surrounding animist Mon-Khmer groups signify the porosity of religious boundaries, hegemonic relations between ethnic Lao and upland
minorities have been a constant feature. Buddhist principalities in pre-modern Laos were eager to integrate these groups not only for economic (slavery) and military (forced recruitment) reasons, but also because Theravada Buddhism was considered to be a superior civilisational force.

In order to engage with forms of internal colonialism prior to the French intervention of 1893, Ladwig has analysed Buddhist historiography, local chronicles, and oral histories where Mon-Khmer groups are classified as forest people living in a state of savagery without any form of writing or state-building, performing buffalo sacrifices, and not knowing the teachings of the Buddha. The sources also emphasise, however, the integrative potential of Buddhist polities using conversion which, as in the case of Cheng villages, started as early as the 17th century, granting the group a status as ‘temple serfs’, and has continued into the present through the state’s policy of linking Buddhist temples to the new idea of a ‘civilised modernity’. Buddhification as a strategy of integrating ethnic-cultural diversity thus shows a great continuity not only from the pre-colonial to the colonial period, but also through the era of the post-socialist nation-state.

Both Ladwig and Tappe have applied diverse approaches and methods of historically informed anthropology making extensive use of archival research (Paris, Aix-en-Provence, Vientiane) combined with multi-sited fieldwork in village societies of their regions. This emphasis on archival sources entails methodological challenges, since official documents generally represent discourses of domination that often only allow for indirect assessments of the colonised (see their MPI Working Paper No. 141). Research results of both projects have been presented at international conferences in Lisbon, Chicago, Madison, Halle, Göttingen, Berlin, Paris, Kyoto, at the EASA biennial conference in Nanterre, and the German Anthropological Association’s convention in Mainz.
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Industry and Inequality in Eurasia

This Group was launched in September 2012 as a continuation of the Department’s long-term research in economic anthropology. Its organisation is similar to that of an earlier Group, “Ritual and Economy”, with the core team consisting of six postdoctoral researchers who will coordinate their individual field projects over a period of three years. The main aim of this new group is to look at the ways in which different dimensions of social inequality, such as class, gender, power, and status or caste, intersect in a variety of industrial settings, state owned as well as private. We explore how the relative salience of these dimensions is changing under altered conditions, and the implications of these shifts for general theories about the transformations associated with industrialisation. The ethnographic work will investigate the impact of industry on local lives in contexts very different from the early history of industrialisation in Europe. The overall aim is to interrogate the analytical models of Western social theory in both its bourgeois and its Marxist-Leninist variants. In view of the contemporary significance of industrial work in those parts of the world traditionally studied by anthropologists, the topic has received surprisingly little attention. It has not had a substantial impact on debates in economic anthropology. This Group sets out to make good these deficits.

The Anthropology of Industry

From the beginning, anthropological studies of industry have shared a great deal with sociological approaches. In some countries the distinction makes no sense at all. Anthropologists have frequently drawn on sociological theory, while sociologists have applied ethnographic methods when researching the shop floor and have also investigated kin and household relations outside the factory which shape work within it. Both anthropologists and sociologists have been much influenced by Marxist analysis of alienation and deskilling. Anthropological work on industry dates back to the colonial era, notably in the Zambian Copperbelt, and anthropologists were prominent pioneers of notions of informal economy in the 1970s. Since then, profound changes in global economies have led anthropologists to explore
far-reaching deindustrialisation in some regions and dynamic expansion of industry in many others.

The privatisation and restructuring processes which are characteristic of the ‘neo-liberal’ decades have led to new ways of working and labour organisation, as well as reduced rights in return for labour. In the decades which followed the Second World War, employment in large-scale (and especially public sector) industry often conferred multiple benefits, for example, to housing, education, healthcare and pensions; such jobs were generally very secure. Nowadays, accelerated global flows of capital, new management styles and regulative technologies are paring back the permanent skilled workforce everywhere, reducing benefits and increasing the use of casual labour. In short, the classical Western model of “industrial citizenship” (T.H. Marshall) has a declining purchase on contemporary realities.

There are many permutations of the shift to less secure employment, among them: outright redundancy, re-classing some jobs as short-term contracts, outsourcing work so that the same worker does the same work for a different employer under different conditions, or reducing pay so that additional, often informal work is needed for a living wage. We are interested in how these global patterns are experienced by workers and the ramifying effects on households and communities. How do such changes affect social relations and hierarchies within and beyond the factory and how do local practices, in turn, affect who has access to work and how work is performed? What are the consequences of the distinction between those with relatively secure, salaried employment and those reliant on precarious contracts or informal work servicing the industrial complex?

This is the broad political and economic background shaping the comparative work of this Group. Whereas the Economy and Ritual Group concentrated on the domestic domain, we start with industrial workplaces, shop floors, aging machinery, redundant workers, devalued skills, ruined buildings, and new work regimes. From these places we track connections to households and neighbourhoods. The ethnographic range is considerable: Eastern Europe (Bulgaria and Estonia) is brought into conversation with the Middle East (Egypt), Central Asia (Kazakhstan), South Asia (India and Nepal), and China. Whereas industrial ethnographies from Western Europe frequently chronicle industrial decay and capital flight as cheaper labour is sought elsewhere in the world, most of our sites deal with the other side of the coin. This geographic reach allows us to explore the flows of capital, labour and new managerial expertise between regions outside Western Europe, thus moving beyond an East-West divide that has diminishing salience.

Themes

In order to generate comparisons of how inequality is playing out in industrial settings across our fieldsites, we have selected six related themes on which to focus:
1. Vocabularies of Class:
How are relations of power conceptualised and articulated by people working in modern industrial environments? Does the common experience of work shape a class, or are such groups fragmented by other characteristics such as contract type, gender, age, skill level, political affiliation, ethnicity, caste, or religion? Moves to private ownership are often accompanied by changes to the ethnic composition and stratification of skilled, manual, and managerial work, and to the values attached to these different kinds of work. The management stratum is often staffed, or at least led, by foreigners who have not worked their way up from the shop floor but arrive with a predetermined model of management methods. Where a younger generation of workers no longer has the promise of work as a right, the factors that shape work, the struggle to obtain and retain control over work, take on a new salience. The power disparity between those who control labour and those who are supplicants for work has been heightened. This theme engages directly with our overarching aim to analyse the purchase that class analyses, based on early European experiences, have in different contemporary ethnographic contexts.

2. Debt and Ownership:
How do debt, ownership, and property relations mediate other forms of inequality? Factory shop floor studies afford the chance to document workers’ experiences of and responses to changing property regimes, particularly the move to private, often international ownership of previously state-owned and managed factories. We ask who stands to gain from restructuring, where and how resistance or accommodation

*Ethnic Russian miners in eastern Estonia: the structural position of Russians in society, and of mining in the economy, have both changed greatly since Estonian independence. (Photo: E. Kesküla, 2012)*
of new power disparities occur, and whether alternative forms of ownership, such as workers’ co-operatives are mooted. Work contracts reveal further dependencies beyond the distinction between salaried and casual work. Varieties of debtpeonage or bondage can disempower and bind workers to employers. In a context of dispossession from secure work, we will explore the mechanics of supplementing or providing income and whether those in need turn to family, neighbours, unions, loan sharks, or employers for credit, and if so, on what terms this is supplied. Such relationships of indebtedness, whether understood as mutual help, gift exchange, temporary or lifetime loans, reveal the networks of support and dependency across workplaces and communities. This theme thus offers understandings of unequal access to property, work, and the means of livelihood.

3. Relatedness and Genealogy:
What can family genealogies and questions of relatedness tell us about the reproduction of labour and inequalities in capitalist industrial regimes? Workplaces, household and neighbourhood economies are also being reshaped as a consequence of labour force contraction and reduced job security. Longitudinal studies reveal patterns within and between families of upward and downward mobility, migration, changes in lifestyle aspiration. Access to work underpins everything else. Age and education level are further significant factors, which operate differently depending on the type of work and the context. Often, children may have more formal education qualifications than their parents, but their work prospects are poor because heritable positions, together with the overall numbers of workers, have been reduced, or experience is privileged over knowledge of new technologies. We examine gendered reconfigurations within households, from relatively equal work in terms of status, security and pay, to divisions between who has permanent work and who short-term work in the same plant, to household economies dependent on informal sector work. Such data will help us address the familiar question of the extent to which downward pressure on factory wages and a reduced work force is effectively subsidised by informal, precarious labour and seasonal patterns of work inside and outside the factory. This theme speaks to changes in patterns of inequality across and within generations and households.

4. Risk, Environment, and Health:
What are the relationships between bodily, environmental, and financial risk in heavy industry? Foreign capital, along with new ways of working, has streamed into heavy industry plants, mines, and large-scale infrastructure projects with the aim of maximising shareholder return. Typical ways of doing this are: restructuring the workforce, rebuilding plants, and reinventing ways and rhythms of work, all of which have a profound effect on the experience and sociality of work. The introduction of health and safety regulations brings a new (self-) monitoring devices to the shop floor or mine. These are often undercut by speeded-up production lines, which
can be physically devastating, reduced times and spaces for encounters between workers or simply for rest. The cost of environmental regulation compliance is also high. Toxic pollution not only affects workers within a plant or mine but is often a determining factor in local social geographies, with management tending to live in upwind, cleaner areas and workers in contaminated, downwind land. This theme opens up a spatialised reading of inequality.

5. **Technology and Skill:**
How do skilling/deskilling, the production process and machinery generate relationships and hierarchies among workers? Once the vanguard of socialist industry, the high social and moral status of miners and heavy industry workers has been diminished in favour of white collar work as well as service and management professions. In the former Soviet Union, the industrial workforce was predominantly Slav. This has changed in the newly independent states, where Russians now have a diminished social status and citizenship rights. These new labour hierarchies have been taking shape slowly, as many older or former workers still hold skilled/artisanal labour in high esteem. New machines may put people out of work and demand new skills, making old skills superfluous. Equally, the ability to coax antiquated machinery into performing is highly valued. This theme emphasises the relationship between workers and machines in determining control on the shop floor.

6. **Political Struggles:**
What types of conflict do working people engage in and what forms do the struggles assume? Local political conditions can be decisive in reformulating social hierarchies, access to work, and working conditions. Thus the Arab Spring, the Nepalese Maoist party, and trade unions can contribute to challenging power hierarchies and how job allocations and redundancies are determined. The institutions through which resistance is organised are particularly important in light of the rise of informal and precarious contract labour, where unionisation is often weak or forbidden. We question whether ‘resistance’ is a useful analytical term for understanding encounters between different classes, and groups within classes, where incompatible hierarchies, based on different status variables, co-exist and produce subtly different forms of power.
Planning Ahead

Group members will complete their major field research for this project by early summer 2014. They will present some of their results at an international workshop scheduled for May 6-9, 2015. The focus of the meeting will be on the evolving distinction between salariat and precariat. Among the central questions we aim to address at this workshop are:

• The kinds of relationships, or alternatively the lack of meaningful relationships that secure and casual workers have with each other in terms, for example, of kinship, marriage ties, and daily interactions: Do they live in the same neighbourhoods or households, and work in the same groups? How are they differentiated (if they are) in terms of lifestyle, consumption patterns, educational attainment, and aspirations?

• What are the differences in the work conditions and terms of employment, and in the life-chances of these workers and their children? How materially different are their households? Are there marked differences in terms of education levels, in the incidence of ill health, in life expectancy, and in other markers of ‘well-being’? What are the prospects for mobility?

• How does the differentiation between these different ‘fragments’ of the manual labour force map onto other kinds of differentiation, such as gender, or ethnic, religious, or (in the case of South Asia) caste identity? Is the distinction between local ‘sons-of-the-soil’ and migrant-incomers congruent with that between the two types of workers?

• What are the political ramifications of overlaps between ‘company’ and ‘contract’ labour on the one hand and other identity markers such as regional ethnicity or religion identity? Do these types of worker have different political orientations? What can we say of their degree of unionisation? Do the two kinds of worker share the same picture of the social hierarchy and of class inequalities? How do they conceive the main divisions within society – as a sharp dichotomy or as a ladder-like hierarchy?

• Is it more appropriate to think of a range of positions along the continuum from ‘secure’ to ‘precarious’ employment? If so, what are the sociological implications in terms of the way in which workers think about themselves and their relationships with others?

• Finally, are the differences between the two (or more) types of workforce so marked that they should be seen as belonging to distinct social classes? Do they regard themselves as separate classes; do they see themselves as having conflicting interests, and are their interests in fact opposed?
Urban Anthropology

Head of Focus Group: Christoph Brumann
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The Global Political Economy of Cultural Heritage

The focus of this Group, launched in 2011, is the popular UNESCO World Heritage Convention. The Group combines multi-sited field research of the central World Heritage institutions with ethnographic studies of selected World Heritage sites in urban Eurasia, thus striving to understand both ends of this “global system of common difference” (Wilk). It explores how, through the increasingly widespread idiom of heritage, reference to the past underwrites and sometimes subverts present-day political and economic agendas.

Shifting to a New Gear: North-South tensions in a global arena

Brumann has completed his fieldwork in the UNESCO arena, observing a fourth session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 and adding further interviews with key actors. The first articles have been submitted to leading journals; further ones and a monograph are underway. Observation of the 2012 and (online) 2013 Committee sessions suggests that what was seen as an uncertain development in the previous report is a more momentous shift. Much of prior World Heritage debate was about how to make the notoriously Eurocentric World Heritage List more (regionally) balanced, credible, and representative. Now, however, the shared right of all nation states to have their candidates listed is paramount, whatever the consequences for the list.

More obviously than previously realised, this is the product of the disaffection of states from the Global South with the World Heritage institutions, mainly ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) but also IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) and the convention secretariat, the World Heritage Center. It is now commonplace for these bodies to be overruled at the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee (the central decision-making organ, consisting of 21 elected treaty states out of a total of 190). Lobbying and the exchange of favours among the states on and off the Committee prevail. The shift came at a moment when a particularly large number of strong non- and peri-European states (BRICS and G20 members and other regional leaders) were on the Committee, but incoming Northern members Japan and Germany have not challenged it and have focussed on shepherding their own candidate sites through the process. As a result, the Committee has become essentially toothless, unable to reject candidates with negative
evaluations or to take tough decisions on already inscribed sites. The tension as such is old but the blunt way of pushing aside the experts is new.

This is not just impatience with a slow and unpredictable process, obstructing high hopes for heritage-related tourism development, but a reaction to lingering Euro-centricism. ICOMOS has no qualms about approving yet another Baroque palace for listing but can be less enthusiastic about some non-European candidates. In spite of the efforts of the 1994 “Global Strategy” to broaden heritage conceptions, ICOMOS and IUCN are still perceived by many non-European delegates as Northern ‘clubs’. And indeed, ICOMOS representatives are still disproportionately Euro-American, and advisory bodies care little for the impression left when, for example, they all choose white Anglo-Saxons as speakers in a pre-session orientation meeting.

Transparency has done little to stop the new trend. The 2012 Committee session in St. Petersburg was the first to be web-streamed and fully accessible to the press. Yet the poorly concealed exchange of favours continues unabated, and delegates seem to be even more exposed to monitoring by their home ministries and site communities now, with some even on a text-message ‘remote control’. The restraining effect of transparency expected by reformers has yet to materialise.

The recent turn toward national self-serving is explicable through a commons paradigm: in the consensus-oriented environment of UNESCO, the strong interest of a single nation state usually wins the day. The long-term consequences in the form of an inflated list, overburdened administration, and diminished threat potential against conservation infringements are borne by all. Yet these costs pale compared to the immediate national benefits of an additional listing, a free hand for development projects, or the diplomatic returns for supporting a fellow state in need. Also, the success of the convention is premised on growth: new listings keep the states interested and make for happy news that the condition of the listed sites does not always provide.

The new course comes at a cost, however: the 2012 session saw a memorable standoff when the Islamist insurgents then in control of the northern half of Mali started to demolish Sufi tombs and mosque entrances in Timbuktu. They justified this by the Committee’s having placed them on the List of World Heritage in Danger a few days earlier, objecting that the sites were nothing but violations of sharia principles and none of UNESCO’s business. One might have expected a fundamental debate here, yet the news caught the Committee in the midst of its most eagerly anticipated business, the examination of new inscriptions. It was striking how, once its procedural machinery was rolling, the Committee had trouble even acknowledging a frontal attack on its authority and moral premises. It took three days to draft an official condemnation.

This is because the World Heritage Convention has a principal-agent problem: all of the agents empowered by its mechanisms are either weak – the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS lack funding and, like IUCN, can give recommendations only – or are more committed to their national interests. The convention as the
principal continues to grow as a global presence, as indirectly acknowledged even by the Timbuktu challenge, yet it thus has nobody to stand up for it. In the past, this was mitigated by the Committee states sending their heritage experts who, while certainly fulfilling their own national agendas, were firmly committed to the World Heritage idea. Now, however, delegations are led by career diplomats with unrelated professional backgrounds and frequent transfers, who serve their own career prospects best by closely following the order of their immediate principal (i.e. nation state). They have larger political concerns in mind, moreover, such as restraining inter-state conflicts over contested sites. Therefore, and in contrast to the usual predictions of the globalisation literature, the transnational players (ICOMOS, IUCN, World Heritage Centre) have been losing ground while nation-state interests have been significantly strengthened. Much more so than before, however, these nation states are now encountering each other as equals.

**World Heritage on the Ground**

The second component of this Group consists of field studies of urban World Heritage sites in Eurasia, all of them former capitals and hubs of empire that are icons for the respective nations and major destinations for cultural tourism. Their built heritage ranges from palaces, mosques, and temples to city walls, bazaars, and town houses. It is spread out rather than concentrated, thus complicating the task of conservation. The selected field sites – Istanbul, Turkey; Melaka, Malaysia (2012/13); and Xi’an, China (2013/14) – thus resemble Kyoto, the book-length study of which by Brumann (2012) serves as a methodological touchstone.
Despite the great difference in size, Istanbul and Melaka have been undergoing a similar transformation through a host of large-scale building projects. In Melaka, World Heritage and the boost it gives to (mostly inner-Asian) tourism and second-home construction for Singaporeans has been the main driver of this trend. By contrast, in Istanbul, heritage is just one force among many and tends to be overshadowed by modernist global city ambitions. Economic considerations dominate in dealing with heritage; the political value of Melaka’s heritage for a multicultural Malaysian nation and the benefits of restoring old synagogues for the AKP – Turkey’s ruling Islamic party – are less central. The political leadership and specialised bureaucracies are rather closed and autocratic in both cities, responding to clientelism rather than civil society initiatives (but see below).

In Istanbul, world-famous monuments such as Ayasofia or Topkapi Palace are in good shape while many of the historic town houses that also enjoy World Heritage status are disintegrating or being replaced by luxury residential developments. Controversial projects such as the Metro Bridge over the Golden Horn are pushed through and World Heritage Committee concerns shrugged off. In their shadow, however, a baffling array of uncoordinated restoration work by public and private actors is ongoing and iconic sites continue to be symbolically disputed (e.g. should Ayasofia again be used as a mosque?). The Malaysian authorities tend to follow World Heritage demands and conservation orthodoxy more closely for the protected core. Around it, however, high-rise development continues apace, pushing the historic port city ever further back from the coastline. Still, private entrepreneurial initiatives with ambitious conservation agendas are not being blocked, and reference to the past is normal even for large investors, as shown by the colonial-style shopping plaza located at Melaka’s fanciest condominium complex or the façade of the planned mall in Gezi Park, evoking a 19th-century army barracks on that site.

De Giosa established good contacts with the Chetti community, descendants of the first Indian immigrants, who served as colonial middlemen. In Chetti self-assertion against later Indian migrants, rituals and other forms of heritage play a major role. Marquart chose the redevelopment of Taksim Square as one of her case studies, not expecting it to become the trigger for the “Turkish Spring”. Her ethnographic observations of the unfolding of a national political drama will add a significant dimension to her study of how local citizens respond to appropriations driven by the political elite and investment capital.

*World Heritage on the Ground: ethnographic perspectives* was also the topic of an MPI workshop convened by Brumann and David Berliner (Free University of Brussels) in autumn 2012. In the first conference of this kind, 13 anthropologists with long-term field experience at World Heritage sites explored the parallels. African and Asian locations predominated, and in addition to historic cities, archaeological sites and cultural landscapes were also considered. The key role of national rather than transnational actors was confirmed. While local empowerment does occur, non-local elite personnel and institutions are more likely to assume control, and the profits
from increased tourism often almost completely bypass locals. The emergence of ‘heritage victims’, those who end up overlooked, dispossessed, and evicted, is by no means rare. A book publication of the revised papers is in progress.

A more narrowly focused MPI workshop, *Inside the UNESCO Heritage Conventions: ethnographic and historical approaches*, will be convened by Brumann and Aurélie Élisa Gfeller (The Graduate Institute, Geneva) in January 2014. It will assemble the small group of anthropologists, folklorists, archaeologists, geographers, and historians who have conducted in-depth research on the decision-making processes of the two UNESCO conventions on World Heritage and intangible cultural heritage.
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Group Objectives and Organisation

Established in 2011, this Research Group investigates local markets and other sites of small retail trade in the seemingly paradoxical context of Vietnam’s continuing socialist orientation, on the one hand, and contemporary neoliberal economic and social transformations, on the other. The Group currently consists of Kirsten Endres as Head of the Group, two PhD students (Lisa Barthelmes and Esther Horat), and, since April 2013, Caroline Grillot as postdoctoral researcher (replacing Christine Bonnin, who took up new assignments in January 2013). Besides holding regular informal meetings, the Group organises and participates in workshops and conference panels in order to place its findings in broader comparative contexts and to contribute to theoretical conceptualisations of the relationship between neoliberal reforms, economic restructuring, and changing state-society dynamics. In order to provide a visual illustration of the different research sites, three short movies were produced in cooperation with a Vietnam-based film production company.

Market Development Policies in Vietnam Today

Public markets have, in different times and places, commonly been sites of intense policing and regulation. Along with their growth, complex contestations emerged over important issues such as the institutionalisation and control of marketplaces, the levying of taxes, the use of public space, as well as, more generally, over changes in production and exchange relations. Vietnam is no exception in this regard. Neoliberal restructuring processes have affected Vietnamese small-scale traders in various ways. The transformation of urban public markets into trade centres and shopping malls is one salient case in point: large plots of state-owned real estate in the inner city of Hanoi are handed over to private investment companies for development, in the process of which thousands of small traders are ‘dispossessed’ of their means of economic survival in the marketplace. In spite of these larger processes that have so far become most evident in urban settings, large sections of Vietnam’s population continue to rely on small-scale trade and market vending activities in order to sustain their livelihoods.
The ‘appropriate’ development of traditional marketplaces has been on the Vietnamese government’s agenda since the early 2000s. New policies were issued in the areas of distribution network planning, general public market regulations and management issues, and the privatisation of market construction, renovation, and upgrading. In the capital of Hanoi, in particular, a number of long-standing public retail markets have been demolished and rebuilt as multi-story trade centres by private sector contractors. As a result, many small-scale market vendors, after years of struggling for economic survival in temporary markets awaiting relocation, now suffer the consequences of higher monthly fees, inadequate spatial conditions, and the loss of customers. In addition, since the mid-1990s, other ‘disorderly’ forms of commercial activity, such as street vending and hawking, have repeatedly been banned in government efforts to bring order to city streets and discipline citizens into becoming ‘modern’ urban subjects.

Yet the state’s modernising mission represents only one side of the coin. Equally important in explaining the elimination of traditional public markets is the current climate of wealth accumulation in Vietnam that takes place at the higher levels of an unholy confluence between clientelistic mechanisms of political power and capitalist opportunities to profit – opportunities that serve the interests of a powerful politico-economic elite by absorbing its overaccumulated capital. Consequently, the government’s attempts at civilising the marketplace have brought about significant changes in the distribution of social and economic entitlements.

These issues were discussed in detail at an international workshop organised in cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology at the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS) in Hanoi in April 2012. The workshop attracted wide interest and deepened the group’s collaborative ties with Vietnamese experts and research institutions.

Rule by Uncertainty and Avenues of Negotiation

Many of the rules and standards imposed by recent political economy changes run counter to the moral norms that govern the social, spatial, and temporal organisation of ‘traditional’ economic activity and therefore meet with various forms of resentment and resistance by those affected. In addition, rather than providing a consistent legal basis for their economic activity, the maze of rules and regulations relevant to Vietnamese small-scale traders does little in the way of reducing uncertainty. On the contrary, regulatory uncertainty (as well as coercion) has evolved as an efficient means by which the Vietnamese state exercises power over its citizens. Unlike in India or the Philippines, restrictions on the formation of associations persist and effectively block possible avenues for Vietnamese citizens to pursue and safeguard their interests. Vietnamese small-scale traders (particularly mobile street vendors) therefore engage in subtle everyday strategies of avoidance and compliance in order
to subvert, contest, and negotiate the enforcement of top-down planning policies and legal provisions that undermine their livelihood opportunities.

One way of negotiating the imposition of legal restrictions is through petty bribery. Whereas, generally speaking, Vietnamese citizens feel exasperated by the degree to which corruption in its manifold forms and manifestations has come to permeate their daily lives, small-scale traders commonly justify their own resorting to such practices by declaring them an essential means of economic survival. The tropes, analogies, and metaphors used in accounts of corruption not only frame and shape their (self-)perception and experience, but also transmit social commentary and political criticism. Kinh (ethnic majority) traders at the northwestern border between Vietnam and China, for example, rhetorically cast their petty bribe arrangements with officials as benevolent acts of providing access to economic opportunity for which they offer a token of appreciation – the bribe – in return. The metaphorical justification of the bribe as a means of economic survival, on the one hand, and as an act of the state official’s compassionate complicity, on the other, reflects small-scale traders’ moral claims upon the state to their right of making a substantial living and transforms this type of corruption into a legitimate practice.

**Informality, Moral Economy, and Household-Based Trade**

In Vietnam, more than forty percent of non-agricultural household businesses engage in trade-related economic activities. With formal business registration as the main criterion of distinction between the formal and informal sectors of the economy, three-fourths of these households are categorised as belonging to the informal sector. Whereas this classification certainly applies to mobile street traders and to vendors in temporary, unlicensed markets, the boundary between the formal and the informal already starts to blur when it comes to formally registered vendors in public markets managed by local authorities. Many licensed traders engage in ‘informal’ vending activities, for example by merchandising goods obtained through informal/illegal channels (i.e. smuggled or imported ‘duty-free’ across the border, or purchased from unregistered traders or producers), by employing ‘informal’ stall helpers, or by ‘informally’ subletting their vending space to other users. In Vietnam’s largely local, relationship-based economy, informality in fact constitutes a particular mode of social interaction and economic exchange and should, therefore, be treated analytically as an aspect of the moral economy rather than as a sector separate from the formal.

Vietnamese economic organisation remains deeply entrenched in prevailing social norms and values regarding filial obligations and family cohesion. In rural areas, the importance of the household as an economic unit becomes particularly apparent. In non-agricultural villages – i.e. villages that specialise in manufacturing and trading – family enterprises are the most common type of economic organisation. Some of these villages have been very successful: Ninh Hiep, for example, emerged as a dynamic regional trading community since the early 2000s that channels Chinese
textiles from the Vietnam-China border to various locations throughout Vietnam. Family enterprises are the most common type of economic organisation in this village, with each household specialising in a specific phase in the production and supply chain, i.e. importing fabric or ready-to-wear clothing from China, cutting and sewing garments, and selling textile products at the local market. While traditional gender roles continue to perpetuate male dominance and female subordination, it is the women who are perceived as both the main breadwinners and managers of the family economy. The prevailing preference for village endogamy and a low level of out-migration accounts for a steady growth in the number of household-based trading enterprises, as young couples usually set up their own business after marriage. Unlike in Hanoi, where the replacement of old-style markets by shopping malls has diminished spaces for traditional forms of vending, the recent construction of two new market buildings by private investors provides Ninh Hiep cloth traders with additional vending space that suits their economic needs and enhances the economic strength and reputation of the village as a major textile hub in Vietnam.

Yet most villages in the densely populated Red River Delta still depend, for better or worse, on agricultural production for the bulk of their income. Migration (temporary/seasonal) to urban areas has therefore become a common household strategy for economic advancement. Whereas, for example, female street vendors are often looked down upon as second-class citizens in the capital of Hanoi, their remittances back to their home villages contribute significantly to enhancing their household’s economic situation at the village level. Although they retain strong links with their rural-based families, many street vendors who spend the bulk of their time in the city also find it difficult to adapt to the tight social environment and set role expectations associated with Vietnamese village life upon their (temporary) return. The interrelation between the street vendors’ experience of migration and their sense of belonging and personal identity is one of the issues that shall be explored in greater depth during the subsequent phases of the project.

Cross-Border Trade, Mutual Perceptions, and Notions of Entrepreneurial Success

Vietnam’s love/hate relationship with China has been a persistent theme throughout Vietnamese history. After the brief but violent border war in 1979, official border crossings were shut down and trade came to a halt until the normalisation of bilateral relations in the late 1980s. Since then, the border gradually transformed from a line of demarcation between two hostile neighbours into a vital economic resource and thriving nexus of social and cultural interaction. On either side of the frontier, internal migrants moved (back) to the border area in order to seize the economic opportunities at hand. Along with the forging of new cross-border trading relationships, mutual images and perceptions evolved from the interstices of wider societal/political discourses and the localised, everyday experience of, and interaction with,
the neighbourly Other. Despite the fact that bilateral trade relations between China and Vietnam are clearly dominated by Chinese imports, cross-border economic ties are characterised by a high degree of mutual dependency, and small-scale traders on both sides are acutely aware of the fact that it is the very existence of the border that enables them to make a relatively decent living in this region. Yet whether Chinese or Vietnamese, the rules of the game are to a great extent determined by the side of the border on which the economic exchange takes place, and the degree to which traders conform to business practices that differ from their own plays a decisive role in determining Vietnamese and Chinese traders’ attitudes towards each other. Their mutual perceptions are thus informed as much by cultural prejudice and political tensions that shape public sentiment as they are conditioned by economic opportunity, individual self-interest, and face-to-face commercial transactions with suppliers, intermediaries, and customers from across the border.

Vietnamese ethnic-majority small-traders would certainly not deny that one needs to work hard in order to be successful in the market. The ways in which they conceptually frame their economic success, however, reveal that discipline, rational calculation, and personal skills are very much downplayed in personal accounts. Instead, a person’s propensity for trade and the wealth generated by it are narratively constructed as part of a person’s fate decreed by heaven, and a trader’s success in business is referred to as lộc – a key concept that relates to good luck, fate-fortune, prosperity, and divine benevolence. Lộc may be secured by moral virtue, enhanced by ritual practice, reciprocated in ritual exchange, distributed among kin, and transferred to future generations. It is thus in constant circulation: from ‘heaven’ to humans, from humans to deities and ancestors, and from deities and ancestors back to humans. Further research into the complex web of interlinkages between the economic sphere and the metaphysical assumptions that govern and guide Vietnamese perceptions of the self and the world is expected to contribute valuable insights to our understanding of local economic practices, the moral implications of wealth, and ideas about human agency.

Outlook

In the coming phase of the Research Group, a number of publications will be prepared. Besides individual articles in peer reviewed journals, the Group aims to produce a special issue of the Vietnamese Journal of Anthropology in collaboration with the Hanoi Institute of Anthropology. The EuroSEAS panel Traders and Peddlers in Southeast Asia Today: confronting risk, enhancing luck (Lisbon, July 2013) laid the groundwork for an edited volume on small-scale trade and traders in Southeast Asia. The Anthropological Atelier Risks, Ruptures, and Uncertainties: dealing with crisis in Asia’s emerging economies, jointly organised with the Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology in Vienna in December 2013, also intends to prepare a collective publication.
The expected results of this Research Group will contribute to a fuller understanding of complex market-society-state dynamics that inform, and are formed by, the social contexts in which the everyday economic practices of Vietnamese small-scale traders and market vendors are embedded. We anticipate that our findings will set the stage for further investigations that take up a broader historical and conceptual approach in order to situate the particularities of the Vietnamese experience within the wider trajectories of resilience and (post-socialist) transformation in Eurasia.

Cloth trader in Ninh Hiep. (Photo: K. Endres, 2013)
Introduction:
The legacy of the Project Group Legal Pluralism

This report offers the very first opportunity for the new Department ‘Law & Anthropology’ to provide a description of its activities. To ensure a clear understanding of the overview below, a brief preliminary word of explanation is in order. The basic choice was made to take into account, when establishing the Department, the achievements in past years of the Project Group Legal Pluralism (hereafter Project Group) – notably by allowing the researchers who are still associated with the Project Group to complete their work in progress. This decision was in part a pragmatic one, with the aim of enabling researchers on a contract that exceeded the mandate of the Project Group to complete their work, while also forging a link between the Project Group’s research programme and that of the new Department.

The Project Group, the predecessor of the new Department at the Institute, has succeeded in establishing an outstanding reputation as Europe’s leading centre for the study of legal pluralism around the world. The research programme set up by the Project Group addressed the complex entanglements of various forms of normativity within both smaller and larger arenas in different parts of the world. By so doing, the Project Group initiated innovative legal anthropological scholarship in the area of legal pluralism that is respected worldwide. This legacy constitutes a formidable asset for the new Department.

One of the objectives of the new Department is therefore to build on this legacy. But at the same time, one of the principal reasons for establishing a new Department was to make it possible to broaden the scope of activities, to establish other emphases, as well as to set up longer-term research projects. By focusing on continuously emerging new settings, both within and outside Europe, that are the consequence of increased mobility across national borders, globalisation, and other situations created by various contacts between cultures, societies, and communities – both large and small – the Department seeks to further develop a critical perspective on issues that are becoming ever more important within the present context. These include the changing loci of organisational power, processes in which the state’s influence is receding, non-territorialised political communities, new sources of tension between states and non-state actors, transnational configurations of identity, and new practices of political power within which they are constituted. These are all issues that often trigger debates about how to accommodate diversity and divergent allegiances and create space for them in the contemporary plural context.

It is therefore also understandable that the new Department’s profile as presented in this first report is somewhat hybrid at this stage, since on the one hand it draws
on the work of researchers who were (still) attached to the Project Group and who were kept on by the new Department and, on the other hand, it already includes work only just begun by newly hired researchers.

In the years to come, four research priorities in particular will play a central role in developing the Department’s profile: 1. accommodating diversity in contemporary societies, with a particular interest in the increased interconnectedness of law and religion; 2. raising awareness of human rights in various settings; 3. promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice; 4. assessing the comparability of concepts, procedures, institutions, practices, etc., within and across normative orders. These four research priorities are necessarily provisional, but have the advantage of enabling to group together, for this reporting period of 2012–2013, the activities inherited from the Project Group and those which are now part of the new research programme launched by the Department. It is likely, however, that these priorities will shift as the new scholarly activities unfold and the profile of the emerging research unit evolves.

The following section sets out briefly what is meant by each of the priorities, before providing a short description of the way in which the work of each researcher attached to the Department during the reporting period fits within these priorities.

Four Research Priorities

1. Accommodating Diversity in Contemporary Societies (with a Particular Interest in the Increased Interconnectedness of Law and Religion)

The contemporary era is marked by an impressive proliferation of identities, affiliations, and allegiances – religious, linguistic, ethnic, regional, transnational, etc. – that are irreversibly transforming societies into new types of plural entities. Among the research priorities set by the Department is the endeavour to identify normative frameworks, judicial decisions (case law, both national and international), and practices that address this plurality and assess to what extent these are responsive to the expectations of the individuals/peoples to whom they apply. Two research tools are particularly helpful for the study of these frameworks and the accompanying practices: on the one hand, the careful collection of basic comparative data traced through the various types of legal documents (case law from different courts, legislation, legal opinions, expert reports, etc.) and the legal reasoning involved in these documents and, on the other hand, scrupulous ethnographic descriptions of particular practices and institutions, at times including life stories. The Department aims to become a centre of excellence in the study of accommodating diversity in the context of contemporary societies by combining an analysis of the legal sources
Applicable to the topics under investigation with ethnographic (or biographical) data that serve to contextualise the analysis and provide it with an (empirical) foundation.¹

A field in which several researchers at the Department have been involved over the past months is the (increasing) interconnectedness of law and religion at a time when faith-based identity claims seem to be returning to the forefront in different ways in various parts of the world. The Department has thus begun to prioritise comparative research, based on in-depth ethnographic description, on the different ways in which the demands of state laws are, in practice, reconciled with the desire of individuals and groups to (continue to) observe the rules of conduct dictated by their religious (or other) convictions. In ‘Western’ legal thinking, diversity is usually embraced from the perspective of individual freedom of religion or thought, guaranteed as a fundamental human right; ethnographic studies show, however, that this is not necessarily an approach that resonates with the people’s own perception of group identities and traditions. The legal anthropological research undertaken by the Department seeks to provide an approach that, based on accurate ethnographic data, may lead to a new understanding of faith-based identities and their underlying assumptions. Such an approach stresses internal diversity and challenges reified notions of religion and belief, recognising instead that one of the effects of globalisation is that people tend to move away from homogeneous conceptions of religion and religious membership towards a conception of faith based on autonomy, choice, and reason. With the work of Turner, Billaud, Ramstedt, and Foblets, the Department has already started looking more closely at topics such as mechanisms for the incorporation of religious rules into civil law, the autonomy of the will (optio iuris) in family matters, and recourse to religious arbitration for certain types of disputes. At this stage, these are just stepping stones, the aim being to further assess (legal) techniques that facilitate the coexistence of different normative registers.

2. Awareness of Human Rights in Various Settings

A second related area of research which has been prioritised from the very beginning of the new Department is the – much debated – issue of the acceptance of pluralism within international human rights law.

¹ As explained in more detail below, from January 2010 to April 2013, Foblets was the coordinator of a European research project (“Religare: Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe. Innovative approaches to law and policy”, see www.religareproject.eu), funded by the European Commission (FP7, 2010–2013), and comprising 13 teams based in 10 European countries. It compiled the most complete documentation possible on cases of accommodation on grounds of religion. The systematic gathering of specific cases of accommodation – some hitherto unpublished – has yielded an unprecedented information resource that allows for comparative analyses and indicates, on a case-by-case basis, ways in which accommodation is made for religious diversity within the internal legal order of various European countries. This tool makes possible different types of research, both legal and anthropological in nature. It is this type of documentation that lies at the basis of the plan to put forward the subject of accommodating diversity as a priority topic in the research programme of the new Department.
Over the past few years, human rights have exerted growing influence on traditional international law, to such an extent that state policies, whether they regard individuals or collectivities, as well as NGOs, multinationals, and other non-state actors are increasingly viewed through this lens. As it has developed, however, the mainstream literature on human rights often builds on pre-existing mechanisms of power and made a case for individual human rights that are expected to be of benefit to all. Today, individual human rights are enshrined in most formal state laws. They constitute formal grounds for sanctions designed to ‘eradicate’ what are considered inappropriate or unacceptable practices. Legal anthropology does not neglect this, but accords at least as much importance to the particular way a society or a group views identity, affiliations, and allegiances as they evolve in response to historical circumstances. Ethnographic studies explain in detail the obstacles that may arise in the course of the advancement of a mainstream concept of human rights focused on the individual. These obstacles are numerous. One such obstacle is the fact that the notion of individual human rights, as protected by most international human rights treaties to date, has emerged from historical circumstances that did not affect all human societies. As a result, their supposed universality is not in fact obvious to everyone. Anthropology shows that the reality of individuals and of the groups they form cannot simply be summed up as a (widespread) violation of international human rights law. Instead, through ethnographic observation, anthropologists explore the degree to which the acceptance of pluralism within international human rights law can serve as a response to dealing with diversity within and among societies.

Anthropology offers a precious tool-kit (ethnographic, conceptual, and theoretical) that allows us to accurately describe the different ways human rights operate in various settings. As part of its contribution to more comprehensive (ethnographic) studies, the Department has, in the past months, started negotiations on cooperation with several other research centres working on human rights in and outside Europe, a growing number of which have begun to listen to the voices of anthropologists on the subject in recent years. This is an opportunity that should not be missed.

3. Promoting the Integration of Anthropological Research and Legal Practice

A third priority on the research agenda of the new Department is the intensified collaboration between basic research in anthropology and legal practice.

In recent decades, anthropological investigations have started attracting the attention of governments, investigative agencies, the judiciary, etc., whenever these bodies seek to gain reliable insight into legal cultures unknown to them. The number of courts and public officers that are looking for (plausible) expert findings and opinions that may disclose relevant anthropological information is increasing, at least in the U.S. and Europe. There is a significant and expanding array of roles for basic ethnographic research to play in government, international development programmes, community-based organisations, etc., where it can provide a valuable
angle of observation and interpretation for engaging with concrete legal problems. The question of analysing ethnographic material in relation to legal practice (including policy aims) is particularly crucial. This was also partly the case in earlier times, but the terms of the discussion have changed in contemporary contexts, in which a wider range of parties is involved: not only government, business, and NGOs concerned with development and change, but also the communities and peoples concerned. Consultancy work represents an increasingly significant contemporary form of applied anthropology. The Department seeks to be of service in at least two ways to the promotion of an interdisciplinary rapprochement between anthropology and legal practice.

This occurs, firstly, by contributing to the growing body of literature in which anthropological insights are incorporated into the judicial process and legal practice more generally. The ethnographic expertise involved can improve understanding of historical processes and by so doing help develop policies for the future, particularly with baseline studies (e.g., development policies, integration policies, policies of accommodation, etc.).

Secondly, the Department aims to offer a unique setting to which to invite anthropologists from around the world who are variously involved in government service or consultancy work more generally, to reflect and provide insight into their own experiences. In this way, Halle can serve as a prominent forum for the discussions inherent to anthropological practice today, thereby helping to define the new role of legal anthropologists who do consultancy work. Issues of the kind that concern the purposes, dilemmas, vicissitudes, and conflicts as well as the empirical findings and the ethical problems raised by consultancy work are bound to arise ever more frequently, thus obliging consultants to address such dilemmas as: what is the anthropologist’s position in the societies he or she studies, that of a relatively detached observer or someone committed to a programme of action in relation to the socio-legal problems studied; and how is the study affected by his or her commitment? Questions such as these – which revolve around the positionality of the ethnographic consultant – highlight ethical and other questions at stake in producing expert statements. They have preoccupied, among others, social and cultural anthropologists who serve as ‘expert witnesses’. Yet research on anthropological expert witnessing presents just one facet of a more complex, emergent situation in which consultancy work places anthropologists today. This situation requires a sharpening of the understanding of specific professional matters – theoretical, ethical, and material – that accompany some forms of consultancy work. Such matters are certainly of interest, given the problems they raise for every anthropologist who specifically engages in legal issues. There is a clear need for the further development of professional rules, and the Department will make a strong case for rigorous professional rules.

Promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice thus constitutes a particular focus within the field of research activities being developed by the Department. A variety of meetings are envisaged, both among anthropolo-
gists themselves and bringing together scholars of anthropology with various practitioners of law (lawyers, magistrates, parliamentarians, civil servants, etc.) with responsibility for decisions on legal questions. In the medium term, the objective is to produce a richly documented reflection based on concrete experience regarding ethnographic consultancy in the legal field, and incorporating these experiences into an unfolding research programme on the inclusion (or exclusion) of ethnography in the legal realm. There is no shortage of topics that lend themselves ideally to this sort of encounter: conflict resolution practices (restorative justice), property law and the elaboration of common property regimes, gender and citizenship, the nature of legal and social personality, restitution after civil conflict, the growing importance of Islamic law within the context of contemporary legal pluralism, the use of the cultural defence as a mitigating circumstance in criminal cases, etc.

4. Comparison and Comparability of Concepts, Procedures, Institutions, Practices, etc. within and across Normative Orders

The fourth priority might at first glance appear somewhat less original. In studying and interpreting specific legal practices they have come across through field research, legal anthropologists often proceed to comparisons. Through comparison, one can hope to check an initial understanding of the features of a particular (local) context against a broader (cross-cultural) field of data and expertise. Cross-cultural comparison is, however, an extremely tricky enterprise: fundamental to the task of cross-cultural comparison is the basic question of how the anthropologist talks about the events and institutions he or she is studying at a local level, how he or she ‘translates’ them. The labels given to data may exert decisive influence over what can then be done with those data. The risk of ‘false comparisons’ is a core ethnographic problem, since it is ethnography that generates the basic data which subsequently feed into cross-cultural comparison. In the research activities and projects they set up, members of the Department are thus asked to devote particular – and systematic – attention to the risks, causes, and (possible) effects of ‘false comparisons’ in their analysis of empirical (fieldwork) data and to be critical in examining the processes of translation and comparison that generate such falsifications or distortions. By increasing sensitivity to issues of comparability and translation and by systematically drawing attention to the epistemological, linguistic, and methodological difficulties that come with comparison and translation, the Department can help refine, where necessary, the conceptual framework and accompanying theoretical models available in legal anthropology for studying and comparing legal and judicial mechanisms and identifying normative thresholds (formal/informal; state/non-state; secular/religious; legal/illegal, etc.) in and among various settings. Anthropology has a key role to play in this regard. The Department will seek to provide support for this role.

All four above-mentioned priorities are situated at the level of reflection on the nature and aims of the work done by anthropologists interested in law, including legal
practice. They are also intrinsically linked to the scholarly research currently being done in the domain of law and anthropology. Given that the results of that research are often drawn upon for practical applications by political or judicial decision-makers, this presents a serious set of challenges to the discipline. No anthropologist today can afford to ignore the real or potential impact of the knowledge he or she disseminates through reports and publications, in particular when these appear to be of particular relevance, whether for the treatment of minorities, protection of heritage, or land conflicts, to name but a few relevant issues. In the years to come, the Department, by means of targeted activities, could contribute to filling that gap, and will seek to contribute to the critical reflection on these implications.

These four fairly broad priorities and the range of associated questions that need closer investigation have already served as guidelines in the selection of both the first cohort of postdoctoral researchers who joined the Department in early 2013 and the six doctoral researchers who took up their positions in January 2014.²

² Katrin Seidel, Julie Billaud, Maria Sapignoli, and Miia Halme-Tuomisaari.
³ Their names and research topics are listed below.
Ongoing Research Activities at the Department

Marie-Claire Foblets (Director)

In the reporting period, the focus of Foblets’s activities was on developing the four above-mentioned priorities to be addressed within the research programme of the Department. A number of the commitments undertaken before she had assumed the position at the Institute full-time in July 2012 were still underway during the reporting period. These projects are in line, at least in part, with the new initiatives undertaken in the course of launching the new Department; insofar as these give a more accurate picture of the entire range of activities carried out by Foblets in 2012 and 2013, these commitments are also briefly outlined below.

From the start Foblets launched a series of exploratory workshops with a view to developing a collaborative network that involves scholars from different places who have done a large amount of recent work on topics related to the four above-mentioned priorities. The first two meetings, held on 12–13 and 13–14 September 2012, were devoted (1) to the exploration of the purposes, dilemmas, and problems linked to anthropological expertise and consultancy work, and (2) to the methodological challenges posed by the comparative studies of legal cultures. The events brought together anthropological and legal scholars with judicial and legal practitioners from around Europe and beyond, all of whom face the issue of cultural diversity in their scholarly or practical work. An academic publication is in preparation.

The third workshop (4 October 2012), organised jointly with the FP7 (EU) RELIGARE project,4 ReligioWest (EUI), and the law faculty of the University of Milan, was devoted to The European Court of Human Rights and the US Supreme Court Case-Law on Religion in the Public Space: a comparison. Two other workshops followed in Florence in January 2013 and in Berkeley, California in September 2013. An application for external funding for a comparative US-EU project on the protection of the freedom of religion is in preparation. The fourth workshop was held in May 2013, and addressed the concept of personal autonomy, the aim being to prepare a larger conference on the subject to be held in Halle on 26–28 May 2014.

Another of Foblets’s major research activities during this period, completed in January 2013, was the coordination – already mentioned – of the “Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe: innovative approaches to law and policy (RELIGARE)” project funded under the European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme (FP7-SSH, Theme 8: Socio-economic sciences and humanities, 2010–2013, EUR 2,699,943).5 Led by a consortium of 13 partner universities (in 9 EU Member States and Turkey), the three-year project has yielded several monographs, edited volumes, special issues of peer-reviewed journals, an online database, and five policy briefs.

---

4 See note 1, above.
5 See note 1, above.
A closing conference was held in December 2012 in Brussels, attended by over 200 scholars and EU officials with a view to assessing the research findings. The final Publishable Summary Report was submitted to the Commission in May 2013, and an academic volume of articles in which around 40 academics and practitioners, including legal professionals and policy-makers, NGOs and EU institutions respond to the findings and recommendations of RELIGARE is in progress and will be published by Ashgate Press (UK) in 2014. Several contributions to thematic volumes emerging from the RELIGARE project (on family law and the accommodation of religious diversity in the workplace) have also appeared in the course of the reporting period. The RELIGARE project has been designated one of the three best (of 500) FP7 projects at the Catholic University of Leuven (award conferred on 11 December 2013).

Following on her earlier research on the Moroccan Family Code (*Moudawana*) at the time of its introduction in 2004, Foblets recently launched a project to assess the effects of this code (between 2004 and 2013) on Moroccan citizens living in Europe. The project involves data gathering by a team of 6 research partners, who are conducting a comparative study of the way in which the provisions of the Code are applied by Moroccan courts as well as by the consulates, administrations, and courts of the five main European countries where Moroccan nationals reside today (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain). To date, over 700 cases have been collected with regard to marriage, divorce, and filiation among Moroccan nationals living abroad, and are being studied on a comparative basis. This is the first research of its type since the Code went into force ten years ago. The Code was praised when it was enacted, but a critical examination of its application in Europe remains to be done. A conference bringing together the researchers and presenting their findings will be held in 2014 to mark the tenth anniversary of the new Code, and a publication of results will follow.

With a view to promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice (as explained above), Foblets has also begun preparatory discussions with the board of the European Network of the Councils of the Judiciary (ENCJ). The ENCJ has 10,000 members, all judges and prosecutors, spread over 17 European countries. The goal is to set up a series of activities that bring about a systematic dialogue between legal practice and expertise in cultural diversity. Two activities are in the pipeline: first, to conduct a survey among the ENCJ members on the difficulties encountered in practice by the judiciary on issues of cultural diversity, and second, to invite judges to participate in a moot court to be held in May 2014. Around 10 judges from different parts of Europe will take part.

In 2012, Foblets agreed to serve as the general rapporteur on the topic of Law & Migration for the International Academy of Comparative Law (IACL) in preparation for their 2014 Congress (Vienna). To date, around 30 national reports have been commissioned and will be used to prepare a comparative report on the topic. She invited Jean-Yves Carlier (Université Catholique de Louvain) to join her in drafting
the report. Together they will edit a volume containing a selection of the national reports (negotiations with Springer Verlag ongoing).

During the reporting period, Foblets also began to set up collaborative arrangements for joint research projects, with three finalised to date:

1. "The State and Indigenous Legal Culture: law in search of legitimacy", where she is a member of the coordinating team. The project includes investigators from 13 universities (funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the University of Ottawa, and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, awarded May 2013 for 6 years: CAD 1,901,645).


3. "Patterns of Governing Religion", funded by the International Research Acceleration Programme at the University of Ottawa, led by Lori Beaman (September 2012–September 2014), for which Foblets is ‘lead collaborator in a foreign institution’ (official title given as per the SSHRC grant).

The Department will further extend the network of collaborative arrangements as the research programme takes shape.

All other activities by Foblets, such as supervision of doctoral work and membership on thesis committees, teaching activities at the Catholic University of Leuven, peer review for journals, editorial board memberships, papers given, and attendance at conferences and workshops, are mentioned in the annex.

Postdoctoral Researchers from the Project Group Legal Pluralism

Bertram Turner

The last two years of Turner’s work was dominated by the dynamics related to the development of the new Department. Since Turner’s integration into the new departmental structure, his major objective has been to contribute to the development of the new research unit. Turner’s own research agenda and activities during the reporting period have indeed corresponded to the main fields of research outlined in the basic and programmatic texts on the research profile of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’ as presented in this volume.

During the reporting period, Turner’s research activities were concentrated mainly within three domains. The first field of research involves the issue of human security and the politics of securitisation. This was particularly linked to Turner’s contributions to the research agenda of the International Max Planck Research School Retaliating Mediation Punishment (IMPRS REMEP). This research had an impact on the conceptualisation and work on the edited volume On Retaliation, which will bring together the contributions to the International REMEP Conference on Retali-
Meanwhile, human security has been chosen as a central focus of the new REMEP research agenda.

The second domain combines the continuation of research on the entanglements of law and religion as elaborated within the framework of the Project Group, with a focus on religion as a component of settings of cultural and legal diversity. While other projects within the Department (including those of Billaud and Foblets) look at how the freedom of religion and belief is constitutionally guaranteed and regulated by state law, Turner’s research looks mainly at how such normative frames affect the social working of law and the legal agency of people in environments that are characterised as multicultural or culturally diverse.

On the basis of data from fieldwork (e.g., in Morocco at the end of 2011) Turner investigates new dynamics in the ways in which law and religion (including ‘non-religion’) are intermingled and how perceptions of these dynamics are changing within rural Morocco as well as in the Moroccan diaspora in Canada. In the reporting period, Turner devoted two main publications to this field of research, one in the volume *Religion in Disputes* and another on translocal faith-based dispute management (see annex). Presentations on these topics and in the field of law and religion included a discussion in of the theoretical approaches and methodologies with which the EU-funded RELIGARE Project operates (Louvain and Brussels, 2012), the Recode workshop in Madrid (April 2013), and a lecture at the MLU in Halle (December 2013).
The third domain of topics to which Turner devoted his research during the last two years is based on the data he collected over 15 years of research that addresses the intertwining and coproduction of normative and technological strands in the politics of resource extraction. The case study looks at the emergence of argan oil on the world market. The research combines the study of the normative framing of extraction politics in natural resource management with the areas of law, science, and technology, and shows how argan woodlands products have begun to capture the market. It also shows how this process affects not only scalar arrangements within the legal universe, but also knowledge regimes and the everyday lives and living conditions of ordinary people. In the near future, Turner’s aim is to focus on the completion of a monograph on argan oil in Morocco as an example of the complex normative realities that combine resource extraction with nature conservation, the integration of niche products into the world market, commodity chains, technological innovation, work organisation, and other fields of normative regulation.

A long-term project has now been planned in cooperation with Thomas Sikor and the University of East Anglia, UK, bringing together various strands of Turner’s outlined research profile, in particular the normative and social consequences of migration, the impact of transnational law on local settings, and the ensuing transformation of property regimes, all very much in tune with the Department’s agenda for the upcoming years. The central question is how international migration translocalises and transforms dynamics of property management. The project’s focus will be on migrants from the Global South to the European Union, how they influence negotiations over rights to land, other resources, and valuable goods in their places of origin, and how consecutive changes in property dynamics modify the politics of social justice in and beyond migrants’ home villages. The initial emphasis will be on rural property. It is envisioned to combine the analysis of concrete case studies within the framework of joint PhD projects with comparative research that involves contributions from the disciplines of development studies, social anthropology, and legal studies.

Martin Ramstedt
Since the inception of the new Department, Ramstedt’s activities have been informed by the following four objectives: (1) to help bring to a fruitful conclusion the research directed under the auspices of the Project Group; (2) to feed data and insights accumulated from previous research as a member of the Project Group into the research perspectives of the new Department; (3) to complete his Habilitation; and (4) to design a new individual research project in the field of law and religion in Europe: The Case of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin.

Conclusion of the Research Directed under the Auspices of the Project Group:
In both 2012 and 2013, Ramstedt co-edited – together with Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Bertram Turner – the book Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes (see annex). The publication of
the book was the final result of the Project Group programme “Religion in Disputes”, concluded in 2012.

Ramstedt’s analysis of the concept of local citizenship in Bali’s new village jurisdictions, which formed part of his contribution to the book, motivated him to co-organise the Joint Institutes’ Colloquium Series on “Citizenship Today” for the 2013 Summer Semester (in collaboration with Tabea Scharrer and David O’Kane from the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ at the Institute, as well as Katharina Schramm of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg).

The official end of the Project Group in 2012 was marked by the International Conference, Temporalities of Law, at the Institute, which Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Ramstedt convened on 28–30 November 2012. A selection of the conference proceedings will appear as a theme issue of the Journal of Legal Pluralism in honour of Franz von Benda-Beckmann, edited by Melanie Wiber and Ramstedt (publication scheduled for March 2014). The content of the theme issue – how different temporalities structure and are structured by law – meshes well with the fourth research priority of the new Department, i.e., the concern with the comparison and translation of concepts, procedures, institutions, practices, and the like within and across legal orders.

Contribution of data and insights accumulated from previous research as a member of the Project Group to the research perspectives of the new Department: In April 2012, Ramstedt participated in the Symposium ‘Das Recht im Blick der Anderen’, organised by Thomas Moos of the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research of FEST (Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft or Protestant Institute for Interdisciplinary Research) in honour of Prof. Dr. Eberhard Schmidt-Assmann. The concept of law proffered at this meeting comes close to the general approach adopted in similar research programmes on the social life of law throughout Germany (in particular, “Law as Culture” in Bonn, “Rechtskulturen” (“Cultures of Law”) in Berlin, the Cluster of Excellence “The Formation of Normative Orders” at the University of Frankfurt, and other smaller programmes).

On the occasion of the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association, Ramstedt organised a panel with the title “What Is Lost and What Is Gained in Translation? ‘Indigenous Peoples’ in different socio-legal spaces”, with the purpose of providing an opportunity to discuss how to further advance the methodology of ‘translation’. In the past few years many anthropologists have applied the concept of translation to projects of comparison, taking a closer look at how, in the context of globalisation, legal concepts, institutions, and practices have been translated into different socio-legal spaces. The panel sought to take the methodological reflections a step further by focusing on a concrete legal category.

---

6 Richard Rottenburg, Professor of Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, was instrumental in putting translation on the agenda of the anthropology of law and of organisations in Halle. Over the years, Sally E. Merry has contributed to this discussion in Halle.
On 19 October 2013, Ramstedt participated in a symposium titled *Das Recht indigener Völker an natürlichen Ressourcen und die Sorben/Wenden* (The Rights of Indigenous Peoples to Natural Resources and the Sorbs/Wends) at the Brandenburg University of Technology in Cottbus. With representatives of key Sorbian institutions on hand, Ramstedt was able to witness an incipient translation process of the rights claims of the indigenous peoples’ movement in the German/European context. One of the results of the symposium was to move from reflections on this movement towards an application for external funding.

**Habilitation Project:** Ramstedt’s chapter in the edited volume *Religion in Disputes* constituted the final chapter of his cumulative Habilitation thesis, *The Social Construction of “Indonesian Hinduism” in Bali and Beyond: religion, law, and nation-building in modern Indonesia*. In accordance with the regulations of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, concerning cumulative Habilitation projects, his Habilitation thesis consists of a series of previously published chapters. These chapters revolve around a common topic as indicated in the title, and are preceded by an introduction, which Ramstedt finalised in 2013.

**Translating Buddhism into Different European Jurisdictions: the case of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin:** According to the findings of the RELIGARE project (see Foblet’s activities report, above), legal debates on religion in European countries tend to revolve around two issues: (a) religious dress and (b) places of worship.

During the reporting period, Ramstedt began to investigate the latter issue by focusing in particular on Buddhist temples in Europe, an issue which thus far has remained largely underinvestigated. Ramstedt will start with a case study of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin, which is the only branch in Europe of the Songshan Shaolin Temple in Dengfeng, Province of Henan, People’s Republic of China, which was added to the list of UNESCO World Heritage Sites in 2010. In 2009, the Shaolin Temple Berlin applied to the Berlin Senate to buy five hectares of land at Tempelhofer Feld, the former airfield at the closed-down Tempelhof Airport, in order to build a huge temple compound combining both Chinese aesthetics and modern, energy-efficient technology. The permission of the Senate of Berlin is still pending, however. One of the reasons is that the petition for a referendum (Initiative “100 & Tempelhofer Feld”) opposing all existing plans to construct new buildings on the grounds of the former airport. In contrast, the Şehitlik Mosque located on Colombiadamm adjacent to Tempelhofer Freiheit, a newly developed park and open space, was granted a piece of the Tempelhofer Feld by the Senate for the extension of its cemetery. Further fieldwork will elicit more details about the development of the temple construction project.

Should the land be granted in the end, the Shaolin Temple Berlin will be able, on an even greater scale than is already the case, to develop social engagement projects such as prison work, the training of military personnel, training of the German Olympic teams, interreligious dialogue, the operation of a psychosomatic clinic, chaplaincy, and the like. Further fieldwork will document these activities as they
already exist and unfold. Ramstedt was able to accompany a Shaolin Temple delegation to the interfaith dialogue organised by the ‘Berliner Forum der Religionen’ in November 2013.

**Latest development:** In late November 2013, Ramstedt received confirmation that he has been selected for a fellowship (2014) at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg in Bonn, within the framework of its “Law as Culture” programme. Ramstedt will take this opportunity to concentrate on co-editing the proceedings of the above-mentioned LSA panel in Boston on the topic “What Is Lost and What Is Gained in Translation?” Moreover, this will give him a unique opportunity, shortly after having finished his Habilitation, to prepare a monograph tentatively titled “The Global Indigenous Peoples Movement and the Politics of Indigeneity in Bali”, which will be based mainly on empirical data collected during his past research at the Institute in Halle. He also plans to continue his fieldwork on the Shaolin Temple in Berlin.

**Judith Beyer**

Beyer also joined the new Department after the conclusion of the Project Group. Beyer’s ongoing research project, “Law and Religion in Myanmar. (de-)-constructing religious communities”, is concerned with legal pluralism and religious diversity in Myanmar. As part of the wider Indian Ocean region, Myanmar has a long history of transmaritime connections through the exchange of people, goods, and innovations, with law and religion being among them.

Probing the concept of the ‘ethnocratic city’ (Yiftachel), Beyer’s project investigates the dialectics of ethno-national urban control, on the one hand, and the ethnic and religious minorities’ strategic manoeuvring of land policies and planning policies, on the other. The project pays particular attention to the role of religion in disputing processes concerning land and property. At the moment, the focus lies here on several case studies, investigating the question, “What is the relationship of changing land and property legislation, urban development and foreign investment to the construction and deconstruction of religious communities in Yangon?” The project investigates the construction of religious communities in the sense of creating new communities, often along ethnic lines, but also in the literal sense of constructing new church buildings or expanding existing ones. Both activities are entangled with recent political and legal changes. One of the case studies is concerned with the large-scale renovation of existing churches and other religious buildings as effects of modernisation as well as changes in land and foreign investment laws. A second case study investigates patterns of migration to Yangon and ethno-religious settlements around churches.

A third case study is concerned with the construction of new churches (‘church planting’) and the general drive towards missionary work in Buddhist neighbourhoods. The project traces the different strategies used by Christian communities to expand their missionary activities spatially.
The first findings of Beyer’s research show that throughout history, land and property regimes in Myanmar have regularly been subject to political change. Since the country opened up in 2011, new land laws and foreign investment laws have been implemented, as well as new import and export regulations. Additionally, the recent lifting of international sanctions has triggered a massive increase in foreign trade and interest in investment. Land grabs are taking place on a large scale. While this phenomenon is already being studied in rural areas, the complexity of urban land transactions and especially the role of organised religion are still little understood.

The project is aimed at the publication of scholarly articles and a post-doctoral thesis (Habilitationsschrift).

Apart from this ongoing research project in Myanmar, Beyer’s other interests and engagements in the Department fall within the research priority of ‘Promoting integration of anthropological research and legal practice’. She is listed as a country of origin expert for the FAHAMU refugee programme, a UK-based legal aid network that pools resources for use by refugee legal aid advisors and advocates. Her expertise covers, in particular, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Myanmar.

---

7 See http://www.refugeelegalaidinformation.org/about-us-0#sthash.N2bvJ3wN.pdf
In October 2013, she organised a panel, “Anthropology and Law outside the University: New challenges for legal anthropology”, at the biannual conference of the German Anthropological Association (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde), which will lead to an edited volume in collaboration with Tobias Kelly, Anthony Good, and Marie-Claire Foblets. Beyer regularly provides expertise for developmental organisations, part of which consists of evaluating and advising on judicial aspects.

She is also part of a mentoring programme of the Central Asia Research and Training Initiative (CARTI) of the Open Society Foundations, where she is advising a legal scholar in Kyrgyzstan (Dr Natalia Alenkina). Alenkina’s research project builds on Beyer’s previous research in Kyrgyzstan on the courts of elders (aksakal courts). In addition to supervision and joint publications, she is working on the possibility of setting up a “Legal Anthropology” module as part of the curriculum for law students at the American University in Central Asia (AUCA) in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.

Due to her longstanding interest and engagement in Central Asia, she was elected to the board of the European Society for Central Asian Studies’ conference (ESCAS) in August 2013. She was responsible for social media, networking, and the society’s website.

During the reporting period, Beyer submitted her monograph, *According to Customary Law. Legal pluralism and the ordering of everyday life in Kyrgyzstan*, to the University of Pittsburgh Press, where it is currently under review. She also continued expanding her longstanding research interests in the role of law in connection with emotions and well-being and in ethno-methodology, resulting in two peer-reviewed articles, “Constitutional faith. Law and hope in revolutionary Kyrgyzstan”, published in *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology*, and “Ordering Ideals. Accomplishing well-being in a Kyrgyz cooperative of elders”, published in *Central Asian Survey*.

**First Cohort of Postdoctoral Researchers (January 2012–)**

As a means of enabling the Department to develop the most active profile possible in terms of scientific output, from the first months following its launch, the Department began to recruit a number of postdoctoral researchers. Four researchers were appointed, with varied but complementary profiles, each in her own way working on at least two of the Department’s four research priorities. During their first few months in the Department, all four postdoctoral fellows devoted their time to finalising, revising, and developing pieces of writing as well as to participating in various international conferences that had already been started or planned prior to their joining the Department. These activities are also mentioned here, as they are part of the researchers’ scientific profiles and in line with the Department’s research programme. In 2013, the process of recruitment was set in motion to appoint seven PhD students, who started in January 2014. Their names and research projects are listed on page 100 of this report.
Julie Billaud

Julie Billaud joined the Department on 1 January 2013. Her research interests fall, each in its own way, within the four main research priorities of the Department.

Billaud is currently finishing up a monograph based on her PhD dissertation. Entitled *A Voice of One’s Own? Women in public life in ‘post-war/reconstruction’ Afghanistan*, the monograph will appear in the University of Pennsylvania Press’s “Ethnographies of Political Violence” series. The book critically addresses the intended and unintended effects of transnational discourses and practices aimed at promoting ‘women’s rights’ and the ‘rule of law’. The book is structured around two main parts: the first focuses on the historical and political backdrop upon which women’s issues are discussed, in the context of a complex process of nation building. In the course of a history marked by forced modernisation and Islamic fundamentalism, Billaud’s book shows how the state has remained a phantom-like figure that haunts the collective imagination of Afghans in powerful ways. In the second part she shows how Afghan women routinely respond, through embodiment and performance, to the various sources of pressure pertaining to their visibility in public life. The book offers an actor-oriented approach, a close-up on the struggle of ordinary women to remain in control of their lives while preserving ‘honour’, ‘reputation’, and community cohesion. It shows how women, as agents involved in a project of self-legitimization, find their inspiration in culturally intelligible forms. Billaud’s book contributes to Afghan, Central Asian, and Islamic studies by providing a gender perspective on the effects of conflict-induced state-formation processes.

Prior to joining the new Department, Billaud participated in the research project “International Human Rights Monitoring at the Reformed United Nations Human Rights Council: an ethnographic and historical study”, directed by Prof. Jane Cowan (University of Sussex) and funded by the British Academy. This ethnographic study investigates the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), a new mechanism of rights monitoring put in place by the reformed UN Human Rights Council in Geneva. The UPR is conceived as a public audit ritual grounded in a broad social and political field constituted through specific encounters, institutional codes, norms, knowledge practices, and documentation processes.

Through a series of case studies, interviews with various actors involved in the UPR (NGOs, diplomats, international civil servants), observations of UPR sessions, and participant observation at the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights’ (OHCHR) Secretariat, the research to which Billaud has been contributing seeks to define the nature and function of this new monitoring exercise. The research highlights the intended and unintended effects of a cyclical repetition of audits. As part of her analysis of the data collected over the course of her fieldwork, Billaud has written a chapter, “Keepers of the ‘truth’”, for a volume entitled *Assessing the Universal Periodic Review: rights, ritual, ritualism* (Cambridge University Press), edited by Hilary Charlesworth and Emma Larcking of the Australian National University, Canberra. Recent ethnographic accounts of bureaucracies have focused on
the technologies (Latour 2010), aesthetics (Riles 2006), and governance techniques (Strathern 2000) that participate in the production of ‘expertise culture’. Billaud’s research interests engage with this vibrant scholarship, but also add nuances: by studying the everyday documentation practices of Secretariat drafters, her study provides insight into the concrete modalities through which core UPR principles such as ‘transparency’, ‘non-politicisation’, and ‘neutrality’ are upheld. She also shows how the language of ‘transparency’ and ‘non-politicisation’ presents the world it is supposed to ‘objectively’ depict in a decontextualised and technical manner. Billaud, moreover, engages within the affective life of documents (Navaro-Yashin 2007): she shows how the circulation of documents from a ministry or an NGO office located somewhere in the world to the UN Secretariat in Geneva contributes to the creation of specific affective regimes and social imaginaries. These transnational circuits of affects play an important role in fostering a sense of moral agency among the various actors involved in the UPR, creating an imagined ethical community of actors responsible for ‘making human rights real in the world’.

With her appointment at the Institute, Billaud is embarking on a new research venture that seeks to explore the Islamic legal culture of England. Since 2009, she has conducted several periods of fieldwork in various British cities where shari’ah councils have been set up. From September 2013 until March 2014, she conducted more fieldwork at shari’ah councils as well as at law firms specialising in shari’ah law and at banks offering shari’ah-compliant financial products.

A major aim of her new project with the Department is to map out and define the nature of the multiple political and social ‘fields’ where Islamic legal referents have made their appearance in Britain over the past decades. Because globalisation has displaced centres of Islamic knowledge production, religious sources and authorities have multiplied and become more easily accessible. As a result, Muslims’ relationship to their sacred texts, to conventional discursive methods, and to traditional authority figures has been deeply transformed. Muslims are now confronted with new forms of textuality (personalised pious narratives) articulated by modern professional thinkers without formal religious qualification, who weave together elements of philosophy, modern populism, expertise culture, and Koranic references. This decentralisation of knowledge, which has always existed in Islam, has intensified in recent years, depriving Ulama of the exclusive monopoly on ijtihad (interpretation). While structures of authority have become more fluid, a movement involving contestation of the normative basis of religion has emerged. The expectation is that Billaud’s new study will offer an empirically grounded and historically informed account of the various ways in which shari’ah has become de facto British, by describing the processes of ‘identity commoditisation’, legal interpenetrations, and cultural transformations that are produced in the encounter between Islamic norms and British legal orders. Finally, this research will contribute to the theoretical understandings of Islamic ethics and the power of Islamic norms in the shaping of ‘Muslim subjects’ in Britain.
Billaud is now editing a special issue on this topic for the journal Archives des Sciences Sociales des Religions.

Maria Sapignoli
Maria Sapignoli joined the Department on 1 January 2013. Her three main projects are briefly described here:

Global and Local Impacts of the Discourse on Indigeneity: the transnational San social movement and the peoples of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve: Sapignoli’s fieldwork over the last seven years has mainly taken place in southern Africa (Botswana) and at the United Nations meetings on indigenous peoples’ rights. It ranges from the global (UN) and the regional (Sub-Saharan Africa) to the national (Botswana High Court and Government offices) and local (the Central Kalahari Game Reserve and rural communities, including resettlement sites in the country). This research addresses indigenous peoples’ rights and identity formation in southern Africa and the ways that local people are affected by, and have an impact on, institutions such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR), and on the development, refinement, and implementation of documents, policies, and law concerning indigenous peoples’ rights. Sapignoli also examines the social movements aimed at promoting indigenous and minority rights (e.g., San movements, African indigenous movements, and global indigenous movements). At the national and local levels, she considers how indigeneity shapes the relationships among groups and individuals, and between groups and the state, law, and institutions; and how global concepts of rights, justice, and equality are experienced and shaped in practice by those who see themselves as the subject of rights (San and other minorities) and by those that either accept or deny such rights (southern African states and transnational corporations).

The work is part of an ethnography of globalised processes and the ways in which international institutions are in a dialectic with local groups who articulate their identities and requests at different levels and scales.

In the Name of the State: law, governance, marginality, and local realities in Botswana: In this project Sapignoli looks in particular at the roles of leadership, community-based organisations, local courts, and national-level courts, including the High Court and the Court of Appeal in the Republic of Botswana. Part of the research looks at the variation in the ways in which the kgotla, a traditional Tswana legal and political institution, is used by different groups in the country, and at the
sources of law that are used by the headmen/headwomen in cases in local courts.\textsuperscript{8} The Republic of Botswana is often presented as a social and economic ‘miracle’. It is an example of a country in which British and Roman-Dutch common law systems and state customary law are applied. Since independence, however, questions have been raised nationally and internationally about the treatment of San and other minorities. Only the eight major tribes are recognised in the Constitution of Botswana and have seats in the House of Chiefs. In recent years, several NGOs have worked to include minority groups’ rights in the Constitution and state policies.

This research considers how the San are treated in court and how they adapt, understand, resist, and modify what the state recognises as indigenous and customary law in Botswana, which derive in part from Tswana, Bakgalagadi, and colonial and state law; and how San representatives argue for the recognition of their ‘indigenous customary law’ in accordance with international discourses.

This research focuses also on the relationships among state, civil servants and local communities in Botswana in matters of land rights, ownership, and access. It considers the contradictions, continuities, and exceptions among practices, norms, and juridical decisions, with particular reference to issues relating to the land, natural resources, social care, and safety nets among indigenous communities in Botswana, an area where there are ongoing conflicts over state- and local-level policies and procedures.

Exclusion, Inclusion and Marginality: conservation and development. Rights, responsibilities and indigenous peoples: In her third research project, Sapignoli analyses the international and state policies, guidelines, procedures, and legal machinery that deal with the issue of extractive industries, corporate social responsibility, environmental conservation, involuntary resettlement and displacement, and the ways local people respond to, engage in, are affected by, and resist them in their daily practices. Although the issue of the displacement of peoples has been a major subject of discussion internationally for the past several decades, there are relatively few comprehensive legal instruments that deal directly with resettlement. The United Nations issued a set of guiding principles (\textit{United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement}) which have been helpful in providing a body of standards for organisations working with Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) (Oliver-Smith 2012). Other organisations have also developed resettlement guidelines. Private mining and oil companies, among others, have issued their own guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR), which devote some attention to issues of resettlement.

\textsuperscript{8} This project will also be linked to the Canadian grant-funded project mentioned on p. 84 with which the Department is collaborating and which provides comparative material on the use of traditional mechanisms of dispute settlement and mediation in different contexts (including non-African). This project, funded by SSHRCC (Canada), is entitled “The State and Indigenous Legal Cultures: law in search of legitimacy”, and is being conducted by Ghislain Otis (University of Ottawa), Jean-François Gaudreault-DesBiens (Université de Montréal), and Marie-Claire Foblets, with the involvement of 13 other partners.
Issues surrounding the corporate social responsibility of transnational corporations and agencies have become significant areas of debate in recent years. This research focuses on the impact, both of conservation and of extractive industries, on southern Africa (Botswana), and looks at the legal, social, economic, and cultural implications of resettlement and the loss or regaining of access to land, considering, in particular, the case of the San and their access to justice in the context of resettlement. This is part of a larger comparative study of the legal aspects of resettlement and of the social and environmental implications of conservation-related resettlement, which is on the rise in eastern, central, and southern Africa.

During the reporting period, and while working on the three above-mentioned projects, Maria Sapignoli also did part of her fieldwork at the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (May) and in Botswana (August–September 2013). In addition, she is also preparing several publications: (1) a monograph on indigenous peoples (accepted by the School of Advanced Studies, Human Rights Series, University of London Press), with particular reference to the African context; (2) an edited volume (to be published by UNICOPLI, Milano) on indigeneity in the African context with insights into the roles indigenous peoples play at the global, regional (African), national, and local levels; (3) a monograph (People, Parks, and Power: the ethics of conservation-related resettlement), co-authored with Robert Hitchcock (accepted by Springer, New York/Amsterdam, Anthropology and Ethics Series). During the reporting period, Sapignoli also submitted two journal articles for peer review: one titled “In the Age of Humanity: human rights, citizenship and indigeneity in the Central Kalahari” for a special issue on ‘Humanity and the San’, and the other a review article for the journal Reviews in Anthropology, titled ‘Mobility, Land Use, and Leadership in Small-Scale and Middle-Range Societies’.

Sapignoli is currently preparing a workshop for the Department (scheduled for spring 2015) entitled Indigenous Peoples between Law and Justice. She is also the spokesperson for the Department in the Working Group on “Diversidad Cultural y Protección Jurídica” (“Rights, Justice, Cultural Diversity”) with the MPI for European Legal History (Frankfurt). Finally, she is taking part in the international project entitled “The State and Indigenous Legal Cultures: law in search of legitimacy”, already mentioned above.9

Katrin Seidel
Katrin Seidel joined the Department on 1 November 2012. Her research interests are situated at the intersection of legal pluralism and forms of heterogeneous state-hood. Even though legal pluralism has become a widely used analytical tool for grasping the legal reality of plural societies, it appears in reality to be finding its way only hesitantly into (trans-)state legal reforms and policies. Seidel’s studies

---

9 See page 84.
focus on state actors’ ways of constitutionally ‘recognising’ local and religious legal orders within broader rule of law approaches and policies. The principal site of her research is the Horn of Africa. A research assumption in Seidel’s work is that the constitutional recognition of religious and local law opens up space and a forum for continuous negotiation processes between diverse actors. These negotiations, in turn, continuously (re-)structure power relations. In certain situations it appears that the constitutional ‘recognition’ of so-called non-state normative orders offers a way to deal with the *de facto* marginal influence of state law. Major research questions in Seidel’s work are: How, where, and among whom are negotiations of different normative values taking place? What are the institutional designs for the negotiation spaces in which manifold legal perceptions and normative values interact? To what extent are plural normative realities reflected in state legal frameworks, and in judicial bodies in particular? How do state actors acknowledge diverse local judicial institutions and represent themselves organisationally and ideologically in relation to them?

The research approach that Seidel has embarked upon since she joined the Department is based on her previous work, which resulted in her PhD dissertation, *State-Recognised Legal Pluralism in Ethiopia: interdependent relationships between Islamic law and state law*. In her thesis she assessed the potentials and challenges of integrating local and religious normative orders into a constitutional framework (*in casu* Ethiopian). In her postdoctoral research project Seidel focuses on state emergence in the Republic of South Sudan. For the aims of Seidel’s postdoctoral research, South Sudan presents itself as a particularly relevant case, since its ‘statehood’ in itself, and in particular the constitution of the emerging state, is still under construction. The study focuses on current constitution-making efforts. The ongoing constitutional drafting process has been officially delegated to the National Constitution Review Commission (hereafter: NCRC). In order to grasp the complexity of activities that accompany these processes, attention is drawn not just to negotiations by the manifold South Sudanese actors, but to influences by regional and international actors as well. One focus of the study is on the *de jure* and *de facto* efforts of integrating so-called customary law, including related dispute resolution mechanisms, into the South Sudanese judiciary. With a view to studying these efforts empirically, a series of fieldwork periods in South Sudan have been planned. Seidel already spent a first period (March 2013 through May 2013) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and in Juba and Rumbek, South Sudan. The troubled political situation

---

10 State recognition may be described as challenging processes of conflict and accommodation between ‘state identity’ and the self-regulation claims of social groups.
in the country permitting, extended and follow-up fieldwork is scheduled for 2014 and 2015.11

From Seidel’s preliminary observations, it appears that the internal ‘legitimacy’ of state actors is still being negotiated. Civil society actors launched a ‘citizens’ constitution-making process in 2011 in all ten states of South Sudan with the aim of contributing towards ‘a constitution that reflects the will of the people’ and promoting ‘popular ownership’ (normative frame of reference). Citizens were consulted via focus groups, the regional representatives of traditional authorities, women’s groups, youth groups, civil society organisations, state assemblies, religious groups, members of parliament, and local government actors, etc., to discuss the meaning of the national constitution and to encourage people to submit as many ‘suggestions’ as possible to the National Constitution Review Commission (NCRC).12

In its own way, Seidel’s current project on South Sudan fits into the new Department’s research plans, as it seeks to contribute to the production of cross-cultural comparative knowledge on heterogeneous statehood, constitutionalism, and the role of the judiciary in a plural context.13 On the potential and the challenges of external legal interventions and on ‘applied’ legal anthropology, Seidel’s observations – both in Ethiopia and in South Sudan – show that legal standards such as rule of law and access to justice are far from self-evident: legal categories such as the distinction between criminal and civil law are being challenged, as is the notion of ‘customary law’. Seidel’s efforts can enrich debates on the role and challenges of ‘applied’ legal anthropology.

Seidel has recently published a number of works: a monograph (based on her PhD thesis), Rechtspluralismus in Äthiopien: Interdependenzen zwischen islamischem Recht und staatlichem Recht (“Legal Pluralism in Ethiopia: interdependences between Islamic and state law”), appears in Rüdiger Köppe Verlag’s series “Recht in Afrika” (November 2013); When the State is Forced to Deal with Local Law: approaches and challenges for state actors in emerging South Sudan. In: Hoehne,

11 Methods of data collection will be participant observation, semi-structured oral interviews and collecting legal documents, including information disseminated via newspapers and the local media, whenever relevant. Methods of interpretation will include legal interpretation and techniques for comparing legal documents, the critical-historical analysis of historical documents, the content analysis of oral and written material, as well as discourse analysis.

12 During her 2013 exploratory fieldwork, Seidel was also able to access and study a number of decisions of the South Sudan Supreme Court (Juba) as well as of the Court of Appeal of Bahr el Ghazal (Rumbek), with a view to examining the role of local law in legal practice and observing how the interactions among various legal orders play out in disputes. She also contacted local chiefs’ courts in Rumbek as well as members of statutory courts, who introduced her to the various mechanisms of judicial proceedings as well as to the rules governing interactions between the local and the statutory courts. Unexpectedly, she was also given access to the Juba Archives, which house a multitude of legal documents from the colonial period. These will allow her to trace back the development of the plural judiciary, and in particular the way the Anglo-Egyptian administration approached the predominantly local legal orders (indirect rule).


**Miia Halme-Tuomisaari**

Miia Halme-Tuomisaari joined the Department on 1 January 2013. She has a PhD in law and a background in anthropology and critical legal theory. Her ongoing research venture is titled “Expert Knowledge and Shifting Subjectivities: exploring UN human rights treaty bodies”. This project studies how the expansion of the contemporary human rights phenomenon has been accompanied by the growing importance of implicit knowledge held by human rights experts. It examines these developments and their consequences through the practices accompanying the compilation and processing of periodic state reports submitted to UN human rights treaty bodies. Halme-Tuomisaari’s research seeks to combine the analysis of empirical data of the transnational human rights framework at key intersections of the different participants – governments, international organisations, non-governmental organisations, and experts – with systematic theoretical discussions. In her view, these themes have, despite the vigorous ‘engagement’ following decades of ‘disengagement’ by the discipline, remained marginal in the anthropology of human rights, as the functioning or implications of the transnational human rights framework have not yet become fully developed and theoretically robust subfields. With her study, she wishes to contribute to the anthropology of human rights bureaucracies, the study of expert knowledge, and the study of global governance. The project will produce a number of individual chapters and articles, with the final aim being a monograph.

To concretise her query, Halme-Tuomisaari’s study focuses on a single document, Finland’s 6th State Report on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to be submitted to the Human Rights Committee. Finland enjoys the reputation of being a ‘model state’ in human rights issues and a Nordic democracy that fares well in international assessments of the ‘world’s best places to live’. Finland’s State Report will be examined as an illustration of the vast number of documents produced and expected today by states as they participate in the different documentary cycles in the ongoing international human rights ‘dialogue’. In this analysis

---

the recent scholarship on contemporary expert practices is helpful, particularly the recent ethnography of documents. As the Finnish Foreign Ministry prepares its state reports, it has begun, over the past few years, to attempt to incorporate ‘shadow reports’ into its official reports. In practice this means that consultations are held with chosen NGOs whose solicited comments on the draft state report are selectively incorporated into the finalised report. Instead of this practice receiving criticism for compromising the access of treaty body members to factual information on the Finnish human rights situation, it has been widely acclaimed by UN treaty bodies due to the country’s favourable standing in the world of international human rights as well as its recognised democratic mode of governance.

Halme is also co-editing a book with Pamela Slote titled *History of Human Rights: continuities, gaps and coincidences*, as she continues, for this project, her earlier investigation of the contributions of American NGOs to the adoption of the UNDHR.

**Doctoral Students (2013–)**

Two doctoral students began their work at the Department in 2013: *Lucia Facchini*, also a member of the International Max Planck Research School REMEP (topic: Formal and Informal Migration Management in Italy: local, national and transnational factors; see also REMEP activities report); and *Sajjad Safaei* (topic: The Politics and Poetics of Human Rights in Contemporary Muslim Context). In January 2014, seven other doctoral students joined the Department: *Harika Dauth* (topic: Roma in Europe and Legal Pluralism); *Marcus Klank* (topic: Internal and External Autonomy of Religious Minorities in Germany); *Kalindi Kokal* (topic: Understanding the Litigant’s Approach to Dispute Resolution in India); *Annette Mehlhorn* (topic: Indigenous Justice in Bolivia: human rights in Latin America); *Kiran Morjaria* (topic: Dispute Management among Gujarati Indians in Kenya and the United Kingdom); *Mareike Riedel* (topic: Accommodation of Jewish Law in Germany); and *Beate Backe* (topic: Yemeni Conditions in Law: Islamic law, customary law, and Western law in conflict).

Three other students will join the Department in early 2014 for a shorter (writing) period: *Jonas Bens* (topic: Equal treatment of ethnic groups in the German legal order); *Agathe Mora* (topic: Transitional justice in post-war Kosovo, with focus on property rights); and *Ian Kalman* (topic: Migration and indigenous difference at the

---


Canada–US border). Other short stays have been offered to a number of additional doctoral students for subsequent periods (after 2014).

Legacy of the Project Group Legal Pluralism

As mentioned in the introduction, the Department brought under its umbrella the remaining activities of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, including the ongoing project ‘Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary’. Their activities for the reporting period are succinctly sketched out below.

Project Group Legal Pluralism (with special attention to the activities of Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann)

Three events marked the conclusion of the Project Group: (1) the publication of *Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes*, edited by Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, Martin Ramstedt, and Bertram Turner (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), which came out of the group’s six-year research programme “Religion in Disputing Processes”; (2) the publication of Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann’s monograph, *Political and Legal Transformations of an Indonesian Polity: the nagari from colonisation to decentralisation* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), which contains what may be described as the culmination of the Benda-Beckmanns’ research in West Sumatra; and (3) the organisation of the international conference *Temporaliies of Law*, the proceedings of which will be selectively published in a theme issue of the *Journal of Legal Pluralism* in March 2014.

The edited volume *Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes* (see also under Ramstedt) focused on the role of religion in diverse disputing processes in and out of court. In their introduction, the editors sought to deepen the understanding not only of the impact of religion on disputing in more complex ways than is commonly considered, but also of how it is often itself transformed in the process. The volume offers a set of comparative cases on the entanglement of religion (in the form of tenets of faith, values, norms, authorities, and institutions) in different dispute settings.

In their book *Political and Legal Transformations of an Indonesian Polity*, the Benda-Beckmanns proffered a long-term study of the historical transformations of the *nagari* (a Minangkabau customary polity), property relations, and the ever-changing dynamic relationships between Minangkabau matrilineal *adat* law, Islamic law, and state law. The study thus presents cases that can be compared along a historical vector. While the focus is on the period since the fall of President Suharto in 1998, the book charts a long history of political and legal transformations before and after Indonesia’s independence in which the continuities are as notable as the changes. It also sheds light on the transnational processes through which legal and political
ideas spread and acquire new meanings. The multi-temporal historical approach adopted is also relevant to more general discussions of the relationship between anthropology and history, the creation of customary law, identity construction, and the anthropology of colonialism.

The official winding up of the Project Group at the end of 2012 was marked by an international conference, *Temporalities of Law*, convened by Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, and Martin Ramstedt at the Institute on 28–30 November 2012. The purpose of the conference was to contribute to the empirical and comparative study of the temporalities of law in society with special reference to plural legal orders. It was demonstrated that law is influenced by different notions of social time present in society at large. Moreover, law is dependent to a significant degree on the temporalities of other academic disciplines that help establish evidence, the culpability of the culprit, and so forth. These insights are not purely of theoretical value; they can be of utmost practical importance as well, for instance, when one has to deal with divergent understandings of timeframes in cross-cultural disputing, as several contributions submitted to the discussions showed. As mentioned above, a selection of these contributions will be published in a theme issue of the *Journal of Legal Pluralism* in March 2014.

In April 2012, Keebet and Franz von Benda-Beckmann participated in the international workshop *Where Now? Moving beyond traditional legal geographies*, organised by the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy at the University of Buffalo, New York. There they presented two joint papers: the first, “Interdisciplinary Legal Scholarships: experiences, probabilities and suggestions”, offered a social-science perspective on the study of law and space. The paper draws on the anthropology of law, with its emphasis on plural legal constellations in which dissimilar and often contradictory notions of space and boundaries, and their legal relevance, come to co-exist in mutual interdependence within the same physical or socio-political space. The paper furthermore highlighted the temporality of legal space- and place-making, suggesting that the fading in and out and the multiple legalities of spaces are the least understood aspects of the temporality of space. These aspects are, however, critical to the power relations within multi-normative spaces and to the degree of legal uncertainty that persons living in these spaces face. Presenting the paper in Buffalo and then again in July 2012 at the Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association in Honolulu served as preparation for the aforementioned *Temporalities of Law* conference in November 2012. The second paper, “Interdisciplinary Legal Scholarships: experiences, probabilities and suggestions”, focused in on the theoretical and practical problems of interdisciplinary legal studies.

In September 2012, Keebet and Franz von Benda-Beckmann attended a symposium, *Pluralism, Transnationalism, and Culture in Asian Pluralism*, in honour of M.B. Hooker, whose analyses of Indonesian and other Asian legal systems have become classics. In their paper “Legal Pluralism, Comparative Law and Legal Anthropology”, they revisited Hooker’s classic *Legal Pluralism* (1975), in which
Hooker sketched an impressive comparative picture of plural legal orders in Asia and provided a detailed overview of the colonial legal and legal anthropological scholarship. In their view, the main role of comparative law is to provide an understanding of diversity in law rather than to promote uniformity of law. This understanding should be grounded in a thorough assessment of the history of legal pluralism and the painful experiences with the many earlier policies that endeavoured to create more legal uniformity. Such an assessment will also inform the research on comparison and comparability to be carried out at the new Department.

Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia

The project “Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia” was completed in 2012. Launched in 2008 under the VW initiative “Unity amidst Variety? Intellectual foundations and requirements for an enlarged Europe”, the project explored the interrelatedness of local state formation and social security arrangements in rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia. It concentrated on two major fields of state regulation: access to productive resources and access to social assistance. The project’s most important outcome has been the development of an ethno-graphically grounded relational perspective of the state expressed in a compilation of comparative articles, most of which are the result of collaborative efforts among the team members (Tatjana Thelen, Larissa Vettes, Mihai Popa, and André Thiemann).

The project was carried out within the framework of the Project Group under the leadership of Tatjana Thelen and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann from the MPI, and Katalin Kovács, a Hungarian anthropologist/rural sociologist from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. During and after the project, some members left the group and developed further research perspectives and collaborations.

Tatjana Thelen, who had initiated the project proposal and served as lead researcher and main coordinator, completed her Habilitation thesis (defended at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg in 2012). She has since accepted a professorship in ethnographic methods and social network analysis at the University of Vienna.

Over the course of the project, Larissa Vettes, Agnieszka Pasieka, and Duška Vranjes acted as assistant coordinators. After defending her PhD thesis, Agnieszka Pasieka was awarded a Bronisław Geremek Junior Visiting Fellowship at the Institute of Human Sciences in Vienna and is now a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences. Her continued cooperation with Rebecca Kay and Tatjana Thelen resulted in a publication (Pasieka 2012) in a special issue of the journal Rural Studies, edited by Rebecca Kay, Sergej Shubin, and Tatjana Thelen.

Duška Roth, together with Stefan Dorondel, organised a panel at the annual forum of the Leibnitz Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe (IAMO), at which several project members presented papers in June 2012. Roth is currently a research fellow at the University of Munich (Leopold Kretzenbacher
Fellowship) doing archival and ethnographic research on the religious and political meanings of a Marian apparition in a Dalmatian village in Croatia in the late 1980s.

Stefan Dorondel is continuing his research on natural resources with a grant from the Romanian National Research Agency, in a new project dealing with the social, economic, and ecological effects of damming the Lower Danube in the 20th century, the effects of which are still felt today in both Romania and Bulgaria.

Gyöngyi Schwarcz has been employed as a researcher at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre of Regional Studies, since June 2012. She continues to cooperate with Alexandra Szőke, digging deeper into topics already explored within the project.

Alexandra Szőke handed in and defended her PhD thesis at the Central European University in 2012, with Thelen as an external examiner. She is currently a postdoctoral fellow attached to the University of Vienna and is working on her new project, “A ‘Road to Work’? – Public work and (un)employment in the Hungarian countryside”, financed by the ERSTE Foundation as a Fellowship for Social Research. The public work programme is examined both in terms of ‘social integration’ and of labour market reintegration, as well as from the perspective of the various effects on the local labour markets and the ways it transforms generational and gender relations within the families affected.

Larissa Vettes took up a position as full-time lecturer at the Institute for Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (2011–2013), and continues to be associated with the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’. Since October 2013 she has been a postdoctoral fellow (one year appointment) within the project initiative “Recht im Kontext” (“Law in Context”: Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin/Institute for Advanced Study). Of the project’s two PhD students, Mihai Popa and André Thiemann remain associated with the new Department; their activities are described in more detail in the annex. Both plan to defend their doctoral theses during the first semester of 2014.

The team was also supported by Andrew Cartwright (Center for Policy Studies, Central European University) as an external advisor and specialist on rural development policies in postsocialist countries, and by Rebecca Kay (Professor of Russian Gender Studies, Department of Central and East European Studies, University of Glasgow), who works on social security in Siberia. The latter collaboration resulted in the joint editorship of “Rural Realities in Post-Socialist Space”, a special issue of the *Journal of Rural Studies* (Kay, Shubin, and Thelen 2012).

Of the central topics that emerged in the “Local State and Social Security” project, several, such as the link between local states and social security, the regulation of natural resources, and questions of inclusion and exclusion, continue to shape the research activities of former Project Group members.
Siberian Studies Centre

Directors: Chris Hann and Günther Schlee
Coordinator: Joachim Otto Habeck

Joachim Otto Habeck

Highlights

• In 2012 Wieland Hintzsche, a Halle-based historian, and Joachim Otto Habeck published a collected volume of papers on the history of exploration and scientific documentation of Siberia, summarising the results of a series of conferences in collaboration with the Francke Foundations in Halle, Russian archives, and Siberian universities.

• In cooperation with geographers of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography in Leipzig, Habeck co-edited a collected volume on Nomadic and Indigenous Spaces: productions and cognitions, published by Ashgate in December 2013. The volume has resulted from research in the DFG-funded Sonderforschungsbereich on the interrelations of nomadic and sedentary societies (SFB 586, 2004–2012).

• In September 2012 Joseph Long received the J.B. Donne Essay Prize on the Anthropology of Art for his essay “The Buryat circle dance and the aesthetics of belonging: Meaning to perform and performing to mean in Southern Siberia”.

• Three PhD dissertations have been published as monographs in 2012 and 2013: Katharina Gernet on young indigenous women’s (im-)mobility in a Kamchatkan village; Anett Oelschlägel on plural world interpretations among the Tyva of South Siberia; and Stephan Dudeck on representations of indigenous lifestyles between taiga encampments and oil workers’ towns in West Siberia.

• In January 2013 Habeck defended his post-doctoral dissertation (Habilitationsschrift) on The House of Culture in Russia: performance of an ideal state at Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg. The manuscript will be published in mid-2014. Habeck has been offered a professorship at the University of Hamburg and will commence his work there in April 2014.
Introduction and Overview

Siberia, in both Russian and international perception, has been continually perceived as a frontier, characterised by particular – and particularly strong – dynamics of development. The scope and speed of development have recently increased in nearly all spheres: in the domain of economic development (as exemplified by the expansion of mineral resource extraction into the shelf of the Arctic Ocean); environmental change (global warming and permafrost degradation); migration processes (a growing influx of migrants from China and Central Asia); and administrative shifts (centralisation, territorial mergers, and the reframing of indigenous entitlements).

Being aware of the tension between political peripherality and the new geopolitical importance of their region, the inhabitants of Siberia experience their everyday existence in terms of both marginalisation and participation in the state’s renewed quest to modernise the entire country. Siberia’s history as an internal colony has created multiple hierarchies and regimes of exploitation, along with niches of retreat or resistance. The region has a contradictory past of freedom and totalitarian surveillance, and this very contradiction comes to the fore in many families’ biographies and individual experiences. Anthropology, in pursuing the task of examining social change in its most obvious as well as most subtle nuances, has drawn on Siberia to explore rapid processes of modernisation and concomitant shifts in social organisation and self-perception.

Research in Siberia has been conducted at the MPI for Social Anthropology from its very beginnings and it has steadily contributed to the Institute’s theoretical advancements, initially through its focus on property relations in indigenous communities and institutional changes in the spheres of hunting, fishing, and reindeer herding. The research agenda of the Siberian Studies Centre has been extended over the years to include additional aspects of social change in Siberia and, more generally, Russia:

1. Traditional livelihoods and access to land have remained important topics and the most innovative contribution in this regard has been achieved through the Centre’s special focus on perception of the environment and orientation in space. Methods of navigation, travelling skills, and conceptualisations of space have been studied from both phenomenological and cognitivist perspectives. Of these two, the latter has been pursued intensively by Kirill Istomin, who initiated a cross-disciplinary pilot study on spatial cognition as a spin-off activity, collaborating with colleagues from other MPIs and advancing the field of neuro-anthropology.

2. The team of Siberianists found it necessary to overcome the conventional focus on indigenous peoples, expanding social-scientific research to include all parts of society in Siberia – indigenous and non-indigenous. If earlier fieldwork took place almost exclusively in rural areas, it became obvious that urban settings and rural-urban connections also had to be studied, so as to embrace the entire spectrum of present-day indigenous livelihoods. Moreover, mobility and mi-
gration, access to resources, economic opportunities and inequalities affect all parts of the population, in highly differential ways that cannot be explained by ethnic affiliation alone.

3. We examined official displays of identity and solidarity hosted by state-supported institutions at the local level, notably through multi-sited fieldwork in the House of Culture (dom kul'tury), the socialist and post-socialist equivalent of what arts centres or community centres are in Western countries. A state-controlled institution with branches in nearly all settlements, the House of Culture continues to play a major role in setting standards in amateur arts, cultural production, and artistic expression of ethnicity. The institution participates in the promotion of ‘unity in diversity’, the basic principle of the state’s attempt to maintain justice among the many ethnic groups and retain their loyalty towards the federal state.

4. Initially, we considered indigeneity and ethnicity to be prime registers of identification, but then broadened the perspective to include other forms of identity. Central to this endeavour was to apply the concept of lifestyle – thus far used in sociology – to Siberia as a domain of anthropological research. This concept has enabled us to examine how social norms, individual reflexivity, aesthetic conventions, and habitualised practice interact in processes of identification. In addition, it has helped to understand ways of belonging that depend on voluntary forms of identification, on the one hand, and new forms of popular culture, on the other, which have hitherto been largely ignored in Siberian studies. The political relevance of this becomes evident in present debates on morality, healthy lifestyles, the social order, and loyal citizenship in present-day Russia. Results of this research will be published shortly.

The following section highlights our most recent activities in these fields.

**Main Fields of Research, 2012–2013**

**Perception of the Environment, Navigation, and Movement**

Shortly before the completion of the DFG-funded Collaborative Research Centre on *Difference and Integration* (SFB 586, 2004–2012), the focus of which was on the interaction between nomadic and sedentary groups, members of the Siberian Studies Centre (Schlee, Habeck, Istomin) prepared a conference on *Nomadic and Indigenous Spaces* in collaboration with geographers of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (Judith Miggelbrink and colleagues), convened in Leipzig in early 2011. Habeck is one of the co-editors of the ensuing book, which contains chapters by Kirill Istomin, Joseph Long, and former MPI researchers Brian Donahoe and Florian Stammler, among others. The volume explores perceptions of space, wayfinding and navigation, technological change, and experiences of movement and dwelling with special attention to pastoral (nomadic) groups in the Far North and elsewhere.
Throughout the volume, an intensive debate unfolds among geographers and anthropologists on phenomenological, cognitivist, and political interpretations of spatiality and mobility in Far Northern and other nomadic settings. Several authors offer critical views on the oft-quoted idea of striated versus smooth (‘nomadic’) space, proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Others argue against Tim Ingold’s tenet that cognitive approaches alone cannot fully embrace how humans actually perceive their environment. Ingold himself, in the epilogue of the volume, counters by emphasising that many cognitive approaches tend to reduce knowing and knowledge to the spatiality of the brain, all too often neglecting the processuality and the bodily movement without which knowledge cannot happen. He likens neuro-imaging to the production of maps, a device of authoritative knowledge and a technique of depiction that cannot really capture temporality.

**Infrastructure, (Im-)Mobility, and Life Projects**

We have examined the topic of mobility and spatiality in Russia’s peripheries from manifold perspectives. These include migration in search of employment and income from China to Russia and the ways it is discussed in China (conducted by Artem Rabogoshvili) and informal, web-based practices of international mobility across Siberia (Denis Zuev’s research on couch-surfing).

Our research highlights that the land, in its spatial quality, is not necessarily an asset for the inhabitants of Siberia, but rather frequently a problem. Roads, railways, and other infrastructure were mainly built in Soviet times: they largely reflect the strongly hierarchical character of the administrative division. Zuev and Habeck describe how rural dwellers’ activities and itineraries are shaped by this ‘dendritic infrastructure’ in its remotest ramifications, and identify vernacular strategies to compensate for the lack or absence of transport. Using the example of the Terskii Coast, Kola Peninsula, Nakhshina shows how local inhabitants try to carve out their existence in face of the difficulties of immobility and the withdrawal of the state. Contemporary Russian city dwellers often think that those who live in the village – especially young people – miss out on ‘modern life’ (Gernet, too, has documented this belief). Nakhshina further suggests that a more optimistic view of contemporary life in rural Russia should also pay attention to the villagers’ creative engagement with their environment, which is a source of personal fulfilment and satisfaction for many. Some Kola villages, and also certain areas of Siberia, have increasingly witnessed an influx of seasonal or weekend residents. This novel trend of affluent, jaded urbanites purchasing houses in rural areas has been providing a more stable basis for the further existence of the place, while however also bringing unrest to the old residents’ community.

**Lifestyle**

The above paragraphs tie into the theme that was chosen to become the main project of the Siberian Studies Centre for the last few years: *Conditions and Limitations*
of Lifestyle Plurality in Siberia. The project, which is now in the course of being completed, has studied the dynamics behind people’s choices of how to furnish their lives with meaning. We argue that the range of options that an individual or group is given in terms of pursuing different ways of life has been changing, and we want to understand the factors shaping that range.

In terms of theoretical advancement, our task is to find out whether and how a basic concept of social-science theory – a concept that centrally connects social structure, inequality, normative practice, and expressive modes of identification – can be extended beyond its conventionally urban, Euro-American explanatory context, and employed in a regionally different field.

Taken as an expressive mode of identification, the concept of lifestyle can be an important element in the further development of a comprehensive theory of identification. The anthropological study of Siberia, greatly shaped by inquiries into ethnicity, can benefit from a fresh, sociologically informed perspective; and by the same token, sociological theory will benefit from an analysis of how lifestyle plays out in regions far from urban centres, where ‘tradition’ allegedly prevents people somehow from developing any notion of lifestyle, as some sociologists have claimed.1 Siberia, as a region where neo-traditionalism itself has emerged as one among several options of asserting one’s identity and rootedness, is a prime terrain for scrutinising the tenet that the relevance of lifestyles is limited to ‘Western’ or capitalist societies. In addition, regarding lifestyle as being exclusive to the better-off segments of the population involves a fundamental misunderstanding of this body of theory, and its power to elucidate social change in the contemporary world. Key to the lifestyle concept is the insight that the expressive choices individuals make are themselves integrated into contemporary forms of social structuration.

Depictions of Happiness, Accounts of Incompleteness
Research for the Lifestyle Plurality project comprised photo elicitation interviews, conducted by Siberianists in 11 locations, rural and urban, with a total of 70 interlocutors. These were asked, well before the interview, “to choose six pictures which best characterise you as personality in different periods of your life”. Jaroslava Panáková (Bagdasarova) conducted a first analysis of the 480 photographs collected during these interviews. She observes that when shown to others, photographs serve to give testimony to moments of happiness and to mark one’s place in some type of collective: family, friends and peers, voluntary associations, or the collective at work.

This self-within-the-collective message is of even higher importance than the intention of creating a biographical account (or “biographical illusion”, as Bourdieu

---

pointed out). Decisions as to which pictures can be chosen for self-presentation reveal pervasive expectations on gender roles and social status.

In contrast to the depictions of achievement and happiness, the verbal accounts around the photographs, which came up in the photo elicitation interviews, were often stories of longing or lack, conflict or divorce, and generally the failure to sustain the collective (marriage, family, etc.) as the source of personal happiness.

Moreover, Panáková has examined the aesthetic conventions that come to the fore in the process of photographing. These follow the standards promoted over several decades by educational and cultural institutions (as the Houses of Culture, see below), with regard to both the selection of motifs and the composition of the picture. These comprise, for example, the ubiquitous photograph of the newlywed couple at the local monument to war heroes. Another example is the family photograph in front of the wall carpet in the living room, expressing social status, ‘culturedness’, wealth, and cosiness. Such practices are common throughout Russia, with very little regional variation.²

Typical part of wedding rituals in Russia: bride and groom pose for a photo at the memorial of the Great Patriotic War, 1941–1945, emphasising their connection with earlier generations.
(Photo: I. Schröder, 2011)

² Differences between ethnic groups can be found, however, with regard to the composition of another visual medium – drawings – as has been shown by Istomin, Panáková, and Patrick Heady in a study on Nenets, Chukchi/Yup’ik, and Russian children’s drawings, published in Cognitive Science. They corroborate earlier findings on cultural differences in perceptual processing and artistic style and they argue that the research on cognitive aspects of environmental perception should not be dismissed. This position is also held by Brian Donahoe, as mentioned above.
The Cultural Sphere as a Place of Ethnic Self-Assertion

Habeck’s Habilitationsschrift (post-doctoral thesis) builds on the Centre’s earlier research on the House of Culture yet shifts the analysis towards the role of the self in public performances of ‘cutureness’, arguing that it can be understood as an aestheticised act of self-improvement and self-disciplining. The thesis manuscript will be published by Transcript Publishers in mid-2014.

Eleanor Peers has been working on a related issue, discussing the ways in which a peculiar version of aesthetics, developed since the 1930s, continues to determine how presentations of ethnicity in the public sphere should be framed. Much of the responsibility for such performances rests on the shoulders of such groups as national-cultural organisations (natsional’no-kul’turnye organizatsii). On the example of the Baikal region, Artem Rabogoshvili has been exploring how these groups are constituted and how they participate in public displays of ‘unity in diversity’, organised with the support of regional administrations, but also how some activists express their dissatisfaction with the highly formal and at times old-fashioned character of such presentations.

Buryatia and the wider Baikal region is the area where over the last few years, Halle Siberianists have been most intensively studying processes of politico-administrative changes, reformulations of nationality policies, and public spaces for the assertion of ethnicity. Administrative mergers indicate an important shift in Russia’s policy as concerns the rights of ethnic groups: namely, the transition from a territorial model of national autonomy initially implemented by Lenin towards a model of cultural autonomy that dispenses with territorial entitlements. Effectively, ethnic self-awareness is now relegated to the ‘cultural’ rather than the political sphere (as has been argued, among others, by Long and Peers). While in line with international conventions that defend the rights of ethnic minorities, centralisation entails a diminution of ethnic entitlements and the influence of national elites in the Russian Federation.

Play, Commitment, and Self-Established Social Norms

The mechanisms whereby cultural and pedagogical institutions seek to channel ethnic and national sentiments are also explored by Ina Schröder in her research on ethnic summer camps in Western Siberia, where educators try to awaken a sense of self-awareness and worth by teaching indigenous (in this case, Mansi) language and traditional skills. In these summer camps, children and youth do experience a sense of personal development, where the continuation of Mansi traditions is choreographed in an improvised, ‘fantasy’ mode of existence. For the majority of participants who are from ethnically mixed families, the camp offers a social hub and the discovery of ancestral practices as a dream-like alternative to their experience of deficient social ties, the marginalisation of Mansi identity, and economic hardship in their home villages.
This trope of withdrawal from a dull ‘real’ life is also studied by Tatiana Barchunova and Natalia Beletskaya. Role playing is a temporary ‘escape’ and transcendence of the social norms of everyday life. Depending on the degree of commitment (or obsession), it can turn into the only desirable mode of existence. Role playing can be compared with other practices of withdrawal, for example, retreat to a dacha (weekend home) or to the forest (see below). These are spaces individuals use in order to live according to their own moral judgments and rules. Just as ethnic identity is, for some, the prime source of elation and exclusivity, so can self-made personal affiliations produce emotional – and at times fanatical – practices of distinction and discrimination.

**Luck, Control, Withdrawal**

Numerous publications on the anthropology of Siberia have discussed the linkage of spirituality and land use. Of those written by Halle Siberianists and guests of the Centre, four will be mentioned here. Csaba Mészáros, a guest researcher from Hungary, has shown in an MPI Working Paper how cattle breeders in the central part of Yakutia (Sakha), in their search for hay fields, try to take control of open areas (alaas) in an otherwise forested landscape, that is considered by them to be a generally hostile environment. These meadows, even if far away from the village, are like islands of intensive activity, connotated with ancestral ties and (generally benevolent) ancestral spirits. Such description of ‘control’ markedly differs from accounts (usually, of hunting societies) that discuss human-animal relations in terms of sharing, giving, and mutual sacrifice.

Ludek Broz and his co-author Rane Willerslev propose, on the basis of fieldwork among Yukaghir and Altaians, that hunting luck is double-edged: what appears to be the exceptional luck of the hunter may be seen by local master-spirits as theft – as a provocation that requires revenge; or the spirits may try to lure the hunter into an act of reciprocity, by which the hunter becomes subject to the animals’ world. Hunters can try to influence their interrelations with local masters and animal spirits, but they can hardly hope to exert control over the web of life that they are part of (not even partially, as the Yakut cattle breeders try to do). These ethnographies contrast indigenous worldviews with those of settlers – in the Siberian case, mainly Russians – and with the master narrative of technological domination and appropriation, so fervently promoted by the Soviet state.

Anett Christine Oelschlägel argues that among the communities she has lived with in Western Tyva, both worldviews – domination over the natural environment versus interaction and interdependence – continually exist in a complex and contradictory interrelation: they create situative frames for the identification of causal explanations and guide further action, and they come with different normative orders that can hardly be reconciled or brought into a coherent whole.

Stephan Dudeck provides a similar example of contradictory normative orders, exploring how Khanty/Nenets reindeer-herding families commute both physically
and mentally between their forest encampment and an oil worker boom town in Western Siberia. Both Oelschlägel and Dudeck emphasise their interlocutors’ notion of distinct spaces – niches, parallel worlds, and alternative modes of existence wilfully kept apart from interference from state institutions. These can be fractal in character, so that even the most official and solemn event – such as the carefully arranged display of ‘unity in diversity’ – entails moments of informality and conscious isolation.

Halle and the History of Siberian Explorations
Since 2004, the Siberian Studies Centre has co-organised workshops on multiple aspects of the history of science in Siberia with Wieland Hintzsche, a Halle-based historian, the staff of the Francke Foundations, and the Georg Wilhelm Steller Society. These workshops continue the city’s long tradition of academic exchange with Russia and scientific interest in Siberia, enhancing the visibility of Siberian Studies as a component of the city’s cultural and intellectual life. From the workshop contributions of 2008–2011, Hintzsche and Habeck selected a set of exemplary papers, supervised and edited translations from Russian, and published the papers in a collected volume, *Die Erforschung Sibiriens im 18. Jahrhundert* [‘The Exploration of Siberia in the 18th Century’]. The authors include MPI research associate Han Vermeulen and Sayana Namsaraeva, a former MPI Siberianist. The ensuing volume is meant to initiate further research into the ways that expeditions and scientific studies of Siberia fed into, and were informed by, the Russian Empire’s projects and administrative requirements vis-à-vis its newly acquired Eurasian colonies. The history of science in Siberia, and of the attempts of state institutions at controlling space and native populations, are a field where the research activities of the Siberian Studies Centre converge with those of the focus group on *Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia* (led by Dittmar Schorkowitz). This research should be pursued with a focus on the 19th century, as this period has previously received comparatively scant attention.
International Max Planck Research School ‘Retaliation, Mediation, and Punishment’ (IMPRS REMEP)

Bertram Turner

Outline

The International Max Planck Research School ‘Retaliation, Mediation, and Punishment’ (IMPRS REMEP) was constituted as an interdisciplinary research network connecting four Max Planck Institutes and two universities. The contributing partners during the reported period were the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg/Breisgau, where the central administration of the Research School is based, the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg, the Max Planck Institute for European Legal History in Frankfurt/Main, and the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle/Saale. The cooperating universities are the Albert Ludwigs University of Freiburg and Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg. The research activities of IMPRS REMEP in Halle are organised in particular by the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’, headed by Günther Schlee, and the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’, headed by Marie-Claire Foblets. The Research School’s university partner in Halle/Saale is the Institute for Social Anthropology in connection with the Graduate School Society and Culture in Motion (GSSCM), represented by Richard Rottenburg. The REMEP coordinator in Halle is Bertram Turner.

IMPRS REMEP appeals to young researchers in criminology, disciplines of jurisprudence such as criminal law and international law, legal history, and social anthropology, especially the anthropology of law and conflict. An integral part of the interdisciplinary Research School is a PhD programme integrating dissertation projects within the framework of the REMEP research focus. The total number of students involved in the network is currently 25, and the number of alumni 17. Scheduled at first for two cycles within a period of six years, the research interest of IMPRS REMEP goes beyond the scope of a doctoral programme and aims at the establishment of an interdisciplinary dialogue between social anthropological and jurisprudential research. Regular winter schools with international experts featuring workshops and conferences on specific topics have been included in the research design.

Obituary

With great sadness and dismay, IMPRS REMEP takes leave of its faculty member, member of executive body, and former head of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, Franz von Benda-Beckmann, who died in January 2013. He was a dedicated and
enthusiastic teacher and very active and stimulating supervisor at our Research School. Just one month before his unexpected death, he was still teaching together with his wife, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, at the Halle-REMEP teaching course, which took place the very morning after of the official farewell conference organised in their honour at our institute.

The Department ‘Law & Anthropology’: a new contributing partner

After taking over the position of the director of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’, Marie-Claire Foblets joined IMPRS REMEP and gave new impetus to the research agenda including an emphasis on cultural diversity, migration, and the role of religion in the field of human security. REMEP, a transdisciplinary network uniting scholars from legal studies and social anthropology, constitutes an excellent tool to intensify internal cooperation among the Departments ‘Integration and Conflict’ and ‘Law & Anthropology’. It also provides a platform that allows us to pursue the new departments’ research agenda involving legal practice and applied legal anthropology as well as the comparison of legal cultures and processes of normative translation in a wider network. The REMEP framework thus meshes perfectly with the department’s aim to engage in research and teaching in dialogue with the field of legal studies.

Research Agenda Updated

Following the extremely positive evaluation upon the completion of five of the six years of the first term, REMEP applied to the Max Planck Society for a second research term of six years. The application for extension was used as an opportunity to modify the overall REMEP research profile by taking into account the research results produced during the first phase of the IMPRS and to adapt the scientific agenda according to the findings achieved so far. This led us move toward associating the existing profile with the issue of human security. The version of the updated agenda, as reproduced here, is an abridged version based on the detailed one Bert Turner has outlined on behalf of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’. The extended version, to which all partners have contributed, will be posted on the REMEP website.

REMEP has its focus on the fundamental question of how peace, social order, and human security are negotiated, maintained, and re-gained. In this context we examine, on the one hand, retaliation, mediation, and punishment as three related aspects of dealing with the violation of rules. This approach implies a retrospective view of things and focuses on subsequent attempts to restore order after it has been disturbed. On the other hand, we examine attempts to establish rules with the intention of preventing disorder and conflict in the first place. Practices and technologies aiming at producing order and human security are thus unavoidably based on the presupposition that at least certain aspects of social development can and should be
anticipated or regulated. They also imply the conviction that the actors responsible for producing anticipatory knowledge and for designing and implementing preventive measures and regulations, according to this knowledge, can and should be held accountable for the effects of their interventions.

The profound processes of social, economic, and legal transformation of the last several decades have demonstrated an urgent need to join interdisciplinary research efforts with the aim of new analytical insights into global attempts to maintain or restore human security.

In order to deal with the complex relations of local and translocal processes and to grasp the different ranges of ordering practices and technologies, REMEP is designed as a ‘scaling project’ to link three interconnected scales.

The first scale and point of reference for all our considerations remains the nation state with its legislative, judiciary, and institutional apparatus. In a historical perspective, the emergence of the modern state and the monopolisation of violence have established criminal punishment as the only legitimate form of violence and state-organised coercion as the only legitimate form of coercion when the maintenance of social order within the framework of a state and on its territory is at stake. However, the relationship between punishment (by the state), mediation, and retaliation in the attempt to establish and maintain social order and human security is far more complex and less evident than has been suggested by conventional normative and social theory focusing on the nation state as a given unit of analysis. Moreover, while colonialism has exported the European model of the nation state to all corners of this world, in many regions, a functional state with effective institutions does not always persist. In some cases of dysfunctional states, transnational actors intervene to generate new forms of normative and institutional hybridity; this, however, often leads to new breakdowns.

The second and smallest scale we have chosen refers to segments of society that, for various reasons, are widely exempted from the rule of law guaranteed by the state. In a wide range of arenas, recourse to law and administration is either severely restricted or even entirely prevented. Instead, order is maintained to a large extent by agents who are not acknowledged by the state and who apply their own techniques, among them mediation, but also violence. Over the last several decades, policy makers have not only encouraged conflict regulation, victim-offender conciliation, and mediation beyond the judiciary, but provide a statutory basis for inserting mediation into formal justice systems. This shift towards reconciliation and mediation is an attempt to prevent future disturbances and conflicts and improve human security.

The third scale refers to processes of globalisation and transnationalisation. The governance of human security at the transnational level has recently attracted increasing interest. Security requirements find expression in the production of normative templates that address a variety of issues ranging from protection against threats to public safety to any given domain relevant to livelihood security. In this context, global governance institutions dominate the politics of securitisation by setting up
legal frameworks of security for essentially all domains of life. In this field, the monopoly of power and the nation state often step back behind international and transnational forms of policing and military cooperation, which are expressed, for instance, in the development of cross-border systems of collecting and exchanging information as well as in the emergence of supranational interventions and task forces.

Finally, as we distinguish among these scales, we are particularly interested in transscale processes. Some of them have gained importance due to increased human mobility and the emergence of multiple forms of belonging. Others are connected with globalised market developments, financial flows, and the circulation of technologies and models for organising processes. And lastly, some are linked with the contemporary trend towards subjecting states to international law. This trend is expressed most significantly in the establishment of the International Criminal Court as an institution conceived to improve human security. The relationships between retaliation, mediation, and punishment are of particular interest in this field, as the institutionalisation of international criminal law appears to be in use as a laboratory for experimentation. Within this laboratory, the scope of punishment seems limited, as are mediation and the reference to violence. The increase of truth commissions working parallel to ICCs underlines the necessity to create a balance between punishment on the one hand and techniques of mediation and reconciliation on the other.

**Current PhD Projects**

During the reporting period (2012–2013), IMPRS REMEP has entered into its next cycle. Lucia Facchini and Anne Fleckstein, who were recruited by GSSCM, our partner at the MLU, also joined REMEP, thus acting as a link between the two institutions. Another two members of the Halle team, Kaleb Kassa and Ameyu Godesso Roro, were recruited in Ethiopia and now strengthen the Africa segment of the Halle group.

The existing Halle group was thus reinforced by four more students. The students of the previous cycle have since begun their final phase of writing, handed in, or completed their PhD projects. Four of the current cohort, Immo Eulenberger, Zahir Abdal Kareem, Fazil Moradi, and Stefanie Bognitz, have completed their fieldwork while Lucia Facchini is currently doing field research in Italy. The two who joined most recently, Kaleb Kassa and Ameyu Roro, are now preparing their field stays in Ethiopia. The PhD projects cover a wide range of topics within the REMEP research agenda.

*The Promise of Access to Justice in Rwanda* (Stefanie Bognitz)
The project analyses mediation in Rwanda. In the organisation of access to justice, mediation is introduced as a mandatory, neo-institutional, and community-based level of jurisdiction. Mediation oscillates between the reinvention of tradition and
high-modernist state projects backed by the rule of law and good governance programmes. The mediation apparatus is ingrained in decentralised, administrative structures and provides access to justice for virtually anyone. However, a judiciary based on the principle of subsidiarity allows the state back in to govern ‘alternative dispute resolution’.

*Negotiating Social Justice in Post-Ba’ath Iraq: the recognition and reparation campaign against the Iraqi state* (Fazil Moradi)
This research project is set in the current context of conflictual politico-legal processes in post-Ba’ath Iraq. The politico-legal shift in Iraq has come to entail a space of possibility for the survivors of Operation Anfāl (literally, ‘spoils’) to claim reparations, which is now nationally and internationally recognised as a case of genocide, committed by the Ba’ath regime against its Kurdish population in 1988. The ethnographic study thus explores the ways in which involved civic and political actors make use of existing domestic legal avenues, international human rights norms, and global models of reparations to articulate and negotiate a measure of social justice for Anfāl survivors.

*The Ateker Region: entangled frontiers and ethics of interaction* (Immo Eulenberger)
This project examines the importance of retribution and mediation for the patterns of social organisation in a Northeast African border region where nomadic pastoralists coexist with an expanding modern order. Studying the Ateker region of Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, and South Sudan, the project employs context and discourse analysis as well as in-depth studies of collective violence as a systematic practice to explain the resilience of cultures of ethnic warfare and their entanglement with the local manifestations of global phenomena.

*Processes of Ethnic Identification in the Course of Land-Based Conflicts in South Gedaref State, Eastern Sudan* (Zahir Musa Abdal-Kareem)
The project investigates the issue of identification in relation to land-based conflicts in southern Gedaref state, eastern Sudan, with reference to the relations between mobile herders and sedentary farmers. The key question is whether land-based conflicts are affected by land overutilisation. Ultimately, more complex webs of conflictive parties turn out to be involved.

*Changing Pattern of Conflict, ‘Retaliation’ and Mediation: the Hamer-Dassanech areas, southern Ethiopia* (Kaleb Kassa)
Conflict has continued to be a ‘common feature’ among the postural communities in southern Ethiopia. This region of the country has been considered to be one of the ‘hot-spots’ of conflict in East Africa, reflecting the higher rate of conflicts and its effects, and the complexity of the resolution process. Against this background, this
project aims to address how conflict, retaliation, and mediation are conceptualised, integrated, and reflected in the everyday lives of Hammer-Dassanech communities.

Transformation in Gumuz-Oromo Relations: identity, conflict, and social order in Ethiopia (Ameyu Godesso Roro)
The study aims at examining the dynamism of Gumuz-Oromo relations in the framework of conflict and social order. It focuses on the general question of how the formation of regional states in Ethiopia after 1991 led to the re-examination and exacerbation of relationships between the Gumuz and Oromo neighbours.

“Establishing as Complete a Picture as Possible”. Media and technologies of truth in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Anne Fleckstein)
The project deals with the procedures, technologies, and media which contribute to the establishment and authorisation of epistemological and political order and the passing on of historical knowledge. It seeks to introduce cultural and media studies analysis into the discourse on political transitions and to highlight the connection of media, law, politics, and historiography.

Formal and Informal Migration Management in Italy: local, national and transnational factors (Lucia Facchini)
This project is focused on the phenomenon of international migration in Italy. Widespread, deep-rooted institutional gaps have led there to the diffusion of precarious and informal immigration patterns, in which the access to services tends to be non-homogeneous and particularly dependent on local contingencies. In such a context, it is crucial to investigate the various roles played in the prevention or exacerbation of social tensions among individuals as well as collective actors – from authorities to trade unions and NGOs, including criminal groups. My main effort will be to recognise and evaluate institutional and informal practices in dealing with such problematic situations.
REMEP Activities

The reporting period was extraordinarily intensive in terms of both research and other activities. The Halle group actively contributed to the general REMEP agenda, to the prominent inclusion of an evaluation in Freiburg in February 2012 and the Winter Universities in Hinterzarten in February 2012 and in Heppenheim in February 2013. The Halle team was particularly involved in the organisation of panels on transitional justice, on ritual, on survivors’ responses to past and present injustices, and on conflict, cooperation, and security.

In addition to the general REMEP agenda, a number of events took place at the local level in Halle. After recruitment was completed in October 2013, a new round of introductory workshops at all four contributing Max Planck Institutes for the newcomers followed. A teaching course, moreover, took place in Halle in December 2012 bringing together new REMEPs from Freiburg and Halle.

In view of the upcoming international conference on the same issue, Fazil Moradi and Stefanie Bognitz organised a preparatory workshop in October 2013, which was entitled: On Mediation: forms, models, and theories. REMEP faculty members, PhD students, and invited guests attended this workshop.
The regular REMEP Round Table was resumed, focusing on the issue of human security and the ways the concept is related to the core subject area of REMEP. As can be seen in the individual lists of activities, REMEP students were involved in publication projects and actively participated in conferences and workshops beyond the REMEP framework.

**Outlook**

After the evaluation and successful re-application, the second six-year term will begin in January 2014 and end in 2019. Apart from the new emphasis on human security in the framework, the new term brings with it a number of changes in the organisational and personal structure at IMPRS-REMEP, and particularly the change in the lead from Prof. Albrecht to Prof. Schlee, who will take on the role of spokesperson from January 2014 as Prof. Albrecht becomes deputy spokesperson. The IMPRS administration will, furthermore, shift from Freiburg to Halle, connected with the move of the position of the central coordinator from MPI Freiburg to MPI Halle. Bert Turner withdrew as a coordinator of the Halle team and remains a faculty member.

The first event in 2014 will be the International Conference *On Mediation* to take place in Frankfurt in February. The timing of the event involves another shift, namely the postponement of the REMEP University from its traditional winter date to the summer.

*Briefing recruitment committee at Bula Hora University September 2012. (Foto: B. Turner, 2012)*
International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE)

Daria Sambuk

Introduction

The International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE) was launched in 2012 as a cooperative project of the “Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia” Department of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology and three institutes of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg: the Institute of History, the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, and the Institute for Art History and European Archaeology. In addition, two graduate schools of the university contribute to the recruitment and funding of ANARCHIE students: “Society and Culture in Motion” and “Enlightenment – Religion – Knowledge”.

ANARCHIE is governed by a Principal Faculty consisting of senior staff in the participating disciplines, who also supervise the doctoral projects. The Faculty is headed by three Speakers, and overall responsibility lies in the hands of Chris Hann, who also represents the field of anthropology. In setting up the school, Hann worked very closely with Michael G. Müller, who has recently been replaced as the representative for history by Andreas Pečar. François Bertemes plays the leading role for archaeology. The ANARCHIE coordinator is Daria Sambuk.

IMPRS ANARCHIE is designed for three cohorts of twelve PhD students, each involving all three disciplines. The first cohort was recruited in 2012; the others will follow in 2014 and 2015. Each cohort works around a core theme: “collective identifications” for the first, “religion and ritual” for the second, and “economic and demographic drivers of social change” for the third. Each of these themes can be addressed in the broadest possible time span, from the Neolithic to the present day, across the entire Eurasian landmass.

The ultimate aim of ANARCHIE is to renew interdisciplinary contact between anthropology, archaeology, and history. Jointly taught courses in the first two semesters lay the theoretical and methodological foundations of the programme. Winter and summer schools offer platforms to discuss the projects with the local scientific community and with internationally renowned experts.
Research Agenda

The impulse behind ANARCHIE was born out of the awareness that contacts between these three fields of study have weakened in the course of the professionalisation of the academy. It might be argued (and still is in some places) that archaeology and anthropology are both latecomers, “subsidiary” to the classical discipline of history. In modern universities they are often to be found outside the humanities, the traditional home of Clio. Anthropology has successfully reinvented itself to escape from its longstanding association with the Naturvölker. Both in terms of empirical range and theoretical innovation, the discipline has been dynamic in the postcolonial era. Arguably, however, the changes have been greater in archaeology, above all as a result of a rapprochement with the natural sciences and ever more sophisticated methods. The disciplines have been going their separate ways for a long time, such that nowadays, even when archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians ask similar questions, they lack the training and knowledge that would permit them to consider the perspectives of their erstwhile colleagues.

Although ANARCHIE does not support projects devoted exclusively to disciplinary history, the curriculum does provide coverage of the main trends. Dialogue between the disciplines has been encouraged from the very beginning of the programme, together with an awareness of the big questions underpinning all three. The introductory courses into methods and theoretical concepts explicitly open up comparative and interdisciplinary approaches. Although every PhD student has a clear disciplinary affiliation (a requirement of the Martin Luther University, which does not award joint degrees), each project is expected to draw significantly on at least one of the other two disciplines; this is reflected in the composition of each student’s Advisory Committee.

Using the vocabulary of multiple temporalities, IMPRS questions established modes of periodisation. With the notion of multiple geographies, it explores the construction of historical regions, as well as states and ethnicities. Ultimately, ANARCHIE postulates the Eurasian landmass from Japan to the British Isles as a unity, thus pushing against Eurocentric scholarship, which has long insisted on a “continental” divide between Europe and Asia. We emphasise interaction and the movement of people, ideas, goods, and technologies. It follows that some of the theories devised to analyse contemporary capitalist globalisation may be relevant (albeit on smaller scales) to phenomena of the preindustrial era. In recent and contemporary scholarship, historians such as Jürgen Osterhammel, archaeologists such as Andrew Sherratt, and anthropologists such as Jack Goody have gone against the grain of disciplinary specialisation. ANARCHIE students are encouraged to respect and follow such trails.
Interdisciplinary Cooperation

Interdisciplinary dialogue is fostered by focusing on multivalent contested concepts such as ‘culture’, ‘society’, ‘civilisation’, ‘ethnicity’, ‘class’, ‘network’, ‘identification’, and ‘state’. Can we agree on common definitions and operationalise them?

In conceptualising their projects, students are encouraged from the outset to consider insights from the other disciplines. That no social, cultural, or economic phenomena can be understood and made plausible without historical grounding, has become evident to the MPI anthropologists, who have learned that written historical sources can also be approached with anthropological questions and techniques that often originate in anthropologically inspired historical research. From archaeologists, they may acquire greater awareness of the built environment and the constructed character of space.

As for archaeologists, whose research is unthinkable without a materially based concept of culture, they have much to learn from anthropological warnings of the pitfalls of assuming tight connections between material traces and ethnicity. Archaeologists, who cannot rely on written sources, may instead, if the proper caveats are entered, make constructive use of recent anthropological research to draw parallels or analogies with the modes of communication or production techniques of the non-literate, non-industrial groups they study. Both archaeologists and historians can profit from fresh developments in network analysis and debates over the performative aspects of social action, fields very actively developed in anthropology. For historians, one benefit of close cooperation with anthropologists is the refinement of methods of oral history; here again there can be reciprocal benefits for anthropologists, as several ANARCHIE anthropologists are combining oral history research with archival work.

Synergies between the individual projects have already been numerous, leading to unlikely but fruitful further questions. Does the construction of the past and its instrumentalisation in the course of identity formation follow a similar logic in Early Modern England and contemporary Mongolia? Did the transfer of goods and technologies affect the local societies of the Bronze Age Aegean and medieval Central Europe in basically similar ways? Can a detailed study of local networks in a German town in the late Wilhelmine era reveal mechanisms that might help to reconstruct social relations as among the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Etruscans?
Current PhD Projects

The first cohort of PhD students, those who started their work in Halle in October 2012, is conducting research which falls in one way or another under the umbrella topic of collective identifications. The group consists of twelve internationally recruited young researchers, four from each discipline. Their projects focus on various regions across Eurasia: the Aegean, Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and China. The chronological framework of the first cohort stretches from the Bronze Age to the present. The anthropological projects typically pay close attention to uses made of the past in the present, and to how different versions of the past are promoted by different actors.

Morphing “Chineseness”: the negotiation between history and modernity in Xi’an (Leah Cheung Ah Li, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Graduate School “Society and Culture in Motion”)
This research project investigates the process of heritage making in Xi’an, the most ancient city in China, which is currently experiencing intensive industrial and urban development. Leah Cheung analyses how historical and archaeological sites are used to represent Chinese “history” in order to construct a common Chinese identity.

Oral Traditions and Moral Citizens: historical anthropology of Kyrgyz oral poetry performances (Mustafa Coşkun, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
Mustafa Coşkun’s research aims at a comparative analysis of oral poetry in Soviet and post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan, where oral poetry performances have long been embedded into the moral and political language and constitute a prominent aspect of the social life of the population. Since oral poetry performances have become a fertile ground for the circulation of moral vocabulary and expression of socio-political commentary, their study will lead to new insights into both socialist and postsocialist modernisation projects.

Acculturation in Thracia and Moesia Inferior from the 1st to the 4th century AD. The role of the settlers of the eastern Roman provinces as a cultural medium (Daniel Delchev, archaeology – Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
On the basis of archaeological evidence, epigraphic, numismatic, and written sources, Daniel Delchev studies the eastern Balkans as a bridge for cultural exchange between eastern and western parts of Eurasia. The aim of the project is to analyse the role of settlers as a cultural medium: their origins, and their impact on material culture and society as a whole.
By examining the oeuvre and reconstructing the social environment of the historian Paul Rapin Thoyras, a French Huguenot émigré, Miriam Franchina seeks to shed light on the European identity discourse of the early 18th century. Thoyras’ best-seller, *The History of England*, reflects the emerging interest for the national past as a key to understanding the present and to creating a new identity based on the potentialities of human reason.

European Stoneware. Innovation and transfer of technology during the medieval and post-medieval period (Nadine Holesch, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)  
This project analyses changes in European pottery, one of the most important materials in human daily life, across time and space. Nadine Holesch focuses her research on the diffusion of technology. The reconstruction of potters’ lives and working conditions allows her to draw conclusions about contacts between different regions and the nature of the relevant collectivities.

Forms of Respect and Disregard in Mongolian Culture (Elisa Kohl-Garrity, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)  
Elisa Kohl-Garrity’s project tackles Mongolian notions of respect, which are very important for an understanding of history as moral authority. The study looks into the changing formats and framing of respect in various historiographical projects, which will be analysed in their specific socio-economic contexts.

Communication Networks of the Southern Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Minoan Era (Tobias Neuser, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)  
In order to analyse the functioning of Aegean and east Mediterranean communication networks, Tobias Neuser focuses on storage and consumption vessels imported to the island of Tavşan Adası, where he has been excavating alongside François Bertemes. A study of the archaeological remains of these vessels permits original conclusions concerning trade and colonisation.

The Architecture of Tavşan Adası in Its Aegean Context (Michael Rechta, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)  
Like his colleague Tobias Neuser, Michael Rechta is dealing with Tavşan Adası, formerly a peninsula and now an island off the Turkish coast. Approaching the mechanisms of regional exchange via architecture, he aims to shed new light on communication within the network, and also on the social and economic structure of the island in the Middle, Late Middle, and Early Late Bronze Age.
**Between Luxury and Cruelty – Etruscan otherness in Greek and Roman literature**
(Karoline Rolle, history – Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Karoline Rolle examines Greek and Roman descriptions of the Etruscans. By scrutinising the toposi, stereotypes, and arguments used in the writings, the project uncovers the self-perceptions of the Greeks and the Romans, and the ways in which they constructed and fostered their collective identities.

**The Making of House, Home, and Family in Socialist and Postsocialist Azerbaijan**
(Sascha Roth, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Graduate School “Society and Culture in Motion”)
Sascha Roth sets out to compare socialist and postsocialist notions and practices of family, marriage, and appropriate housing in Azerbaijan’s capital, Baku. The ways in which families negotiate their values, norms, and relations and how they cope with transformation and discontinuities are crucial for understanding contemporary Azerbaijani society.

**The Cross and the Hammer: the reception of social thought in the Catholic Church in the first half of the 20th century**
(Jakub Štofaník, history – Institute of History)
The social programme developed by the Catholic Church and wider Catholic communities in response to new challenges such as industrialisation, urbanisation, the formation of a working class, and migration patterns is the subject of Jakub Štofaník’s dissertation. Focusing particularly on Belgium and Czechoslovakia, he examines the socio-political circumstances promoting and hindering the growth of this diffuse movement.

**Social Agents in Small Towns. The town of Delitzsch before the Nazis came to power**
(Hendrik Tieke, history – Institute of History)
Hendrik Tieke sets out to reconstruct local social agents in a small town in Saxony in order to reveal their everyday networks, alliances, and factions. A detailed examination of documents pertaining to associations, schools, marriages, etc. will enable a more subtle and accurate picture of German society in this period than is possible by focusing solely on political cleavages.
Activities

The launch of the Graduate School in October 2012 was marked by a distinguished lecture delivered by Stephen Shennan, Director of the Institute of Archaeology at University College, London. In his talk titled “Patterns of Long-Term Change in the European Neolithic” Shennan addressed the fluctuation of populations and their impact on social, economic, and cultural patterns, raising questions that can only adequately be addressed via a unified archaeological-anthropological approach.

The ANARCHIE winter school in Wittenberg in February 2013 featured keynote lectures by Louis D. Nebelsick (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw), Debora Gerstenberger (Free University of Berlin), and Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (University of Pardubice). Unlike this winter school, the summer school in Naumburg in July was organised primarily by ANARCHIE students themselves, who set up the programme, selected the external speakers, and coordinated their own presentations in the light of the entire programme as it evolved in the course of the year. Under the title “Identities in (Ex)Change: Interdisciplinary Approaches and Challenges”, the School was divided into three sections corresponding to central interests of this cohort: continuity within change; ritual and exchange; and social (f)actors of change. Alexander Etkind (University of Cambridge/European University Institute, Florence), Bruce Grant (New York University), and Roberto Risch (Autonomous University of Barcelona) delivered keynote lectures and greatly enriched the discussions.
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François Bertemes (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Christoph Brumann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Helga Bumke (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Kirsten Endres (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Georg Fertig (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Chris Hann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Christian Miletta (Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Michael G. Müller (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Andreas Pečar (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Dittmar Schorkowitz (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Hans-Georg Stephan (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle).
Publications

This list also includes publications based on research done while at the MPI although the researchers are no longer with the Institute.

Department ‘Integration and Conflict’

Books


**Edited Volumes and Special Issues**


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


—. 2013. see Hoehne, Markus Virgil and Dereje Feyissa. 2013.


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


Sancak, Meltem. 2012. see Finke, Peter and Meltem Sancak. 2012.


**Articles in Journals**


**Miscellaneous Publications**


Tubach, Linda and Peter Finke. 2013. Pastoralism in Western Mongolia: current challenges and coping strategies. In: Peter Finke and Günther Schlee (eds.).

—. 2012. Le pétrole de Doba, quels changements pour la zone. Tchad et Culture (311): 11.


—. 2013. see Finke, Peter and Günther Schlee (eds.). 2013

—. 2013. see Finke, Peter and Günther Schlee. 2013


Department ‘Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia’

Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


Brumann, Christoph. 2012. Re-uniting a Divided City: high-rises, conflict and urban space in central Kyoto. In: Christoph Brumann and Evelyn Schulz (eds.).


—. 2012. see Bellér-Hann, Ildikó and Chris Hann. 2012.


—. 2013. Schools, Ritual Economies, and the Expanding State: the changing roles of Lao Buddhist monks as “traditional intellectuals”. In: John Whalen-Bridge


Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals


Sekerdej, Kinga. 2013. see Pasieka, Agnieszka and Kinga Sekerdej. 2013


**Articles in Journals**


Miscellaneous Publications


Makram Ebeid, Dina. 2013. And the Workers Demanded “Coal Mr. President!”.
Al-Shorouk Newspaper.
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Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes
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**Articles in Journals**


Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


**Articles in Journals**


Miscellaneous Publications


Siberian Studies Centre

Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes


—. 2012. see Ljarskaja, Elena and Stephan Dudeck. 2012.


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


**Articles in Journals**


**Miscellaneous Publications**

Max Planck Fellow Group

Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes


Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals


**Articles in Journals**


**Miscellaneous Publications**


Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology
Working Papers, ISSN 1616-4568

Year 2012


No. 136: Christoph Brumann: Multilateral Ethnography: entering the World Heritage arena

No. 137: Csaba Mészáros: The alaas: the interplay between environment and Sakhas in Central-Yakutia

No. 138: Dorothea Heuschert-Laage: State Authority Contested along Jurisdictional Boundaries. Qing legal policy towards the Mongols in the 17th and 18th centuries

No. 139: Chia Ning: Lifanyuan and the Management of Population Diversity in Early Qing (1636–1795)

No. 140: Martin Ramstedt: Islamisation by Law and the Juridification of Religion in Anomic Indonesia

No. 141: Patrice Ladwig, Ricardo Roque, Oliver Tappe, Christoph Kohl, Cristiana Bastos: Fieldwork Between Folders: fragments, traces, and the ruins of colonial archives

No. 142: Artem Rabogoshvili: Between Idel and Angara – the search for recognition and identity issues among Tatar organisations in Siberia
Year 2013

No. 143: Günther Schlee: Ruling over Ethnic and Religious Differences: comparative essay on empires

No. 144: Jennifer R. Cash: Charity or Remembrance? Practices of pomană in rural Moldova

No. 145: Michael Peter Hoffmann: Labour Unionism in a Post-Conflict Context: Maoists, unionists, and formerly bonded labourers in an urban municipality in the western Tarai

No. 146: Minh T. N. Nguyen: ‘Đi chợ’ and ‘Mở Bãi’: gendered performance and space production in a rural-urban waste economy of Vietnam

No. 147: Don Kalb: Regimes of Value and Worthlessness: two stories I know, plus a Marxian reflection


No. 149: Christian K. Højbjerg, Jacqueline Knörr and Anita Schroven: The Interaction of Global and Local Models of Governance: new configurations of power in Upper Guinea Coast societies

No. 150: Roberta Zavoretti: Be My Valentine: bouquets, marriage, and middle class hegemony in urban China
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Structure and Organisation of the Institute 2012–2013

Because questions concerning the equivalence of academic titles that are conferred by institutions of higher learning in different countries have still not been resolved completely, all academic titles have been omitted from this report.
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Foreword

Our seventh biennial report is divided into two volumes: a first volume containing contributions from the various departments, research groups and networks, including publication lists; and a second volume providing further information on the scientific activities and achievements of all researchers.

This new edition of the biennial report bears witness to significant changes in the structure of our institute and in our research themes. In March 2012, the third department, ‘Law & Anthropology’, was founded under the direction of Marie-Claire Foblets. In the corresponding chapter of the report, readers may follow the development of this department in its first two years.

The International Max Planck Research School, ‘Retaliation, Mediation and Punishment’ concluded its first phase in 2013 and, as of 2014 has been renewed for another 6 years. A second Max Planck International Research School, ‘Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia’ was founded in October 2012. Both Research Schools have their seat at our Institute.

In October 2013, a new Max Planck Fellow Group, entitled ‘Connectivity in Motion: Port Cities of the Indian Ocean’, was founded under the direction of Burkhard Schnepel, Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg. Researchers for this group have already begun to arrive and take up their work.

Members of our Institute, and many others beyond it, were saddened by the death of Franz von Benda-Beckmann on 7 January 2013. As one of the two heads of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, along with Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, Franz contributed in many ways to making our Institute what it is today. He is dearly missed. An obituary by Judith Beyer and Markus Weilenmann will appear in volume 138, number 1 of the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.

John Eidson
Kirsten Endres
Bettina Mann
Martin Ramstedt
Getting Back to the Basics

It may be advisable to listen to a teacher from time to time. Robin Fox, who belongs to the generation of my teachers and whose book *Kinship and Marriage* (1967)\(^1\) I, like many others, have long used to teach the ABCs of anthropology, made the following assessment of the state of our discipline in a recent book (from 2011, when its author was 77):

“[C]ultural anthropology becomes a writing exercise that ends up as a reorganization of fieldnotes under fashionable buzzword headings or as routinised indignation about social injustice of one form or another. Thus anthropology becomes just another ‘humanism’, subject to changing fads and fashions of interpretation”.\(^2\)

At around the same time, I engaged in some anthropological self-reflection and came to the conclusion that “innovation” in anthropology has a closer resemblance to changes in fashion than to “paradigm shifts” in the Kuhnian sense.\(^3\) Clearly, under such conditions, it is difficult to fit corroborated pieces of knowledge into larger wholes and to arrive at better and better explanations of the social world around us. A report like the present one, however, should address not only the analytical question (What makes anthropology tick?) but also the question of what we, as anthropologists, have done and what more we can do to make sure that our work in this Department and this Institute goes beyond a fashionable trade in buzzwords. How can we improve the prospects of producing reliable data, explaining them with reference to increasingly powerful theories, and contributing to a cumulative process of gaining useful knowledge? At the risk of being accused (wrongly, I hope, because I am aware of the epistemological issues that are at stake) of ‘naïve empiricism’, ‘scientism’, ‘Cartesianism’, or, even worse, ‘realism’, I lay out, in the following paragraphs, our research programme, much of which has already been put into practice and much of which still awaits realisation.

We aim at explaining things. This does not go without saying, as there are many anthropologists who aim at de-essentialising our notions or de-constructing our assumptions about society – perfectly valid aims, which fall short, however, of of-
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fering better explanations to replace the ones that have been deconstructed. Offering better explanations requires reflection on processes of data generation and on the ways in which bodies of data can be put into comparative perspective and related to theoretical questions. In what follows, I review recent developments in our theoretical work, then address problems of data documentation, which are, perhaps, fairly basic but which are still essential for making the process of knowledge production transparent and accessible to critical reflection.

**On Comparative Methods and Theory Building**

The Department aims to provide an intellectual environment that is conducive to attempts to find a common language and to compare results. We do not encourage students to participate in the cult of originality, i.e., to coin new concepts that serve less to advance knowledge than to establish trademarks for individual careers. Unless it is motivated by cogent arguments regarding the inadequacy of earlier concepts in their theoretical contexts or their empirical applications, terminological innovation is harmful. It spoils comparative analysis, which requires shared notions on a fairly broad scale.

Recent reviews of work produced within the Department’s research programme have been positive, emphasising our contribution to systematisation and our commitment to laying foundations that are strong enough to support more complex and more powerful theories. A review of my book, *How Enemies Are Made*, that appeared in *American Ethnologist* speaks of a “systematic and comprehensive work” on a “new theory”, the novelty of which lies less in its constituent parts than in providing “a cogent synthesis of an existing rich body of theoretical work that directs the reader to a systematic process for analysing conflict” (Straight 2011). A review in the journal *Ethnos* of the first three volumes of our series, *Integration and Conflict Studies*, published by Berghahn Books, stresses the “logical order” of our “well-organised” presentations. The reviewers also comment favourably on our emphasis on the efficiency of mental constructs in processes of identification – e.g., the variable plausibility of different options in processes of identification, their comparative power to convince, and the costs and benefits involved in selecting information intended to induce actors to identify themselves in one way or another:

---

4 Reflection on processes of data generation should attend, for example, to the role of our own perceptions, interests, and biases in determining what counts as ‘data’, to the perceptions with which our interlocutors confront us, to the interests that guide the production of knowledge, and to questions of the replicability and reliability of data.


7 In 2013, the sixth volume in this series appeared and the tenth was accepted for publication.
“Not only actors’ alliances and enemies, but also the corresponding cognitive products are the result of the maximization principle. This is an important innovation in Schlee’s modification of the RCT [Rational Choice Theory].”

We try to build theories with ideas that are down to earth and with explanations that have stood the test of time and experience. For example, a central point of our theorising, stated repeatedly in earlier reports and publications, is that any decision involving identification of self or other has implications for group size and that, whether by conscious reasoning or any other psychological mechanism, anticipated group size tends to influence such identification processes, leading to inclusive or exclusive rhetoric (inclusive if one wants to share costs, exclusive if one does not want to share benefits). With this formulation, we are building on one part of Max Weber’s work, which death prevented him from spelling out fully, namely, his discussion of “Open and Closed Relationships”. There, he

“reverts to his earlier statement that a cultural trait could serve as a starting point for monopolistic closure. He observes that a social relationship might be either open or closed to outsiders. The closure of a social relationship could offer individuals ‘opportunities for the satisfaction of spiritual or material interests’ (…) On the other hand, ‘If the participants expect that the admission of others will lead to an improvement of their situation, an improvement in degree, in kind, in the security or value of the satisfaction, their interest will be in keeping the relationship open’”.

Referring to the activities of our Department, Bošković and Ignjatović, in the review cited above, praise us for giving a new twist to Rational Choice Theory. Indeed, choices made by human beings, mirroring the behaviour of organisms in all species that have managed to survive until now, tend to be to their advantage and thus fit the Rational Choice model, regardless of which internal mechanism was employed in producing this result – e.g., hard thinking, ‘habitus’, socialisation, or biological adaptation. Some psychologists are interested in these mechanisms, but other theorists are mainly concerned with the outcomes. So Rational Choice Theory does not necessarily imply that people constantly think very hard, which is clearly not the case. It does assume, however, a certain conscious or unconscious utilitarianism. This utilitarianism clearly informs the choices we investigate in the
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field of social identifications. But how about the categories and group definitions among which people choose? Our findings show that these too are shaped and transformed by ‘identity work’ in the context of competitive social games. This is not the only way in which economic principles affect categories and definitions. The purely cognitive sphere, free of material considerations – leisurely thinking, so to say – also obeys economic principles. The more parsimonious a theory or system of categories is, and the greater the consistency that it displays, the more appealing we find it. Even in the absence of materialist considerations, we cut superfluous parts with ‘Ockham’s razor’ for the sake of the elegance of our theories. Minimisation and maximisation are everywhere.

These more general economic principles should not be confused, however, with utilitarianism in a narrow sense. Fox, whom we cited above, illustrates this point in the following statement about attempts to explain the world, whether by scientists or others:

“(…) for Bacon, collecting and arranging was the beginning of scientific wisdom, and the savage mind does both as an appetitive activity. It needs no utilitarian stimulus; it feeds on the diversity of things to order them.” (Fox 2011: 38)

Since Lévi-Strauss, whose diction Fox adopts in this passage, we know that human beings do not need material incentives or any kind of pressure in order to engage in classification. They just do it. Ordering things according to similarities and differences has a long history, and it is, evidently, not even specifically human. Other vertebrates, at least, do it as well. According to the Rendille, a cow that has seen a snake at daytime will be afraid of a belt at night. This proverb tells us something about the richness of Rendille metaphors: It is a way of saying that a frightening experience may lead to over-cautiousness. But it also tells us something about cows. It is no doubt true that cows are capable of associating similar things with each other, though probably not in a disinterested fashion.

However, naming categories and discussing relations among them or among things that are variously categorised does seem to be specifically human. More than that, it seems to be deeply human and has probably been with us since the origin of our species. In their idling mode, our minds playfully engage in associations and classifications. Some of this engagement may turn out to be of practical use. By making associations between similar memories, we learn from experience. But external rewards are not necessary. Evidently, if the brain does what it likes to do anyhow, it also provides itself with its own internal rewards.

Therefore, we do not need Rational Choice Theory in order to explain why people classify subdivisions of the social world, much as they classify subdivisions of the animal, vegetable, or mineral worlds (or why sometimes their classifications cross the boundaries that separate these domains, as the classical studies of totemism have shown). Some do it professionally as anthropologists or sociologists; others
do it as carpenters or bus drivers – at any rate, as people who are not trained in the social sciences. In such cases, ‘scientists’ tend to speak rather unkindly of ‘naïve’ or ‘everyday’ or ‘popular’ systems of classification. Anthropologists, following the linguist Kenneth Pike, refer to the schemes of the people they study with the adjective ‘emic’ and (less often) to their own schemes as ‘etic’. My term for classifications and explanations of human beings and their collective life by those with no training in the social sciences is ethno-anthropology. We speak of ethno-biology when we refer to branches of knowledge among those whom we study that correspond roughly to the domain we call biology. More generally, we speak of ethno-science when referring to the broad range of classifications and explanations that our human subjects employ in their understandings of the world at large. So why not ‘ethno-anthropology’ for the ways in which the people we study discuss things that are largely equivalent to the subject matter of our discipline?

Despite our debt to Rational Choice Theory, we would never claim that the systems of knowledge in the social worlds that concern us (because they provide the frameworks for the choices that we analyse) are dictated by necessity or utility alone. Most fundamentally, they are the result of the playful activity of brains that appear to be too big for the practical tasks they had to perform as they evolved. They evolved among cooperative hunters, and cooperative hunting is something that wolves do quite well with much smaller brains. The evolutionary advantage of the large brains of humans (which may have resulted from intra-specific selection) is still a matter of debate among evolutionary anthropologists. These brains are only fully occupied by the needs of production and reproduction from time to time. They may give us an evolutionary advantage in the long run, both in our dealing with each other (in all sorts of cooperative and competitive games) and in coping with the vagaries of our non-human environment; but people who are engaged in structuring their social universe in terms of similarities and difference, and in classifying themselves and others are not guided only by consideration of utility or costs and benefits. They are just doing what human beings do anyhow. If incentives emerge that let re-identification or a reshaping of identities appear to be advantageous, identities tend to adjust to social and economic needs; but that is not the primary reason for their coming into being. Incentives and disincentives, along with costs and benefits, only start to play a role in processes of identification – and in our theorising – if we move one step further.
Recent Developments in Theory Building
(with John Eidson)

So far, the Theory Group in our Department has produced an exploratory working paper in which we define basic terms, address critics who question the utility of the concept of ‘identity’, review the history of approaches to social and collective identities, and examine identification processes from different points of view.  

We are now at work on two articles, intended for publication in peer review journals, in which we refine and elaborate our framework for the analysis of collective identities and processes of identification. In the one of these articles, we offer a critical review of the most influential texts regarding social or collective identity in the recent social science literature, showing how our approach builds upon, differs from, or goes beyond them. In a second article, we focus on one aspect of our framework, namely, on the options open to individual actors in identifying with some of those with whom they interact and on their motives for doing so. Given the polyvalence of human relations, actors always have multiple possibilities in identifying with and differentiating themselves from others – with reference to various dimensions of identification such as kinship, gender, generation, locality, language, ethnicity, nationality, religious confession, etc. Options in identification processes depend on semantic relations among categories of identification, e.g., their mutual exclusivity, their degree of compatibility, or their taxonomic relations of inclusion and exclusion. With reference to such semantic relations, we differentiate various forms of identification, which, taken together, provide actors with a range of possibilities in acting in concert with members of categories or groups that vary in size, substance, and distribution in space. Variations in the way in which actors identify with others may be motivated by three factors, often in combination: situational relevance, changing circumstances, or interests – i.e., an actor’s interest in a particular collective identity as an end in itself or as a means to a related or an unrelated end.

When viewed in terms of these variables, the categories through which actors comprehend or represent social relations in processes of identification appear as objects of conscious or unconscious manipulation: they are moved up and down in the order of importance or salience and might be relocated in taxonomies; or they are widened to become more inclusive or squeezed to become less so. Taking all these factors into account, we seek to explain social action not by elevating particular dimensions of identification to the status of causal principles but by examining the relationship between two co-variants – interests and identification. One consequence

---

9 Donahoe, Brian, John Eidson, Dereje Feyissa, Veronika Fuest, Markus V. Hoehne, Boris Nieswand, Günther Schlee, and Olaf Zenker. 2009. The Formation and Mobilisation of Collective Identities in Situations of Conflict and Integration. Working Paper No. 116. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology. This text seems to have attracted some attention outside of our Institute, as our IT Department reports that it was downloaded by outside readers 474 times in 2012, its third year online.
of this argument is that the critique of essentialism (i.e., of explaining individual action with reference to the essential characteristics of a particular group), which has been formulated repeatedly by those sceptical of the analytical value of the concept of identity, must be supplemented with a critique of the concept of self-interest, which refers less to a choice between self and other than to a choice between two different rhetorical strategies, one inclusive and the other exclusive (from the viewpoint of an observer). Each strategy may take one of two forms: first, a choice between narrower and wider categories and, second, the alteration of the definition and boundaries of any given category (making it narrower or wider, rewriting its history and re-evaluating it in terms of its relative status).

Identification and Marginality

In those fields of applied knowledge that are related to anthropology, one does not find much discussion of identity and identification; rather, these concepts seem to dominate in the academic sphere and in an atmosphere that is very critical of applied social sciences, such as development studies and policy advice. What we find there instead is the concept of marginality. This concept is related to that of ‘frontier’ in the purer (basic, non-applied) social sciences, but it has a different normative load. While ‘frontier’ has a heroic ring to it, ‘margin’ has negative connotations. The margins need to be integrated, marginality to be overcome. Leaving the concept of ‘frontier’ aside, we explore in the following the relationship between ‘margins’ and ‘marginality’, on one hand, and ‘identity’ and ‘identification’, on the other. This exercise may help us to see whether our findings about the latter can be made relevant to those who are interested in the former – to those who want to help to integrate the margins and to help the marginal.

Joachim von Braun and Franz W. Gatzweiler\(^{10}\) define marginality as follows:

“an involuntary position and condition of an individual or group at the margins of social, political, economic, and biophysical systems, that prevent them from access to resources, assets, services, restraining freedom and choice, preventing the development of capabilities, and eventually causing extreme poverty (…). The marginality perspective encompasses those poor who are below certain thresholds and outside mainstream socio-economic and human geographical systems, where improved access to rights, resources, and services would help enable decent standards of living. With reference to biological systems, marginality describes the state of organisms outside ranges which are necessary for living systems.”

In describing how the concept is actually used, this definition is quite convincing. ‘Marginality’ is a spatial metaphor, and the description of the concept includes many more spatial or geographical metaphors: ‘position’, ‘access’, ‘below’ (thresholds), ‘outside’ (systems, ranges), and ‘mainstream’. Other elements are borrowed from economics: ‘assets’, ‘services’, ‘poverty’, and ‘standards of living’. The normative dimension is also clearly present: ‘freedom’, ‘improve’, ‘rights’, ‘help enable’, ‘decent’, and, once again, ‘standards’. Rich in allusions, this concept is persuasive because it is composed of elements drawn from different semantic dimensions. And that is what makes it problematic for analytical purposes. Are the margins always on the outside? If so, where is the inside and where is the middle? Can the margins also be in our midst? How can we un-mix the social and geographical connotations of this mixed concept?

Maybe we cannot disentangle the tangled strands of the concept of ‘marginality’. And here is where ‘identity’ and ‘identification’ come in. These concepts too require clarification, but to a much lesser degree. First, we have to make clear that we do not mean identity in the sense of Erik Erikson.11 His “ego identity”, which is necessary for the development of children and adolescents, refers primarily to a coherent understanding of oneself, i.e., to the individual’s feeling that he or she is the same person that others see in him or her. Erikson’s concept of “identity” is normative: it is characteristic of a well-adjusted person who is identical with himself or herself. Here, clearly, the static elements of this concept are emphasised. Such static elements are not completely absent in our concept of collective identities, insofar as considerations such as plausibility must be taken into account. One cannot re-define one’s identities and affiliations all the time without losing credibility and without getting entangled in contradictions. But our emphasis is clearly on changing identifications and their strategic aspects.

By understanding identities and identification processes to be more or less inclusive, we can penetrate some of the domains covered by others with the notion of ‘marginality’. In their introduction to *Pastoralism and Development in Africa*, Andy Catley, Jeremy Lind, and Ian Scoones summarise several contributions (discussed more fully in an article to appear in *Nomadic Peoples*), showing that, in a number of African countries, governments favour large-scale irrigated agriculture over pastoralism, even when the damage done to livestock production exceeds the gain for the overall economy derived from ‘modern development’. For this, Catley et al. have the following explanation:

“An important reason is the interest of governments in raising tax revenue and, more generally, to exert greater control over economic and political life at the margins. By controlling economic activity in the pastoral margins through re-

---

source grabs, ruling regimes are able to capture economic wealth for national development".¹²

But are government decisions regarding pastoralism really motivated by the desire to promote national development?

There is no doubt that ruling regimes are able to capture economic wealth that could be used for national development. But is that what they do? Sadly, historical evidence suggests that this is not usually the case. Newly available public wealth tends to be invested not in national development and the well-being of all citizens but in costly security apparatuses serving to consolidate the supremacy of the ruling elites. In other cases, public wealth ends up in private pockets of members of the state class – a fate sometimes shared by development money provided by foreign donors. The same might happen to money generated by ‘resource grabs’. The long-term land leases to foreign investors are often so ridiculously cheap that it is hard to explain their economic logic, unless one takes into account the possibility of kickbacks to those who make these decisions.

Wisely, Catley et al. do not describe “the state” as a monolithic actor, writing, instead, of “governments” and “ruling regimes”. Arguably, however, what govern-ments do should be examined with reference to the perceived costs and benefits that particular actions have for those who carry them out. In the case of collective decisions, each actor is supposed to take the others into account. However, if a decision goes against someone’s personal interest, often he or she will resist it and exercise all possible influence to make it more favourable for himself or herself.

Here a complication arises. The ‘self’ can be widened by the process we call identification. When making important decisions, most people take into account the effects of these decisions not only for themselves but also for their families; and some people – though, presumably, fewer and fewer, as the identification widens – will also take into account the interests of their clans, firms, tribes, universities, nations, or even humankind and its future, as they perceive it. They may identify with more inclusive categories or groups because of institutional arrangements that punish them if they do not; or they may do so irrespectively of strictly individualistic considerations. In any event, the reference group for cost/benefit calculations (i.e., the unit to which they are perceived to accrue) tends to be larger than the individual. It includes the individual plus those with whom he or she identifies – and the extent to which he or she does so. In making decisions, then, the notion of ‘others’ comes into play in two different ways. One is cooperation: I need others to implement my decisions, and, therefore, I have to share possible gains with them so that they feel happy and continue to cooperate. The other is identification, which moves away from strict individualism to a larger reference group (be it narrow or wide) for pur-

poses of cost/benefit analysis. Both narrow and wide identifications can be in play simultaneously in a single decision: I do what is good for the clan as long as it does not harm my family or me personally; I forego a bit of my profit to let others, whose help I need, participate; I help my group because I identify with it but also because helping my group improves my own standing within it or the marriage prospects of my daughter or whatever. There are no limits to the ways in which narrow and wide identifications can interplay in influencing an actor’s perceptions of the costs/benefits calculations that any given decision might entail.

Let us examine a series of options regarding the ways in which governments or state officials may identify with others. Governments often claim to act in the interest of the people, to identify with the people, so let us first take this claim at face value. If local self-regulation works well and government intervention is both costly and unnecessary, a government that identifies with the people would limit its own role. In reality, few governments behave in this way. In fact, a government that would abstain from ruling, or even just abstain from extending its rule whenever it had a chance to do so, would be hard to find.

A somewhat more realistic assumption – one that resonates with the statement made by Catley et al., quoted above – is that governments identify not with the people but with the state. To increase the importance and the splendour of the state, state revenues need to be maximised. Again, there are two screws to turn. One is the rate of taxation, and the other is the kinds of taxes that are levied. The rate of taxation represents an optimisation problem, with the highest returns falling somewhere in between two extremes. If taxation is too high, it threatens the life or the productivity of the producers and, thereby, potentially limits taxable production. High taxation also increases the costs of control and, as control always remains incomplete, leads to a rise in tax evasion and outmigration. On the other hand, if taxes are too low, the state foregoes possible income. As to the kinds of taxes, in this model one can assume that the government looks for ways to tax all branches of the economy and so should be interested in the growth of the overall economy. Therefore, to return to the scenario described above, a rational, revenue-maximising government would refrain from removing key resources from the pastoral sector, if that led to losses that were higher than the gains achieved through alternative forms of land use. If the aim of a certain government policy was maximisation of the overall economic output of all sectors, taken together, then such a policy would preserve livestock routes and access to river banks and other watering points wherever the losses to the livestock sector incurred by not doing so would exceed the benefits of competing kinds of use. It would also preserve the open range wherever the disruption to the pastoral sector and the ecological damage done by attempts to practise crop production exceeded the benefits of agriculture. This would be the case under marginal conditions where crop production was possible but risky. There, one might obtain a crop one year in two or three, but the yields would be lower than the gains obtained by allowing continued use of these lands by pastoralists, either with regard to the same surface
area or considering this area as part of a wider system without which other parts of the surface could not be used effectively.

In all of these cases, a revenue-maximising government would make careful calculations about what removing a resource from one type of use and transferring it to another would entail for both. Use of that resource would be granted to whichever sector would yield more gain for the overall economy, provided, of course, that this gain was sustainable and taxable. In this model, the reputation of nomads for being difficult to find and to tax does not help their case. In the logic of this system, however, one should enjoy the protection of a revenue-maximising state, if one provides the state with revenue, either directly or indirectly. For example, it should make little difference whether the state taxes pastoralists directly or derives revenues from some other link in the chain of production, from the open range to the urban meat market, e.g., by introducing tolls for livestock transports or by taxing butchers and other meat processors. Even without taxing meat production at all, taxable profits might be generated in other sectors of the economy by having a policy of low food prices and thus reducing the costs of labour. Be that as it may, a revenue-maximising government would have to be convinced that livestock production generated taxable wealth somewhere in the economy, or that it could save expenses in the public sector by providing cheap protein to wage earners. If, however, that were the case, one would not expect such a government to have a pro-farmer and anti-pastoralist bias. Under the assumption that governments attempt to maximise state revenues, pastoralists could expect state protection, as long as they contributed to revenues, one way or another.

This model, with its regularised forms of giving and taking between pastoralists, other sectors of the economy, and the state, is a far cry from the present situation of pastoralists, which is often marked by multiple, unpredictable forms of extortion. Nomads in northern Kenya have compared government chiefs and other state officials, who collect ‘donations’ and ‘contributions’ of all sorts, to lions. Both lions and officials wait at the water holes and prey on the animals that come to drink. In our ongoing research under the heading “Pastoralism in interaction with other forms of land use in the Blue Nile area, Sudan”, Elhadi Ibrahim Osman and I have met nomads who complain about being taxed again and again at different locations. They have shown us not only tax receipts but also membership cards for the ruling party and for a pastoralist association, IDs issued by the native authorities, and receipts from the Jihad Call Organisation (in 2009, when no jihad was being fought in the Sudan). Pastoralists with whom we spoke reported that, in addition to these membership fees, taxes, and contributions, they regularly had to buy access to formerly open land that had been converted into large-scale farms. Often, this agriculture had failed. Nevertheless, pastoralists still had to pay for the right to graze the failed crops, which had dried before maturing. In other cases, nomads were made to pay for the natural vegetation, because the new ‘owners’ of the land had not even attempted to cultivate it. Even to approximate the model depicted in the preceding paragraphs,
the state would first have to qualify, in the eyes of the nomads, as a regulative and protective agency that could, then, legitimately collect taxes. Instead, extortion takes the place of taxation, and the state is often a source of disorder, rather than an agency providing stable conditions and a reliable legal framework for economic activities, a point illustrated in John Galaty’s discussion of land registration.

Having seen that our first two hypotheses regarding the forms of identification underlying the actions of government officials (identification with the people or the state) have significant shortcomings, not as normative but as descriptive models, we still have not answered the question posed above. With whom do governments, or the individuals who comprise them, identify? In whose interest do they act?

Often, the actions of the powerful in northeastern Africa have been explained in terms of different ideologies and religions – Christianity in the case of imperial Ethiopia (the ‘Christian Island’), socialism in the case of the Mengistu regime, a coalition of ethnic nationalisms in the case of post-1991 Ethiopia, and Islamism in the case of Sudan. But then one wonders why it is that governments that are presumably guided by different ideologies have the same policies with regard to pastoralists, namely ignoring their rights and taking their resources. Obviously, ideological differences cannot explain similarity of action. (And then, of course, one may ask what Christianity, Islam, socialism, or nationalism – nationalism understood as acting in the interest of a nation, however defined – would have to say about taking land away from people who depend on it.) Somehow, the ideological explanation does not seem to work either.

Governments and government officials in northeast Africa do not seem to identify with a particular ideology, at least to the extent that the names of different systems of convictions effectively define actual parties and alliances. In fact, the groups to which holders of state power refer when calculating costs and benefits (i.e., costs and benefits for whom?) and making decisions do not seem to differ greatly from those of ordinary people. Like all people who survive, they are concerned, first and foremost, with self-preservation. When their lives are threatened, because of their past crimes or for whatever reason, they fight desperately and cruelly. Only in the impact of their rage do they differ from ordinary people, who have no armed units under their command. When they become wealthy, they want to become even wealthier, again like ordinary people. That ‘resource scarcity’ is a conflict-escalating factor is a myth. Neither governments and government officials nor pastoralists are ever content with what they have; they always want more of the same, be it power, money, or livestock. And fights are fought by those with fighting capacity, not by

When it comes to sharing wealth, holders of state power do so with their own families and within the wider network of relatives with whom they cooperate (although, if they are of a similar status, relatives can also be dangerous rivals). Here, the logic of identification on the basis of shared ancestry or similar criteria interpenetrates with individualistic logic (I help them because they help me).

How precisely this identification with family, kin, and faction interpenetrates with wider forms of identification, such as those with region or ‘race’, is not always obvious at first glance. When, after the construction of the Aswan High Dam, Lake Nasser filled up from 1958 to 1971, the lands of Nubian farmers were flooded. On the Sudanese side of the boundary, the farmers around Halfa were affected. They were compensated with a huge new irrigation scheme below the Khashm al-Girba Dam in eastern Sudan, where the settlement of New Halfa was founded. Farmers were compensated for their lost land and could continue to be farmers elsewhere. Currently, as the dam on the Blue Nile at Roseiris has been raised and, as a consequence, the reservoir behind it, located in a flat alluvial plain, is expanding to cover a huge area, it is clear that many farmers will not be compensated with land elsewhere. There will be some money, and there might be residential plots; but the large tracts of land along the new coastline will be given to big companies. Politicians praise this development because “it will create employment for local people”. But how much employment will modern mechanised agriculture actually provide for former farmers turned labourers? And, even more fundamentally, at least with regard to identification, why does it seem to be unquestioned that, along the Blue Nile, farmers can be turned into labourers, while, in an earlier case further north, near the Egyptian border, farmers were compensated with land and could continue farming? Maybe in the 1960s and 1970s populations were smaller and resource competition was not as fierce. But one also may suspect that the Sudanese government – if one can construct the continuity of such an institution across the many regime changes that have occurred since 1970 – regards the Nubians as ‘real’ Sudanese. After all, most northern Sudanese are of Nubian ancestry, whatever else their Arabised genealogies claim. In contrast, the farmers south of Roseiris are regarded as ‘southerners’, ‘Ethiopians’, ‘Chadians’, or ‘West Africans’, depending on their various local and ethnic origins. In other words, identification may be at work here, insofar as decision makers feel closer to the northerners. Such feelings of relative closeness or distance may or not be linked to benefits that the government derives from supporting northerners and denying support to southerners. For example, government representatives may have thought that the Nubians would support them politically,

16 The labels ‘Chadians’ and ‘West Africans’ are often used to discriminate against people from the west of Sudan, especially Darfur, while other groups have actually migrated from West Africa.
and they may have suspected the people south of Roseiris of SPLM sympathies.\textsuperscript{17} Differences in skin colour, real and imagined, along with a rich terminology from ‘brown’ and ‘red’ to ‘green’ and ‘blue’, are also significant for social identification in the Sudan, a country where racialism is by no means unknown.

Alliances can be extended to non-relatives and even to members of other ethnic groups or religious communities on the basis of ‘give and take’, which may be supplemented by constructs of similarity (comrades, freedom fighters, former fighters for the same ‘just cause’, etc.). Such constructs are fragile, however, when the rewards for defection become too high, i.e., when the bones of contention appear more valuable than the preservation of friendship (as in the case of Eritrean and Ethiopian leaders, who were former comrades-in-arms). Such a model of self-interest, modified by limited ways of widening the ‘self’ through identification with family members, friends, and allies, provides better explanations of what is actually observed than models based on the assumption that actions are taken for the benefit of the people

\textsuperscript{17} The Sudan Peoples’ Liberation Movement (SPLM), now the ruling party in South Sudan, has been forbidden in Sudan, i.e., in the area that was called northern Sudan before the split in 2011.
or the state or for ideological reasons. The proposed model helps to explain why governments make economic decisions that neither benefit the people or the state nor resonate with any religious beliefs or ideological values worthy of the name. They – and that does not mean some abstract institution but the people actually involved in making decisions – make such decisions if they themselves and those who are close to them benefit from them. Leasing giant fiefdoms of land at cheap rates to foreign investors might be disastrous to the people living there, and it might be of no benefit to the wider national economy, but it still might be explicable in terms of more narrowly defined interests. Those who make the decisions might receive kickbacks or shares or jobs for friends and family.

I hope to have shown that our kind of political economy, which takes identity and identification as its starting point, can contribute to development studies, offering an alternative to using the concept of ‘marginality’ in the analysis of similar issues. In practical terms, we try, in our work on “Pastoralism in interaction with other kinds of land use in the Blue Nile area, Sudan” and in our international research network, “Lands of the Future”, to integrate natural science approaches into our analyses of political ecology by involving agronomists and botanists. We can arrive at more

Heightening the dam at Roseiris, Sudan, which will cause the displacement of many farmers. (Photo: G. Schlee, 2009)
intelligent solutions to many problems of ‘development’ – solutions that provide benefits for a wider range of population groups – if different forms of production are viewed as interconnected, rather than being treated as mutually exclusive. If this is to happen, however, the emphasis in development studies on introducing new technologies of organisation and material production must be supplemented with research on collective identities and processes of identification. People act in the interest of those with whom they identify along at least one dimension of identification; and they cooperate with others, as long as cooperation is beneficial to them. Abstract appeals to humanity at large or to the equality of all human beings may be in line with modern legal thinking, but they do not correspond to decision-making processes on the ground.

Christina Echi Gabbert is the organiser of the workshop “Lands of the Future”, at which the homonymous research network was established. In a separate development, she received the Frobenius Research Award for her dissertation, Deciding Peace: Knowledge about war and peace among the Abore of southern Ethiopia (2012). Here, she and Ginno Ballo from Arbore interview Rendille elders in order to find points of cultural comparison. Location: Korr, northern Kenya. (Photo: G. Schlee, 2013)
The Empirical Dimension: reflections on the production of data, documentation, and transparency

At the beginning of this report, I stated our ambition to overcome the often exclusively deconstructive focus of anthropological research and to offer better explanations to replace the deconstructed ones. After having addressed, in the preceding paragraphs, recent developments in our theoretical work, even offering some suggestions for their practical application, I now come back to the other concern mentioned at the outset, namely, questions regarding the generation of data and their place in the production of knowledge.

If we go back to the proto-anthropology of nineteenth-century travelogues and to early anthropological writings, often about expeditions in connection with a museum, we find rich documentation of data. Given the technologies of the day, this required a huge amount of skilled manual labour. Photographs and drawings done by hand were reproduced as copperplate engravings. The writing often took the form of a narrative or resembled entries in a diary – a circumstance that still allows today’s readers to get closer to the authors (thus facilitating research on the history of anthropology) and to the past realities they describe (e.g., by assessing their interests and biases and taking them into account). Later, under the influence of disciplinary elder sisters, such as philosophy and sociology, which enjoyed a high degree of prestige, anthropology became more discursive, more purely verbal, and rather abstract. The typical modern anthropological article does not contain a single picture. The commitment to ‘words only’ also affects numbers. Due to the bias of many anthropologists against quantification, one seldom finds even a single table or basic descriptive statistics. In books, where enough space should be available, ‘vignettes’ are, usually, the only descriptive elements: artful short pieces, often celebrating the subjective impressions of the author, sometimes rendering case histories or other data in a highly edited, consumer-friendly form. That is better than no data at all, but is a far cry from the sort of documentation that would render transparent the process of knowledge production or allow us to accompany the author on her way from the data to the conclusions she draws from them.

Given today’s technologies, storing data, including high-quality audio and visual materials, and publishing substantial selections from them has become much cheaper than it was even a few decades ago. Therefore, one wonders why anthropologists almost never document and share their data. Very often, ethical considerations are cited by those reluctant to remedy this situation – e.g., the protection of the anonymity of ‘research partners’ (informants). But how about the masses of non-sensitive data or the data that can be rendered sufficiently anonymous?

Without neglecting our primary emphasis on peer-reviewed journals and book publications, we have also developed other formats that allow us to give ample space to the presentation of the data that provide the basis for our more theoreti-
cal publications. Following two Internet publications based on field diaries, we have reverted to books and booklets printed in-house, some of which include CDs. These publications are ‘open access’: They are distributed free of cost and are also posted as PDF-files on the Internet. Our new series, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Department ‘Integration and Conflict’, Field Notes and Research Projects, comprises diary-like notes with rich pictorial illustrations, full-length transcriptions of interviews in non-European languages (with English translations), comments, and annotations.

In addition to facilitating critical evaluation of our work by members of the scholarly community, stimulating comparative research within the Institute and beyond, and providing citable references for our books and articles in which only a limited amount of data can be presented, these volumes serve an important function in maintaining links with people in our field sites and continuing their involvement in our research. For those who have helped us to collect data and provided us with information, these books and booklets may serve as small tokens of our gratitude and as tangible evidence of the results based on their cooperation with us. When we sow results back into the field, new discussions and fresh perspectives might sprout.

Especially in their electronic form, these volumes can also be used in producing PowerPoint presentations for teaching purposes; and, as they are open access and free of charge, they can serve an important ‘outreach’ function by kindling the interest of a wider audience in our research.

---

Research Group: Integration and Conflict along the Upper Guinea Coast (West Africa)

Jacqueline Knörr

The Research Group continues to focus on local, regional and (trans-)national dimensions of processes of integration and conflict in the Upper Guinea Coast region of West Africa. Current members are Jacqueline Knörr (Head), David O’Kane (Senior Researcher), Maarten Bedert, Anaïs Ménard (PhD students), Markus Rudolf, Christian Højbjerg, Wilson Trajano Filho (Associates), and Christoph Kohl (research cooperation).

Accomplishments and News

Markus Rudolf and Nathaniel King have successfully concluded and defended their PhD theses. Anaïs Ménard and Maarten Bedert have returned from field research in Sierra Leone and Liberia, respectively, and are in the process of evaluating their data and writing their dissertations. All the members of the group have been conducting field research for different lengths of time.

The co-edited book on The Upper Guinea Coast in Transnational Perspective (Knörr and Kohl) has been submitted to Berghahn, where it is now under review. My own monograph on Creole Identity in Post-colonial Indonesia (Berghahn) should be published by the time this report is distributed. In September 2012, the fourth “Upper Guinea Coast” conference took place in Halle and a book comprising revised versions of most of the papers presented there is currently being prepared for publication (Palgrave Publishers). Several working papers have been written (jointly) by different members of the Research Group. They continue to focus on empirical findings concerning specific comparative dimensions of our research. The endeavour of co-writing working papers has been quite rewarding in that it induces us to focus on comparative issues over longer periods of time and through different stages of individual research processes.

During the past two years, we also organised two “Workshops in the Field” (Ghana and Sierra Leone) as well as two retreats and a series of meetings. All members of the group presented papers at various international conferences.

I am involved in several cross-institutional research activities, including projects funded by third parties. In terms of outreach activities, I have given some interviews (concerning developments in the UGC, gender and migration issues) and have been involved as an expert in asylum cases. Two Facebook pages (one concerning research on the Upper Guinea Coast, the other research on Southeast Asia) have now become rather popular among members of the international research community. In November 2013, the group organised a panel at the AAA meeting in Chicago and was invited by Northwestern University’s Program of African Studies (Wil-
Summary of Ongoing and Recently Concluded Research Projects

Anaïs Ménard’s PhD project focusses on autochthony discourses in Sierra Leone (Freetown Peninsula). With a case study on Sherbro identity, which, due to its particular history, plays an important role as a mediating force in interethnic and rural-urban relations, she explores the relationship between claims of autochthony and the contestedness and flexibility of ethnic identities in a post-conflict context of national (re-)integration. She addresses three focal points of autochthonous discourses: the relationship between Krio and native identities, land disputes resulting from different conceptualisations of citizenship, and dynamics related to traditional secret societies. Her analysis shows that claims of autochthony conceal social mechanisms of integration between groups that are usually described as separate or antagonistic; and it also shows that ethnic identities play a constitutional role in the making of the larger nation.

Maarten Bedert investigates the politics of belonging in a Liberian border region. With a case study among the Dan of northwestern Liberia, he focuses on (1) the persistence of genealogical idioms and kin relations in the wake of recent episodes of civil conflict and (2) the emergence of new secret societies and witchcraft discourses. He explores how identities are negotiated in a local (intra- and interethnic), national (nation-state), and regional (cross-border) perspective and how these discourses are connected to social and cultural continuity and innovation. Contrary to the common notion of ‘post-war reconstruction’ – which implies the breakdown of social relations and institutions during war and, hence, the need for reconstruction after war – Bedert’s data suggests that social relations and institutions tend to be resilient and continue to have a strong impact on perceptions of social cohesion and processes of inclusion and exclusion in the aftermath of war.

Markus Rudolf’s dissertation deals with conflict and integration in the Casamance. He explores how and why the Casamance’s status of being in a situation of neither war nor peace perpetuates itself. His analysis focusses on recurring hostilities, their roots and manifestations, and dissects the apparent incapacity of single actors to broker peace. He shows that actors have nevertheless succeeded in maintaining a relatively low level of violence and that a complex equilibrium has been established within a framework of traditional mediation mechanisms. Markus Rudolf argues that the Casamance case is an example of a peculiar dialectic, namely a process of integration through conflict.

Despite being Sierra Leone’s first private university, the University of Makeni (UNIMAK) must operate under the Sierra Leonean state’s general policies for national education in the post-war context. David O’Kane deals with the consequences of these policies in the local context in which UNIMAK operates: a northern region
which was historically deprived of educational opportunities but is now experiencing rapid change. UNIMAK is being connected in many ways to the national level and the external world, while at the same time maintaining links to local-level communities in Makeni city and its rural hinterland. In this field of local, national and global interaction, contestations occur concerning social and cultural practices, identifications, discourses of local and national elites, and religious beliefs.

Wilson Trajano Filho’s work on creole proto-nationalism and mutual-aid institutions in processes of integration and conflict focusses on Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde at the beginning of the twentieth century. He is currently analyzing data from Portuguese and Guinean archives concerning the creation and dissolution of the Liga Guineense, a mutual-aid institution around which the creole elite of Guinean settlements assembled to assert their political and economic interests in a context of increased Portuguese power. Trajano Filho seeks to understand how proto-nationalist and mutual aid institutions are related to current conceptualisations of the nation in both countries and to the present situation of deep crisis in Guinea-Bissau on the one hand and relative stability in Cape Verde on the other.

Christian Højbjerg has continued his work on the significance of the historical imagination for the construction of ethnic identity, for ethnic groups’ perceptions of each other and for their ways of interrelating, whether peacefully or violently. His approach concerns not only history as part of an ongoing social experience and practice of coming to terms with violent interaction; using fieldwork data, he also shows how memories of the past have influenced recent episodes of armed conflict in the Liberia/Guinea border region and between the Mandingos and co-existing ethnic groups in southeastern Guinea and northwestern Liberia.

Christoph Kohl, who now works at the Peace Research Institute in Frankfurt, continues to collaborate with the group as a research partner. His current Upper Guinea Coast research focusses on the cultural effects of global norm transmission for security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau. In contrast to other largely normative and top-down analyses, he applies a largely bottom-up perspective, exploring how the reforms are perceived and communicated by different local groups.

I have been busy finalising several publications and have begun to (re-)engage in two (partly interrelated) projects, focusing (1) on the role of lingua francas in the construction and transformation of (trans-)ethnic and national identification and (2) on the role of diasporas in the (re-)making of the nation in a field of transnational and global interaction.
Example of Research in Progress:
Creole lingua francas in processes of (re-)integration (Knörr)\textsuperscript{19}

In large parts of the Upper Guinea Coast region, creole languages have served as lingua francas for hundreds of years and – like creole identities – continue to play an important role in the relationship between different types of identities and the construction of transethnic and national identifications in a highly heterogeneous environment.\textsuperscript{20} In the following, two creole languages will be highlighted with regard to processes of (re-)integration, namely Kriol in Guinea-Bissau and Krio in Sierra Leone. This serves to give an impression of how the position, role, and meanings of creole languages are related to the conceptualisation, situation, and evaluation of creole groups and identities in a given society.

\textit{Kriol, Guinea-Bissau}

A Portuguese-based creole language developed along the West African coast as early as the late fifteenth century, when the Portuguese settled in the hitherto uninhabited Cape Verdean archipelago and traded along the West African coast, abducting large numbers of Africans of various origins to the Cape Verdean islands as slaves. This resulted in the emergence of a creole language in Cape Verde and littoral West Africa.\textsuperscript{21} At that time, the language was spoken only by the (new) inhabitants of Cape Verde and minorities living in a handful of trading posts along the Upper Guinea Coast.\textsuperscript{22} Kriol made a nation-wide breakthrough only when the war of independence began in 1961. The independence movement – having creoles as spearheads – employed

\textsuperscript{19} I thank Christoph Kohl for his valuable contribution and comments, particularly where Guinea-Bissau is concerned.


the language to propagate national integration across ethnic boundaries and declared it a national language once Guinea-Bissau achieved independence in 1974.\textsuperscript{23}

The spread of Kriol as Guinea-Bissau’s lingua franca and its transformation into a powerful symbol of national unity was facilitated by the fact that Bissau-Guinean creoles shared the same national identity as other Bissau-Guineans and that Kriol was not associated with any specific ethnic group. Both Kristons and Cape Verdeans – the creole categories of people who spread Kriol in Guinea-Bissau – are considered to be the result of ‘mixing’ (mistura), i.e., including Bissau-Guineans of different ethnic backgrounds and belongings. They continue to identify themselves – and to be identified – with specific, yet different mixtures of background, which, however, are (partially) shared by their (less mixed) compatriots. Likewise, the language originally distributed by them – or rather, their ancestors – is conceptualised as a language of different origins and as a national rather than an ethnic language. The same is true for other representations of creole identity in Guinea-Bissau, such as carnival and the manjuandadi (voluntary mutual aid associations), all of which were restricted to creole categories of people before spreading nationwide to become symbols of national identity.\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Krio, Sierra Leone}

Krio emerged in the late eighteenth century from a conglomerate of languages that reflected the origins of the different groups of liberated slaves who were settled in Sierra Leone at that time and shortly thereafter. In the process of interacting with each other and with the British colonists and local inhabitants, members of these groups began to identify themselves and their language as Krio.\textsuperscript{25} In the nineteenth


century Krio was used among the Krio, who by then had also integrated people of local descent into their group. Local people who were newly integrated had to give up their original ethnic identity and their ethnic language when converting to “creoledom”\textsuperscript{26}. The Krios came to be an elite that spread its language throughout Sierra Leone and beyond. The Krios generally emphasised the differences – in terms of religion, culture, and language – rather than the similarities between themselves and the indigenous population, pointing out what, in their view, made them superior to the latter.

The majority of Krios resisted independence, which contributed further to the contestedness of their status as native citizens of Sierra Leone after independence had been achieved in 1961. However, despite the critical attitude that many Sierra Leoneans still have towards the Krios, they largely appreciate the role that the Krio language plays as a national lingua franca. It seems somewhat ironic that the Krio language is considered one of the major unifying factors among Sierra Leoneans, insofar as the Krios, as a group, have in many ways been experienced as separatists. Especially since the end of the civil war, which raged in Sierra Leone for more than 10 years, the Krio language is gaining in status. It is seen as having a reconciling effect in that it “brings our people back together” (informant of Knörr). At the same time, many, especially younger Krios are (re-)discovering the integrative potentials of creole identity and emphasising the mixed and native, rather than the exclusive and foreign dimensions of their identity – a move that is widely appreciated in a post-war society still struggling to heal and reconcile\textsuperscript{27}.

In our future research concerning the relationship between creole languages and processes of (re-)integration we shall explore further the latter’s impact on the formation and transformation of collective – e.g. ethnic, local, (trans-) national – identities in contexts of (postcolonial) diversity and transnational/global interaction.


In 2012, the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ and the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology of the University of Zurich joined together to create the Centre for Anthropological Studies on Central Asia as a forum for distinguished anthropological engagement with the region. We use the term Central Asia broadly to include the former Soviet Republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, the Autonomous Region of Xinjiang, the Mongolian and Tibetan-speaking areas sometimes referred to as Inner Asia, and adjacent regions in northern Afghanistan, northern Iran, and southern Siberia. Research is also conducted on the new and old Central Asian diasporas, e.g., in Moscow and Istanbul. This gives credit to the many geographical, historical, and cultural similarities that have shaped the life of the people in the region, which include an arid continental climate, an economy traditionally based on irrigated agriculture, pastoral nomadism and trade, as well as similarities in social organisation and religious practices. As a crossroad linking various parts of the Eurasian continent, Central Asia has always been both a source and a destination of cultural and political influences far beyond its boundaries.

Given its history of politically conditioned inaccessibility, Central Asia is still a little known part of the world, even among scholars. In recent years, however, a number of studies have been conducted on current transformation processes. Anthropologists have often focussed on local economic relations and social stratification, new forms of social cooperation, ethnic identification and alliances, as well as religious revival and reconfiguration. The aim of CASCA is to promote empirically grounded research on these and related topics and to strengthen the position of Central Asian studies within the discipline. CASCA members work in close cooperation with colleagues in academic institutions around the world. Beyond its research agenda, CASCA is also committed to developing teaching facilities for BA, MA, and PhD programs, especially in Zurich; and it will also organise international summer schools.

**CASCA within the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’: intra- and inter-regional comparisons**

Research in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ is based on the principle of cluster formation. Having several researchers working in the same region facilitates controlled comparisons, which allow us to discern which changes in some variables entail alterations in other variables. Looking at variation and co-variation yields knowledge about how things are connected, which is the kind of knowledge theories are made of. The three regional project clusters – West Africa, Northeast
Africa, and Central Asia – have a number of things in common: first, much of their territories lie in the arid belt of the old world; second, Islam plays an important role as the religion of the groups under investigation or of their neighbours; and, third, social dynamics are currently shaped by interactions between nomads and settled populations or have been in the past. These similarities suggest that comparison should be possible not only within each region but between the different regions. While the Department itself provides a framework for regional and interregional comparisons, the work of colleagues from other Departments and research groups at the Institute also provides inspiration.

An example of intra-regional comparison is provided by the new CASCA project on “Ethnic Differentiation, Interethnic Relations and Conflict in Central Asia: the case of the Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, and Kazakstan” (see below). Inter-regional comparison will take precedence in a planned comparison of Uzbeks and Fulɓe, to whom much research in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ has already been devoted.

At first glance, the comparison between Fulɓe and Uzbeks seems arbitrary. On closer examination, however, it becomes evident that these two groups share precisely the kinds of similarities and differences that make controlled comparison fruitful:

1. In both cases there is a level of differentiation, consisting in named sub-ethnic groups, above the clan or village but below the ethnic classification as ‘Uzbeks’ or ‘Fulɓe’.
2. Practically all Uzbeks and all Fulɓe are Muslims, at least nominally.
3. Both Fulɓe and Uzbeks are scattered across numerous nation states, albeit for different reasons.

---


30 Before the advent of modern states, Fulɓe groups crossed the entire breadth of the African continent on their pilgrimages to Mecca; thereafter, they continued to traverse the same area – as pilgrims, nomads, and transnational wage labourers. Uzbeks, on the other hand, have a long sedentary tradition. Their scattered presence is mainly the result of the division of their settlement area among the different Soviet republics, which later became independent states. Thus, the presence of these groups in different nation states is due largely to two different processes: the Fulɓe crossed boundaries, while in the Central Asian case, it was the boundaries that crossed the Uzbeks.
4. Both Fulɓe and Uzbeks are ethnic groups on the edge of language families. The Fulɓe speak a language of the West-Atlantic branch of Niger-Congo, but they live in the neighbourhood of speakers of languages belonging to other language families across Africa; and the Uzbeks are Turkic speakers on the edge of the distribution area of Iranian languages.

Comparison of these regions yields a typology of interethnic contact situations that will shed light on central research questions of the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’.

**Current Research on “Ethnic Differentiation, Interethnic Relations, and Conflict in Central Asia”**

Taking Peter Finke’s work on Uzbek identities within Uzbekistan as a point of departure, this project examines processes of ethnic differentiation and interethnic relations in four states where Uzbeks form a significant minority. In recent years, three of them – Kyrgyzstan, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan – have experienced conflicts in which Uzbeks have been more or less strongly involved. Kazakhstan, which so far has been spared serious interethnic tensions, will serve as a kind of control case. The aim is to compare patterns of conflict and political mobilisation through appeals to shared ethnicity. In particular, we intend to examine the relationship between strategic behaviour, social expectations, historical and political frameworks, and cultural models that influence people’s perceptions of the world and structure their interactions.

With ambitions to formulate a synthetic theory, the project combines classic approaches to ethnicity with ideas borrowed from Rational Choice Theory, cognitive anthropology, and political economy. The underlying hypothesis is that groups owe their existence to the benefits they can provide to individuals, in particular their ability to reduce transaction costs. They achieve this by constituting institutional frameworks within which people can make reasonable assumptions about future strategies of other actors. Groups attract new members when, in particular political environments, they are more successful than others in providing such frameworks. In each of the four countries, one site will be selected for field research focussing on three issues: (1) the conceptualisation of Uzbek identity in relation to the local ethnic configuration; (2) patterns of social interaction and of the distribution of political and economic resources; and (3) strategies of mobilisation by political leaders and ethnic entrepreneurs. The major objective of this project is to provide new insights into processes of ethnic relations and conflict management in contemporary Central Asia and northern Afghanistan. This is of tremendous importance for a better understanding of the region in a period of rapid change following the collapse of the socialist regimes.

---

The project, which began in mid-2013, is supported financially by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). Cooperating partners include the universities of Zurich (Peter Finke), Geneva (Alessandro Monsutti), and Halle-Wittenberg (Jürgen Paul), as well as the Max Planck Institute (Günter Schlee). Research will be conducted by Khadija Abbasi, Indira Alibayeva, Wolfgang Holzwarth, and Baktygul Karimova.

**Individual Projects in Halle and Zurich**

*Contested Identity of Sart-Kalmaks in Contemporary Kyrgyzstan (Aida Alymbaeva)*

This doctoral project examines processes of identification in Chelpek, which is identified by insiders and outsiders as a Kalmak or Sart-Kalmak village. The Sart-Kalmak occupy a contradictory position within Central Asian systems of classification. The designation ‘Kalmak’ points to their supposed origins among the Kalmyk, originally nomads speaking a Mongol language and practicing Buddhism; while the term ‘Sart’ indicates that they are sedentary Muslims. As long-time residents of Kyrgyzstan, the Sart-Kalmak are now largely Kyrgyz-speaking; and, especially since Kyrgyz independence in 1991, they feel compelled to emphasise their Kyrgyzness. Nevertheless, they are still viewed by Kyrgyz – and sometimes by themselves – as members of an ethnic minority; and they are wooed by nationalists in the Russian Republic of Kalmykia and in Mongolia who view them as fellow Kalmyk or Mongols. Alymbaeva examines these complexities with reference to the dynamics of ethnic relations in Kyrgyzstan and Central Asia today.

*Re-Negotiation of Local Identity under Global Influences: the case of Tajikistan’s Pamir communities (Małgorzata Maria Biczyk)*

The goal of this doctoral dissertation on Ismailis in Tajikistan’s Pamir region (Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province or GBAO) is to discover how social and economic transformations have been experienced by local communities that differ in significant ways from the Tajik majority, most notably by adhering to the Shia branch of Islam and speaking an Eastern Iranian language differing from Tajik, which is West Iranian. For almost a century, the GBAO has been subject to successive modernisation projects (Soviet, neoliberal, and that of the new nation-state), which have affected the culture and identity of the people. This impact has been mediated, however, by the province’s autonomous status, historically within the Soviet Union and currently within independent Tajikistan.

*The Kazak oralman: comparing migratory decisions, integration patterns and transnational ties in three different settings (Tabea Buri and Peter Finke)*

This project compares the fate of Kazaks in and from three different diasporic settings: China, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan. In 1991, Kazaks made up barely forty per
cent of the total population of the newly independent state. Subsequently, the Kazak government appealed to the Kazaks living in other states to immigrate to Kazakstan, and, so far, roughly one million have responded to this appeal. Upon their arrival, these immigrants are called oralman (repatriates). The project will examine transnational social networks, motives for and against immigrating, and the integration of immigrants in Kazakstan. Tabea Buri, currently an assistant and a PhD student at the University of Zurich, will focus on Kazaks remaining in or leaving China, while Peter Finke will cover Mongolia. The researcher for the Uzbek case study is yet to be determined.

History and Culture of Southern Tajikistan since the Late Nineteenth Century (Wolfgang Holzwarth)
Wolfgang Holzwarth, a senior scholar in Social Anthropology and Iranian Studies, is a CASCA member based at the Oriental Institute of the University of Halle and associated with the Max Planck Institute. In his current project, he is tracing long-term developments in multiethnic milieus of southern Tajikistan from the days of the Bukharan Emirate through the Soviet period to independent Tajikistan in order to understand the impact of changing political and economic arrangements on local society and culture.

Squatter Settlements in Bishkek (Eliza Isabaeva)
In recent years, Kyrgyzstan’s capital and largest city has been expanding rapidly, both physically and demographically. Its population is now estimated to have surpassed one million, a number exceeding the capacity of the municipal infrastructure. This explosive population growth, largely attributable to migrants seeking better economic opportunities, has led to the emergence of squatter settlements along the city’s periphery, which locals call zhany konush (Kyrgyz) or novostroika (Russian). The goal of this doctoral project, based at the University of Zurich, is to show how squatters in Bishkek, who have essentially been left to govern themselves, organise their life and cope with challenges and difficulties by relying on formal rules and creating their own informal rules.

Cultural Adaptation of Dungan Migrant Communities in Kazakstan (Soledad Jiménez Tovar)
This doctoral project examines the cultural exchanges and adaptations by which Dungan (Muslim Hui) people have established local identities in the region of Kordai (Kazakhstan) and Tokmok (Kyrgyzstan), following various displacements between the 1870s and 1960s. A major objective of this research is to problematise existing ideas regarding the perceived ease with which Dungan and other ethnic groups are able to adapt to a multi-ethnic setting in a quasi-national context of shifting territorial identities.
Khojas in Central Asia: construction and transformation of identity (Azim Malikov)
Azim Malikov, a senior scholar from Samarkand State University in Uzbekistan, is working on identity transformations of the Khojas, a privileged religious status group, which can be found today among Uzbeks, Kazaks, Turkmens, and Tajiks. Khojas are divided among numerous subgroups or lineages, which often carry specific names and keep written genealogies, tracing and emphasising their descent from a saintly figure. Some of these lineages also occur in two or more ethnic groups. In this project Malikov analyses these interethnic descent group relationships and identity issues by combining the evaluation of historical accounts and cultural comparison.

Those Left-Behind: mobility and immobility in rural Tajikistan (Meltem Sancak)
Meltem Sancak, who became a postdoctoral fellow in the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ in 2012, is now focusing on Central Asian labour migration. In today’s Tajikistan, more than 5 percent of the total population and over 16 percent of its economically active population have moved to Russia alone as international labour migrants. This project focuses, however, on aspects of labour migration that, so far, have been understudied, namely, its impact on home communities. In the case of Tajikistan, it is mostly men who leave and women who stay behind. Besides family members who are left behind, there are also people who decide not to migrate but who are also affected by the consequences of migration.

Disputing Amidst Uncertainty: procedures of dispute management in ‘post-war’ times in Bamyan, Afghanistan (Friederike Stahlmann)
This dissertation focuses on procedures of disputing under the special circumstances of ‘post-war’ times, accounting for and analysing disputing parties’ assessments and practices. The project follows disputing parties through their dispute management and analyses their decision-making processes with regard to questions crucial for the realisation of procedures of disputing. In each case, it is important to ask who is regarded as a party in the dispute, how the decision to blame someone is made, how the aims of the disputing process are defined, how third parties are handled, and how the various parties deal with the results and the at least temporary ending of disputes.

Pastoralism in Western Mongolia (Linda Tubach and Peter Finke)
The northern part of the province of Khovd, used almost exclusively as seasonal pasture for sheep, goats, cattle, horses, and a few camels, is characterised by great ethnic diversity. This project examines the impact of ethnic diversity on pastoral land allocation. Furthermore, it seeks to discover the effects of different economic and social strategies, including migration, on formal and informal social institutions. Linda Tubach, a doctoral candidate and assistant at the University of Zurich, will focus on Mongols, while Peter Finke will continue his research on Kazaks in this region.
Department ‘Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia’

Director: Chris Hann

Highlights

• **May 2012**  
The 2012 Goody Lecture was given by Peter Burke: *A Case of Cultural Hybridity: the European Renaissance*.

• **June 2012**  
Chris Hann and David Wengrow presented the foundations of their cooperation in the analysis of civilisation(s) at a conference in London organised jointly by University College London and the Max Planck Society (*Research Collaboration in the European Union*). This was followed by an interdisciplinary conference in Halle, convened by Hann and Johann P. Arnason.

• **September 2012**  
A Research Group was launched in economic anthropology, *Industry and Inequality in Eurasia*, led by Hann, Catherine Alexander, and Jonathan Parry.

• **October 2012**  
A new International Max Planck Research School ANARCHIE (ANthropology, ARCHaeology, and HIstory of Eurasia) was inaugurated in partnership with archaeologists and historians of the Martin Luther University.

• **April 2013**  
An international workshop, *The Transformation of Public Markets in Contemporary Vietnam*, was organised in Hanoi by the Minerva Research Group led by Kirsten Endres, in cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology of the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences.

• **June 2013**  
Gonçalo Santos and Stevan Harrell convened a large international conference, *Chinese Patriarchy: Past, Present, Future*.

• **July 2013**  
The 2013 Goody Lecture was delivered by Martha Mundy: *The Solace of the Past in the Unspeakable Present: the historical anthropology of the ‘Near East’*.

• **October 2013**  
Christoph Brumann was elected as a member of the Academia Europaea.
Introduction:
Hierarchies of Knowledge and the Gold Standard for Anthropology in Eurasia

Chris Hann

The primary purpose of this publication is to report on the years 2012–2013 for the April 2014 meeting of the Institute’s Advisory Board. However, the expanded character of the forthcoming programme provides an opportunity to look back and reflect on the long-term programme since our establishment in 1999. The first Focus Group, “Property Relations” completed its work in 2005. Our second such Group “Religion, Identity, Postsocialism” published a final report in 2010. Progress reports on four current Groups, plus Kirsten Endres’s “Minerva” Group, which enjoys a special status, are presented below. In this preface, I shall outline the framework which holds these Groups together. I begin with the name of the Department.

Resilience and transformation form a pair: in our approach to social change, the one presupposes the other. Our very first Focus Groups provided graphic illustrations of this interdependence. The collapse of Soviet socialism in the years 1989–1993 was undoubtedly a rupture, one that brought sudden changes to the lives of hundreds of millions of people. We explored these transformations in fields largely neglected by other scholars. Agricultural collectivisation was a hallmark of most socialist states (not all), and the process of its reversal through privatisation was in many ways exemplary of the chaotic conditions of the first postsocialist decade. Yet within collective farms, which had been for the most part coercively imposed, with little regard to local specificities, anthropologists have long been aware of the persistence of the older values and habits of rural communities. Comparable continuities are evident in the realm of religion, which we began to investigate with a new programme in 2003. Repression in the name of scientific atheism was nowhere completely successful. The patterns we observe in the postsocialist decades are by no means a straightforward revival of the presocialist religious communities. They are the product of successive ruptures and multiple strands of continuity. All of these projects on postsocialist property relations and religion have been based on intensive field research and contributed to the social science analysis of our moment in world history.

Memories of socialism continue to shape the lives of many of the people we study. Younger generations have no direct memories; but we have found that socialist ideas and practices have a resilience of their own, albeit different from that of other faith communities. Our interest in transformation was never confined to the former USSR and its allies in Eastern Europe. From the beginning we have also had projects in China, where momentous changes have taken place in a framework which remains at least nominally socialist and indebted to a European revolutionary tradition. We have recently initiated new projects in states which have never embraced any form
of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, in South Asia and elsewhere. This expansion of scope is a natural development of our fundamental commitment to comparison. It also reflects the obvious fact that the term ‘postsocialist’ (which we never promoted as a theoretical tool) is of dwindling relevance as the decades pass.

Logically, comparisons can be extended worldwide and across all historical periods. However, in practice we have largely confined our work so far to recent centuries and to Eurasia. This last term is sometimes still a source of confusion so let me clarify its usage in this Department, which has not changed over the years. Eurasia is the Old World, the landmass between the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, including the southern shore of the Mediterranean and the large islands of Britain and Japan. The evolution of civilisations across this landmass since the urban revolutions of the late Bronze Age exhibits a substantial degree of unity. We thus reject the idea that Europe warrants the designation continent, an equivalent of Asia. Europe has been a remarkably productive region of the world over many centuries, but so too has China; given the extraordinary diversity of Asia, it seems appropriate to break it down into smaller units for comparative purposes. This is important because so much theory in the social sciences has been based on the experiences of Europe in recent centuries. Contemporary postcolonial theories derive largely from the expansion of North Atlantic power to all parts of the globe. In this sense, these theories represent the resilience of the scholarship of Western European exceptionalism rather than a shift of paradigm. However, imperial expansion also took place in somewhat different time frames contiguously, within the Eurasian landmass. Tracing these other variants of empire is central to the research programme of Dittmar Schorkowitz, who reports below on his comparisons of ‘ethnic minority management’ policies in the Russian and Chinese Empires and elsewhere. Together with the International Max Planck Research School ANARCHIE, also introduced below, the Focus Group led by Schorkowitz, “Historical Anthropology in Eurasia”, demonstrates our commitment to rebuilding close links with historians, historical sociologists and archaeologists – links which atrophied in the twentieth century, when many socio-cultural anthropologists came to define their discipline too narrowly with reference to the methodology of fieldwork.

Some of the most influential traditions in anthropology have been shaped decisively by the centuries of Western expansion overseas. Ethnographers concentrated on ‘peoples without history’, i.e. societies lacking any written records of their past. When anthropologists in the second half of the twentieth century again began to pay more attention to societies in Eurasia possessing their own textual traditions, they had to adapt their theories and methods. Foreign researchers still tended to seek out ‘the other’ in remote places (and there was no shortage of aboriginal, non-literate peoples in Eurasia), but they could hardly ignore the ‘local’ traditions of scholarship, including work of obvious pertinence to anthropological endeavours. It would be myopic to pretend that these scholarly relations can become perfectly egalitarian, or that the dominance of English as a lingua franca now provides for a ‘level playing
field’ across Eurasia. But it is both scientifically fruitful and ethically imperative to open up more conversations with scholarly communities in the countries where we carry out research, regardless of whether these communities identify with a discipline called ‘anthropology’. Sometimes in the frame of formal agreements but more often in very informal ways, such as inviting key partners to sojourn in Halle, our aim is to contribute to the emergence of more cosmopolitan anthropological communities throughout Eurasia. In this way, Eurasia provides us with more than an alternative lens through which to understand world history. It pushes us to adopt a critical perspective on the history of anthropology, and to work hard to overcome the problem of “hierarchies of knowledge”, to borrow a phrase used by Michał Buchowski in criticising some Western anthropological writing about Eastern Europe.

Of course, agendas and research conditions may be very different. In some countries, scholars encounter restrictions in publishing their work. In these cases, too, we seek to improve collegial relations. Differences should be respected, on the basis of maximal transparency of communication. In the past, encounters between socio-cultural anthropology and Western social thought have been fruitful. For example, I have found it useful to draw on the Central Europeans Karl Polanyi and Friedrich Hayek in analysing the dilemmas of global capitalism. But it is possible that new intellectual encounters will be more productive in the future. If such dialogues are to continue to serve a useful purpose, their results must be communicable to scholars at home in other textual traditions. If the Anglophone literature on Eurasian postsocialism becomes mired in the quicksand of postcoloniality jargon, this cannot be healthy for the development of the anthropological field.

Five Hallmarks

Collegiality and clear communication at every stage of the research process are thus prerequisites. Whether our interlocutors are subsistence-oriented farmers, factory workers, or urbane intellectuals, competence in local languages is the indispensable key to understanding other views of the world. The reinvigoration of historical research will not displace fieldwork as a hallmark of our projects. Many will involve combinations of ethnographic and archival data. We intend to do more than we have managed in the past to make raw data available for the benefit of wider communities.

If field research is one enduring feature of our work, a hallmark of equal significance from the very beginning has been comparison. Instead of the blunt contrasting of ‘the other’ with ‘us’ (which for far too long meant an arrogant ‘us, enlightened Western Europeans’), directing attention to Eurasia obliges us to rediscover comparison, rather than contrast, as the prime epistemological foundation of a mature, cosmopolitan anthropology. Comparison begins with the understanding (or translation) of other societies; the enquiry is not left at this level, but must proceed to systematic investigation at multiple levels of analysis.
One such level is the civilisational. If we are interested in the larger patterns of human history, whether in Eurasia or anywhere else in the world, we need concepts to facilitate macro-analysis. This level faded from view with the emphasis on ethnographic research in the last century. The troubled past of the concept of civilisation is well known. Imperial powers have all too often invoked notions of a ‘civilising mission’ to justify their oppression of subject peoples. For this reason, we have proceeded very cautiously over the past several years. Following a workshop in 2010 and a larger meeting in Halle in 2012, both organised with the leading sociological exponent of civilisational analysis, Johann Arnason, we have established a solid foundation on which to build. This is the Maussian view of civilisation as a “family of societies”. Like Arnason, we are particularly interested in inter-civilisational encounters, both past and present. We focus on a wide range of variables through which differences are expressed and less powerful groups are kept under control.

In March-April 2013, Chris Hann visited two of his PhD students during their fieldwork in remote parts of China. Together with Ildikó Bellér-Hann, he also spent several weeks at their long-term field site in eastern Xinjiang. He is pictured here (centre, in blue shirt) crossing the bridge to Vietnam at Lao Cai, on his way to participate in a Hanoi Workshop organised jointly by Kirsten Endres and her partners at the Institute of Ethnology of the Vietnamese Academy of Sciences (see her report below). This border crossing is used primarily by petty traders, whose strategies and moral economy are investigated in Endres’ individual research project. The Chinese text on the large poster reads: Strengthen the Border, Solidify Defence, Safeguard Security, Good Neighbourly Relations and Friendship, Advance Development. (Photo: Kirsten Endres, 2013)
One dimension to be addressed in our analyses of civilisational encounters is the rhetorical invocation of civilisation to legitimate domination. More generally, we explore ideologies and their origins and underpinnings in diverse domains, from secular political doctrines to religious symbols and myths of origin. The concept of ideology is to be understood broadly. It is not restricted to the state power, or to such well-known ideologies as socialism and (neoliberal) capitalism. We have devoted a lot of attention to these two very influential ideologies and we continue to do so in the new “Industry and Inequality in Eurasia” Research Group, which is introduced below. The term ideology can, however, be applied in other contexts, for example to the religious ideologies which we investigated between 2003 and 2010. Christoph Brumann is currently examining UNESCO’s cultural heritage ideology. In my own continuing work in rural Eastern Europe I have shown how a diffuse ideology of private property in land has an elective affinity with nationalist ideology; this combination proved highly resilient and re-emerged strongly following the demise of socialist collectivisation.

Ideologies depend for their efficacy not only on the actors who adopt and transmit them but also on their institutions. This is the final cornerstone of the edifice I wish to present in this brief Preface. Institutional research in anthropology can take many forms. In the “Economy and Ritual” Research Group, which completed its work in 2012, Stephen Gudeman and I, together with our six postdocs, investigated the institutions of the domestic domain in the context of ritual. In doing so, we opened up large fields of economic activity which remain largely invisible to mainstream economists. The domestic domain is also central to our work on social support in East Asia. By contrast, Dittmar Schorkowitz and his Group draw on archival data to reconstruct the functioning of institutions at quite different levels, such as the agencies through which the Chinese state controlled the non-Chinese populations it encountered in the course of imperial expansion. Kirsten Endres and her Minerva Group researchers illuminate the inchoate institutions of the informal economy and its imperfect regulation by the Vietnamese state in the era of socialist market economy. Christoph Brumann does fieldwork on cultural heritage at the highest institutional levels of UNESCO, but he and his students also document the implementation of these policies, and occasional resistance to them, ‘on the ground’, where the focus shifts to the local institutions.

Conclusion: the gold standard

The Department is committed to a dynamic research programme based on innovative themes and implemented in changing regional clusters throughout Eurasia. It has extended its coverage in space to include regions outside the former Soviet bloc, both single-party states which continue to espouse socialism and others that were never socialist. It has also expanded its coverage in time. Historical anthropology, along with economic anthropology, will remain central to our work in years to
come. Our interests in the past and present of Eurasia reflect our passionate interest in its future. Anthropology as we practise the discipline is the very opposite of an *Orchideenfach*, the antiquarian pursuit of the exotic. In my own recent work I have suggested that Eurasia stands today at a crossroads. It needs to choose between the socio-economic models of Karl Polanyi and Friedrich Hayek. The vision of the former has the stronger grounding in the history of Eurasia. The institutions of a Eurasia united politically and monetarily would necessarily be very different from those we observe in Beijing and Brussels today. Anthropologists can help to prepare the ground for an historic unification, as the prelude to forging a genuine world society. The focus on Eurasia as an unusually ambitious variant of ‘area studies’ will then realise its universal significance.

*Fieldwork, comparison, civilisation, ideology, institution:* the features I have outlined above (with the exception of civilisation, which still needs to be brought in from the cold) are the familiar gold standard of social anthropology. This standard has been contested in recent decades. Critical scrutiny of past ethnographic writing and the exposure of political and other forms of bias in many classical works have been salutary; but it is now time to move forward and to re-engage both with the world that is out there today and with the big questions of world history.

This is an apt moment in history to play with monetary metaphors. The gold standard that regulated global finance until 1931 disguised the entrenched domination of the West, notably Britain. Attempts to maintain this standard in the 1920s had highly regressive consequences for income distribution. The analogy to today’s global crisis is obvious: policies of deflation and ‘austerity’ are again lowering real wages and employment in many parts of Europe. Unstinting loyalty to the euro may not be the best way forward.

By a further analogy, it is healthy if anthropologists continue to question their received standard and strive to reach agreement on a disciplinary core that does not entrench the old hierarchies of knowledge. Dialogue and debate are essential. In our case, communication takes place within the Department at our weekly seminar. Group leaders devise their projects independently. We tolerate a lot of theoretical diversity at the level of individual projects. On the basis of this internal pluralism within a social anthropological frame, we seek to join conversations with other strands of anthropology, irrespective of their labels, and with an array of adjacent disciplines. Ultimately, we reflect on how our own scholarly traditions fit into the civilisational pluralism of Eurasia and into world history. We think that this stance is the best way to expand knowledge in the anthropological field. If we can accomplish this within Eurasia, we shall be better placed to pursue more symmetrical forms of knowledge production for the whole of humanity.
Kinship and Social Support in China and Vietnam

Head of Focus Group: Chris Hann

Senior researchers: Meixuan Chen, Minh Nguyen, Gonçalo Santos, Roberta Zavoretti
Associates: Ildikó Bellér-Hann, Markus Schlecker, Xiujie Wu
Doctoral students: Saheira Haliel, Sarah Schefold, Ruijing Wang

Introduction

This Group was launched in 2006. The themes were selected to fit in with the expertise available at the time in the Project Group Legal Pluralism and also to build on the experience gathered in the EU Project entitled “Kinship and Social Security in Europe”, coordinated by Dr Patrick Heady, which ran between 2004 and 2007. The application of these approaches to the largest socialist states of East Asia entailed the recruitment of new researchers for both China and Vietnam, primarily at the postdoctoral level. Individual projects have been both rural and urban, located in both central and peripheral locations, engaging with both ethnic minorities and majority groups. While the evolving political economy of ‘reform socialism’ provides the basic context for this Focus Group, our projects dig deep into beliefs, practices, and realms of contemporary social history where economic models are insufficient for understanding.

Socialism, Markets, and Social Support

Since the radical reform of their economic mechanisms more than a generation ago, China and Vietnam have recorded remarkable rates of growth. Urbanisation and industrialisation have proceeded apace. Although much decision-taking power has been decentralised to enterprise managers, state officials retain control in key sectors such as energy and banking. Privatisation has not been pushed through as comprehensively as in countries of the former Soviet bloc and agricultural land remains overwhelmingly in the hands of those who cultivate it. Blanket diagnoses of ‘accumulation through dispossession’ are therefore misplaced.

The Head of this Group has been fascinated by the affinities to the ‘market socialism’ pursued in the Soviet bloc by Hungary after the reforms of 1968. These experiments, like the somewhat different mechanisms institutionalised in socialist Yugoslavia, were ended abruptly around 1990 as the entire region was integrated into neoliberal capitalism. Although both China and Vietnam have been drawn into global flows of people and capital, the fact that a great deal of economic as well as political power is still exercised by the Communist Party suggests that they represent something other than another variety of capitalism. It can also be argued that these
states continue to represent the most significant alternative to democratic market capitalism. Their performance since the introduction of the reforms compares favourably with that of rivals, such as India. Even if growth rates have slowed significantly of late, they have defied the predictions of Western experts for decades. It is only a matter of time before China overtakes the USA as the world’s largest economy. Performance is also impressive in terms of living standards: indicators for education, health, and longevity all tell essentially the same positive story.

Yet this success is not unsullied. It has been accompanied by severe challenges as hundreds of millions of villagers find new jobs and ways of living in the urban sector. Minh Nguyen has investigated these processes in the case of the Vietnamese capital, Hanoi. She and her colleagues working in China have documented many new forms of social inequality within both urban and rural sectors, as well as a widening gulf between them. This is consistent with the critique of those who allege that the original socialist transformatory vision of Mao Tse Tung and Ho Chi Minh has long given way to corrupt oligarchic rule. For many Western observers, these countries exhibit an endemic lack of transparency which can only be overcome through political democratisation.

This is the context in which the Group investigates social support. Rapid economic growth has been accompanied by institutional changes in many domains, including the domestic. The first decades of socialism had already transformed a great deal. Both in the countryside through cooperatives, brigades, and later the people’s communes, and in the cities through the work-unit, collectives took over many of the responsibilities previously assumed by family and kin. The Maoist state took symbolic charge of social support when it issued its famous “five guarantees”: food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and funerals. This commitment has little salience in today’s market socialist society, because the prime responsibility is clearly back where it had been previously: with kin. But which kin exactly? Do daughters nowadays have the same rights and duties as sons? How do changing economic conditions affect intergenerational flows of goods and services and the inheritance of property?

It is common to use the language of economics when answering these questions, e.g. when we say that parents ‘invest’ in their offspring by supporting their educational expenses as well as through nurture more generally. The market principle can apply directly nowadays, e.g. when those who can afford to do so pay cash for care services, whether in the home or in an institution. However, the majority of actions pertinent to social support, as we understand the term, cannot be reduced to a commercial, profit-maximising logic, nor to a logic of evolutionary fitness. More complex accounts are needed.

From the beginning, this Group has thus looked to expand its comparisons beyond socialist East Asia and to engage with theoretical issues concerning basic concepts such as support, care, and the self or person. The zigzag path from traditional agrarian society through Maoism to reform socialism contrasts markedly with the gradualist expansion of state capacities in most parts of Europe, and also with the
patterns of capitalist countries in East Asia such as Japan and South Korea. The individualisation noted by recent scholars (notably Yunxiang Yan) suggests that China’s current trajectory has come to resemble that pioneered elsewhere. Yet many factors remain distinctive. In spite of the wealth now generated by Chinese industry, wages and consumption remain relatively low (much of the surplus continues to flow into the purchase of Western debt). China is only just beginning to develop health and pension entitlements comparable to those pioneered in Europe in the nineteenth century. The age structure of the population has changed dramatically as a result of the one-child policy. Finally, restrictions on charitable organisations and the absence of religious freedoms are factors with significant implications for the provision of support.

A first conference to explore these issues theoretically and comparatively was convened in Halle in 2008 by two postdoctoral researchers of the first cohort, Friederike Fleischer and Markus Schlecker. A selection of the papers was published in 2013 by Palgrave under the title *Ethnographies of Social Support*. Markus Schlecker theorises the concept of “support encounter” in his introduction to the volume and deploys it in his own empirical chapter with reference to memories of the Vietnamese wars and notions of sacrifice. Friederike Fleischer draws on her data from Guangzhou to show how new spaces are opening up in Chinese civil society, in which especially young people seek to realise new visions of society while concomitantly transforming themselves into ‘modern’ citizens. In both countries, overlapping and at times contradictory ideologies of personhood and sociality turn the social sector into a complicated arena for the negotiation of personal aspirations, social expectations, and kin obligations.
One key synthesising concept in the anthropological literature on China is that of patriarchy. It is a term which has also been deployed in socialist ideology and policy making. To overcome the distortions of ‘feudal patriarchal society’ was central to the goals of the Chinese Communist Party, which signalled its intentions in the Marriage Law of 1950. Yet in spite of the legislation and the creation of new institutions, gender and generational relations proved stubbornly resistant to socialist transformation. As in other socialist countries, participation in the labour force did not mean that women were freed from bearing a disproportionate share of domestic labour, including care work, but it did mean the implementation of policies (for example, in terms of provision of childcare support) aimed at allowing women to cope more easily with the dual burden of employment and family life. The end of Maoism threatened to reinforce existing inequalities, as well as to bring about the restoration of certain older patterns. For example, it was widely predicted that confirming the rural household as the key unit of production and consumption would strengthen patriarchal bias; and a bias in favour of sons has been vividly and notoriously demonstrated since the introduction of strict birth control policies in both rural and urban sectors. At the same time, the increased spatial and economic
mobility of the reform period has given the younger generations a higher degree of autonomy. Joint family arrangements remain common, but the middle generation often has more say than the senior generation in family matters. Gender relations were also significantly transformed, as women seem to have improved their earning power, but the evidence in this respect remains mixed. When it comes to educational investments, the previous work of this Focus Group has shown that discrimination against daughters has declined; in poor rural communities, parents want both sons and daughters to escape from the land, and tend to see daughters as the more reliable providers of long-term parental care, and especially emotional support (see the summary of Helena Obendiek’s doctoral project in Gansu Province, in the MPI Report for 2010–2011).

In order to explore recent empirical trends further and to reassess the theoretical utility of the concept of patriarchy, an international workshop was convened by Gonçalo Santos in June 2013 together with Stevan Harrell (University of Washington) entitled: Is Chinese Patriarchy over? The decline and transformation of a system of social support. Fifteen pre-circulated papers were intensively debated over three days. Participants included sociologists and historians, who helped to place the ethnographic evidence of the anthropologists (including past and present members of the MPI) in wider spatial and temporal frames. The invited discussants included distinguished specialists in other regions of Eurasia, who opened up new, sometimes surprising avenues of comparison (e.g. with the Mediterranean). The workshop was launched by a keynote lecture by Rubie Watson (Harvard University), who reviewed the ways in which the concept of patriarchy has been employed among Chinese reformers and social scientists for generations.

The starting point of the workshop – as outlined by its organisers – was the idea that social scientists ever since Engels have characterised China as a ‘patriarchal society’, in the sense that power is exercised by senior males over women and younger generations through control of productive property, and through an officially sponsored ideology of filial obedience and devotion. The title of the workshop, Is Chinese patriarchy over?, was intended as a provocation as much as an invitation to think about the dramatic changes that have occurred in family and gender relations in the last five to six decades. As expected, most papers presented at the conference pointed in the direction of a reconfiguration rather than a collapse of patriarchal structures. And yet, while most paper-givers agreed that present-day patriarchal formations are very different from those associated with the period before the Communist era, there were no clear-cut agreements over the general direction of this historical transformation, in part because there were significant theoretical differences in the usage of the concept of ‘patriarchy’, in part because the transformation in question displays great diversity along axes such as urban/rural, Northern/Southern, and coastal/interior. To illustrate this diversity, the papers presented at the conference focused on themes as different as premarital sexuality and pregnancy, patterns of post-marital residence, intergenerational power relations within the family, son
preference and birth planning, strategies of educational investment, management of family earnings, childbirth and motherhood, childcare practices, deviant regimes of sex and gender, and models of masculinity. The final session of the workshop saw a radical questioning of the value of patriarchy for comparative anthropological analysis, but most if not all participants agreed that it continued to provide an illuminating lens through which to look at contemporary Chinese society. Stevan Harrell and Gonçalo Santos are currently compiling a selection of the papers for an edited volume, which they intend to introduce with the outline of a new theoretical approach to family and gender relations in China and elsewhere.

**Workshop: Beyond the Global Care Chain Approach. Boundaries, institutions, and ethics of care (10 – 12 July, 2014)**

This Workshop will be convened by Minh Nguyen and Roberta Zavoretti at the Max Planck Institute. The aim is to subject key concepts of the Focus Group, notably ‘care’, to theoretical critique in the light of ethnographic studies covering many other parts of the world, complementing the work that Group members will present concerning China and Vietnam. The call for papers, posted in June 2013, specified the following provisional themes:

- **Boundaries** – the ways in which care practices push, and/or reproduce common analytical boundaries such as private/public, individual/society, gender/sexuality;

- **Institutions** – the changing relationship between the market, the state and the ‘third sector’ including non-governmental and religious institutions, and its implications for care practices and relations;

- **Health and body** – how care practices produce, challenge, and/or subvert conceptions of health/body and the relationship between human body and society;

- **Technologies of care** – technologies for the production of subjectivities, including those of nurturing and disciplining, that are part of care;

- **Ethics of care** – power relations underlying the politics of care needs and inequalities in care provision, moral issues in the often unequal relations of care, and the division of caring burdens in the household and society.
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Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia

In 2012 and 2013, this Focus Group continued its project “Ethnic Minorities and the state in Eurasia”, which explores the forms, practices, and structures of interdependencies, dominance, and resistance in various parts of Southeast Asia, China, and Russia. This multi-sited approach provides ample opportunities for comparing different forms of colonialism (continental, internal, and overseas) in time and space, including cross-epochal legacies as well as synchronous interferences and influence. For a better understanding of contemporary state-minority dynamics it is important to know how the shifting formats of colonialism resulted in differing modes of integration and to what extent these variables depend on factors of longue durée in society, nature, and history. Notwithstanding the huge diversity of forms and transformation processes involved, there is consistency and common ground in the group in that all projects are positioned within the framework of or related to imperial formations (either large ones as in the case of China and Russia or in miniature as in the case of Laos), of multi-national states, or multi-cultural societies.

Research Results and Achievements

Imperial formations in Eurasia have developed lasting strategies to integrate cultural diversity resulting from an immense variety of ethnic minorities they have absorbed in the course of their expansion. While in pre-modern empires (Byzantine, Mongol, Muscovy, Ottoman, Mughal) ‘difference’ was still the prevalent mode of integration, this pattern changed radically with the ‘well-ordered’ state and the final stages of continental colonialism when ‘belonging’ and ‘sameness’ became the dominant mode leading to ideologies of nostrification, homogenisation, and unification. Since then, some empires (Ottoman, Habsburg) have transformed into nation-states, while some large (Russia, China) and smaller formations (Laos) are still struggling to find ‘unity in diversity’.

Though integration strategies vary in time according to their historical background, their ends remain almost the same as the obvious timeless challenge: to maintain cross-epochal cohesiveness in a multi-national state and to guarantee certain rights of national self-determination. In the case of Russia, the urge to have 18th-century enlightened scholars from Western Europe take stock of the empire’s
riches, peoples, and languages led to an assiduous counting and classification paving the way for a *mission civilisatrice* and the modern nationalities question.

In Ming-Qing China, on the other hand, a surprisingly lesser interest in defining ethnic groups (other than Han) can be observed. Here we can see a robust tradition of clustering them under ethnocentric stereotypes instead (Fan, Meng, Hui, etc.) and the belief that Confucianism is instrumental to promote the ‘barbarians’ from a lower ‘raw’ to a higher ‘cooked’ status. Both empires, however, invented and developed, independently of one another, central institutions needed even today to structure ethnic-cultural diversity, to govern the civilisational frontier, and to implement various strategies of integration for the sake of imperial cohesion.

Quintessentially for continental colonialism and in contrast to corresponding agencies of overseas colonial powers, these institutions were never officially called or recognised as ‘colonial offices’. This also holds true for Southeast Asia where traces of French overseas and pre-modern internal colonialism still play an influential role today. What these formations (Russia, China, Laos) do have in common is a shift from ‘indirect’ to ‘direct’ rule, in the latter case stimulated by French colonialism. Territorial contiguity of both the Russian and Chinese empires with their Central and Inner Asian peripheries can thus hardly be used as a counter-argument against classifying their rule as colonial and contrasting their continental formations with overseas variations.

**Why Some Institutions Do Not Die**

Colonial continuities as petrified in institutional structures, cross-epochal habitus, and transformed ideologies are key issues in a comparative research project on governmental agencies in Qing China and Russia by Chia Ning, Heuschert-Laage, and Schorkowitz. Focussing on the role of the *Lifanyuan* (Court for the Regulations of the Frontier) colonial administration, Heuschert-Laage, in her source-based research project, explores Mongolia-related Qing integration strategies and analyses the impact of these processes on Mongolian societies. Having once been a powerful player in Eurasia, the Mongols underwent many changes and were, by the end of the Qing Dynasty (1912), in a state reminiscent of that of colonised peoples in other parts of the world. To explain the changing modes of their integration into an administrative system with the emperor at the top, Heuschert-Laage investigates the political techniques of patronage with their formalised language and expressions of courtesy. She shows that the Qing, by re-interpreting the obligations of gift exchange, transformed the network of personal relationships with Mongolian leaders into a system with clearly defined rules to the effect that, during the late Qing, the façade of a patronage-clientele relationship was maintained in order to legitimise increasingly unequal power relations. Whereas techniques of patronage were developed long before the Qing came to power, it was the *Lifanyuan* which now monitored and modified its performance: the emphasis in gift exchange shifted...
from recording what was received to recording what was given, thus stressing the kindness and generosity of the emperor and relegating the Mongols to a subordinate role at the Inner Asian frontier.

Similar shifts towards inequalities in power relations and direct rule are documented in the changing concepts of territory, especially when land rights and the use of nomadic pastures became challenged by in-migrating Chinese farmers, and with regard to the legal sphere, in which controversies over jurisdictional competence played an important role in re-defining Manchu-Mongolian relationships (see her MPI Working Paper No. 138). What becomes evident from this analysis is, first, the change from a multi-jurisdictional legal order towards greater coherence and consistency. Like the changing formats in gift exchange and patronage, this drift towards incorporating the Mongols into the Qing Chinese legal system corresponds to the general trend towards formalisation and assimilation in other parts of Mongolian and Inner Asian cultures. Secondly, the formation of the Lifanyuan was contested along jurisdictional and administrative lines and its functions were permanently re-interpreted through the interplay between coloniser and colonised, centre and periphery – a feature attested for many colonial institutions.

The positioning of the Lifanyuan within this empire-wide perspective is instrumental for a better assessment of its general role in Qing colonial governance and particularly its engagement with non-Chinese groups in Inner Asia. Guided by her source-based research Chia Ning gives a precise description of the Lifanyuan’s differentiated procedures of indirect rule, employing various ‘social systems’ to govern different ‘social entities’, thus preserving ethnic identities, traditions, and local political orientations for a long time (see her MPI Working Paper No. 139). Since its establishment in 1636, the Lifanyuan functioned as an institutional pillar in Qing empire-building even when indirect rule in the operative social systems was later converted into forms of direct governance and decision-making processes were increasingly centralised.

Complementary to the analysis on Lifanyuan’s involvement in Mongolian affairs, Chia Ning’s research not only corroborates the idea of changing colonial formats but also enlarges our analytical framework by including the Libu (Board of Rites) into a comparison of institutions in charge of Qing colonial affairs. Taking the ethnic-culturally diverse population of the Qing Empire and its Ming predecessor as a starting point, she examines three different types: 1. the Lifanyuan, introduced by the Qing, for Inner Asia; 2. the Libu in its Ming-Qing forms; and 3. the Six Boards for China proper. Lifanyuan and Libu responsibilities overlapped in some regions (Amdo, Qinghai) and with regard to particular patronage-clientele activities (pilgrimage, court rituals, tribute), the processing of imperial examinations, and the supervision of Buddhist and Muslim affairs, leading to forms of close cooperation in colonial management.

Both agencies, however, represent but two formations in a series of institutions dealing with the legacy of ethnic diversity in imperial China. Relieved of its respon-
sibilities in foreign affairs, the *Lifanyuan* continued to exist as *Lifan bu* (a revised name of the *Lifanyuan* since 1906) until 1912 and was soon re-established initially as the Board (1914) and later Commission (1928) of “Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs”, which is still active in Taiwan today and has a parallel ‘twin’ agency in the People’s Republic of China (“State Nationality Affairs Commission”), founded in 1949. It is because of this continuity and the thick structure of China’s internal colonialism that trends of integration, from ‘difference’ to ‘sameness’ (see Schlee, *MPI Working Paper No. 143*), and rule, from ‘indirect’ to ‘direct’, can be brought into continental perspectives when compared with and contrasted to similar developments in Russia, which is the focus of Schorkowitz’s research. Here the longue durée picture looks similar, though the evolution of political institutions is quite different. While there was a “Department of Asian Affairs” (1797) and the “Asian Department” (1819, being the de facto colonial office) as a prominent part of Russia’s foreign office supplemented by a number of indigenous self-governments and steppe dumas (indigenous self-administration), institutional centralisation took shape rather late with Stalin’s “People’s Commissariat of Nationalities”. The urge for ethnic-cultural integration surfaced in Russia especially during caesura-like ruptures (1917, 1989-91) mirroring the oscillation in imperial cohesiveness often described as ‘dynastic’ or ‘administrative cycles’. It remains atop the agenda even today as the “Presidential Council for Intra-National Relationships” shows, founded in May 2012 by a presidential *ukase* (decree) with the aim of forming a ‘single political nation’. Results from these three projects have been presented at international conferences in Beijing, Bonn, Halle, and Paris, at the German Anthropological Association’s convention in Mainz, and have also been published in prominent Chinese and Japanese series.

**Laos and Vietnam: multi-ethnic empires in miniature**

Both Laos and Vietnam, prime examples of ethnic-cultural diversity, can be portrayed as excellent laboratories for the exploration of colonial transformations of political and sociocultural configurations, and the making of a frontier between upland and lowland societies. Tappe in his recent research shows that before French colonial intervention in Southeast Asia, Lao and Vietnamese rulers were content with mere indirect control over upland people, mainly to guarantee the flow of goods from the mountain forests. While in pre-colonial times, Lao rulers maintained tributary and marriage relations with certain groups, the Vietnamese offered titles and ranks to co-opted upland elites. Some groups, such as the Tai Deng, however, constantly moved and mixed and thus created the kaleidoscopic appearance of this specific upland context which challenged the French colonial gaze at the turn of the 20th century.

While developing integration strategies of its own, the French colonial administration adopted lowland ‘imperial’ strategies such as the co-optation of local elites, thereby reinforcing interethnic hierarchies and socio-political tensions. Under French
colonialism, ethnic minorities emerged as a distinct social category, namely as upland societies outside the dominant Lao and Vietnamese cultural mainstream. As an internal frontier in French Indochina, the upland regions dividing Laos and Vietnam entered a new stage of political and economic integration. By taking this perspective ‘from above’ and yet critically engaging with James Scott’s upland-lowland opposition, Tappe emphasises the internal dynamics and frictions of the frontier and uncovers new aspects of historical upland life-worlds. He argues that this ethnically heterogeneous region must be considered not as a periphery, but as a zone of contact and exchange, of mutual interpenetration of different cultures, and of mimetic appropriations similar to the Inner Asian frontier.

Postcolonial nation-building in Laos was characterised by tensions between Buddhist cultural hegemony and the project of creating a single national identity, thus facing an analogous challenge of maintaining cohesiveness as large imperial formations do. This cross-epochal legacy of Buddhism as a mediator of interethnic relations has been in the focus of Ladwig’s research on Buddhification strategies and practices in the two Lao provinces of Attapeu and Salavan. Though exchange and intermarriage with surrounding animist Mon-Khmer groups signify the porousness of religious boundaries, hegemonic relations between ethnic Lao and upland
minorities have been a constant feature. Buddhist principalities in pre-modern Laos were eager to integrate these groups not only for economic (slavery) and military (forced recruitment) reasons, but also because Theravada Buddhism was considered to be a superior civilisational force.

In order to engage with forms of internal colonialism prior to the French intervention of 1893, Ladwig has analysed Buddhist historiography, local chronicles, and oral histories where Mon-Khmer groups are classified as forest people living in a state of savagery without any form of writing or state-building, performing buffalo sacrifices, and not knowing the teachings of the Buddha. The sources also emphasise, however, the integrative potential of Buddhist polities using conversion which, as in the case of Cheng villages, started as early as the 17th century, granting the group a status as ‘temple serfs’, and has continued into the present through the state’s policy of linking Buddhist temples to the new idea of a ‘civilised modernity’. Buddhification as a strategy of integrating ethnic-cultural diversity thus shows a great continuity not only from the pre-colonial to the colonial period, but also through the era of the post-socialist nation-state.

Both Ladwig and Tappe have applied diverse approaches and methods of historically informed anthropology making extensive use of archival research (Paris, Aix-en-Provence, Vientiane) combined with multi-sited fieldwork in village societies of their regions. This emphasis on archival sources entails methodological challenges, since official documents generally represent discourses of domination that often only allow for indirect assessments of the colonised (see their MPI Working Paper No. 141). Research results of both projects have been presented at international conferences in Lisbon, Chicago, Madison, Halle, Göttingen, Berlin, Paris, Kyoto, at the EASA biennial conference in Nanterre, and the German Anthropological Association’s convention in Mainz.
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Industry and Inequality in Eurasia

This Group was launched in September 2012 as a continuation of the Department’s long-term research in economic anthropology. Its organisation is similar to that of an earlier Group, “Ritual and Economy”, with the core team consisting of six postdoctoral researchers who will coordinate their individual field projects over a period of three years. The main aim of this new group is to look at the ways in which different dimensions of social inequality, such as class, gender, power, and status or caste, intersect in a variety of industrial settings, state owned as well as private. We explore how the relative salience of these dimensions is changing under altered conditions, and the implications of these shifts for general theories about the transformations associated with industrialisation. The ethnographic work will investigate the impact of industry on local lives in contexts very different from the early history of industrialisation in Europe. The overall aim is to interrogate the analytical models of Western social theory in both its bourgeois and its Marxist-Leninist variants. In view of the contemporary significance of industrial work in those parts of the world traditionally studied by anthropologists, the topic has received surprisingly little attention. It has not had a substantial impact on debates in economic anthropology. This Group sets out to make good these deficits.

The Anthropology of Industry

From the beginning, anthropological studies of industry have shared a great deal with sociological approaches. In some countries the distinction makes no sense at all. Anthropologists have frequently drawn on sociological theory, while sociologists have applied ethnographic methods when researching the shop floor and have also investigated kin and household relations outside the factory which shape work within it. Both anthropologists and sociologists have been much influenced by Marxist analysis of alienation and deskilling. Anthropological work on industry dates back to the colonial era, notably in the Zambian Copperbelt, and anthropologists were prominent pioneers of notions of informal economy in the 1970s. Since then, profound changes in global economies have led anthropologists to explore
far-reaching deindustrialisation in some regions and dynamic expansion of industry in many others.

The privatisation and restructuring processes which are characteristic of the ‘neo-liberal’ decades have led to new ways of working and labour organisation, as well as reduced rights in return for labour. In the decades which followed the Second World War, employment in large-scale (and especially public sector) industry often conferred multiple benefits, for example, to housing, education, healthcare and pensions; such jobs were generally very secure. Nowadays, accelerated global flows of capital, new management styles and regulative technologies are paring back the permanent skilled workforce everywhere, reducing benefits and increasing the use of casual labour. In short, the classical Western model of “industrial citizenship” (T.H. Marshall) has a declining purchase on contemporary realities.

There are many permutations of the shift to less secure employment, among them: outright redundancy, re-classing some jobs as short-term contracts, outsourcing work so that the same worker does the same work for a different employer under different conditions, or reducing pay so that additional, often informal work is needed for a living wage. We are interested in how these global patterns are experienced by workers and the ramifying effects on households and communities. How do such changes affect social relations and hierarchies within and beyond the factory and how do local practices, in turn, affect who has access to work and how work is performed? What are the consequences of the distinction between those with relatively secure, salaried employment and those reliant on precarious contracts or informal work servicing the industrial complex?

This is the broad political and economic background shaping the comparative work of this Group. Whereas the Economy and Ritual Group concentrated on the domestic domain, we start with industrial workplaces, shop floors, aging machinery, redundant workers, devalued skills, ruined buildings, and new work regimes. From these places we track connections to households and neighbourhoods. The ethnographic range is considerable: Eastern Europe (Bulgaria and Estonia) is brought into conversation with the Middle East (Egypt), Central Asia (Kazakhstan), South Asia (India and Nepal), and China. Whereas industrial ethnographies from Western Europe frequently chronicle industrial decay and capital flight as cheaper labour is sought elsewhere in the world, most of our sites deal with the other side of the coin. This geographic reach allows us to explore the flows of capital, labour and new managerial expertise between regions outside Western Europe, thus moving beyond an East-West divide that has diminishing salience.

**Themes**

In order to generate comparisons of how inequality is playing out in industrial settings across our fieldsites, we have selected six related themes on which to focus:
1. **Vocabularies of Class:**
How are relations of power conceptualised and articulated by people working in modern industrial environments? Does the common experience of work shape a class, or are such groups fragmented by other characteristics such as contract type, gender, age, skill level, political affiliation, ethnicity, caste, or religion? Moves to private ownership are often accompanied by changes to the ethnic composition and stratification of skilled, manual, and managerial work, and to the values attached to these different kinds of work. The management stratum is often staffed, or at least led, by foreigners who have not worked their way up from the shop floor but arrive with a predetermined model of management methods. Where a younger generation of workers no longer has the promise of work as a right, the factors that shape work, the struggle to obtain and retain control over work, take on a new salience. The power disparity between those who control labour and those who are supplicants for work has been heightened. This theme engages directly with our overarching aim to analyse the purchase that class analyses, based on early European experiences, have in different contemporary ethnographic contexts.

2. **Debt and Ownership:**
How do debt, ownership, and property relations mediate other forms of inequality? Factory shop floor studies afford the chance to document workers’ experiences of and responses to changing property regimes, particularly the move to private, often international ownership of previously state-owned and managed factories. We ask who stands to gain from restructuring, where and how resistance or accommodation
of new power disparities occur, and whether alternative forms of ownership, such as workers’ co-operatives are mooted. Work contracts reveal further dependencies beyond the distinction between salaried and casual work. Varieties of debt peonage or bondage can disempower and bind workers to employers. In a context of dispossession from secure work, we will explore the mechanics of supplementing or providing income and whether those in need turn to family, neighbours, unions, loan sharks, or employers for credit, and if so, on what terms this is supplied. Such relationships of indebtedness, whether understood as mutual help, gift exchange, temporary or lifetime loans, reveal the networks of support and dependency across workplaces and communities. This theme thus offers understandings of unequal access to property, work, and the means of livelihood.

3. Relatedness and Genealogy:
What can family genealogies and questions of relatedness tell us about the reproduction of labour and inequalities in capitalist industrial regimes? Workplaces, household and neighbourhood economies are also being reshaped as a consequence of labour force contraction and reduced job security. Longitudinal studies reveal patterns within and between families of upward and downward mobility, migration, changes in lifestyle aspiration. Access to work underpins everything else. Age and education level are further significant factors, which operate differently depending on the type of work and the context. Often, children may have more formal education qualifications than their parents, but their work prospects are poor because heritable positions, together with the overall numbers of workers, have been reduced, or experience is privileged over knowledge of new technologies. We examine gendered reconfigurations within households, from relatively equal work in terms of status, security and pay, to divisions between who has permanent work and who short-term work in the same plant, to household economies dependent on informal sector work. Such data will help us address the familiar question of the extent to which downward pressure on factory wages and a reduced work force is effectively subsidised by informal, precarious labour and seasonal patterns of work inside and outside the factory. This theme speaks to changes in patterns of inequality across and within generations and households.

4. Risk, Environment, and Health:
What are the relationships between bodily, environmental, and financial risk in heavy industry? Foreign capital, along with new ways of working, has streamed into heavy industry plants, mines, and large-scale infrastructure projects with the aim of maximising shareholder return. Typical ways of doing this are: restructuring the workforce, rebuilding plants, and reinventing ways and rhythms of work, all of which have a profound effect on the experience and sociality of work. The introduction of health and safety regulations brings a new (self-) monitoring devices to the shop floor or mine. These are often undercut by speeded-up production lines, which
can be physically devastating, reduced times and spaces for encounters between workers or simply for rest. The cost of environmental regulation compliance is also high. Toxic pollution not only affects workers within a plant or mine but is often a determining factor in local social geographies, with management tending to live in upwind, cleaner areas and workers in contaminated, downwind land. This theme opens up a spatialised reading of inequality.

5. **Technology and Skill:**
How do skilling/deskilling, the production process and machinery generate relationships and hierarchies among workers? Once the vanguard of socialist industry, the high social and moral status of miners and heavy industry workers has been diminished in favour of white collar work as well as service and management professions. In the former Soviet Union, the industrial workforce was predominantly Slav. This has changed in the newly independent states, where Russians now have a diminished social status and citizenship rights. These new labour hierarchies have been taking shape slowly, as many older or former workers still hold skilled/artisanal labour in high esteem. New machines may put people out of work and demand new skills, making old skills superfluous. Equally, the ability to coax antiquated machinery into performing is highly valued. This theme emphasises the relationship between workers and machines in determining control on the shop floor.

6. **Political Struggles:**
What types of conflict do working people engage in and what forms do the struggles assume? Local political conditions can be decisive in reformulating social hierarchies, access to work, and working conditions. Thus the Arab Spring, the Nepalese Maoist party, and trade unions can contribute to challenging power hierarchies and how job allocations and redundancies are determined. The institutions through which resistance is organised are particularly important in light of the rise of informal and precarious contract labour, where unionisation is often weak or forbidden. We question whether ‘resistance’ is a useful analytical term for understanding encounters between different classes, and groups within classes, where incompatible hierarchies, based on different status variables, co-exist and produce subtly different forms of power.
Planning Ahead

Group members will complete their major field research for this project by early summer 2014. They will present some of their results at an international workshop scheduled for May 6-9, 2015. The focus of the meeting will be on the evolving distinction between salariat and precariat. Among the central questions we aim to address at this workshop are:

• The kinds of relationships, or alternatively the lack of meaningful relationships that secure and casual workers have with each other in terms, for example, of kinship, marriage ties, and daily interactions: Do they live in the same neighbourhoods or households, and work in the same groups? How are they differentiated (if they are) in terms of lifestyle, consumption patterns, educational attainment, and aspirations?

• What are the differences in the work conditions and terms of employment, and in the life-chances of these workers and their children? How materially different are their households? Are there marked differences in terms of education levels, in the incidence of ill health, in life expectancy, and in other markers of “well-being”? What are the prospects for mobility?

• How does the differentiation between these different “fragments” of the manual labour force map onto other kinds of differentiation, such as gender, or ethnic, religious, or (in the case of South Asia) caste identity? Is the distinction between local “sons-of-the-soil” and migrant-incomers congruent with that between the two types of workers?

• What are the political ramifications of overlaps between “company” and “contract” labour on the one hand and other identity markers such as regional ethnicity or religion identity? Do these types of worker have different political orientations? What can we say of their degree of unionisation? Do the two kinds of worker share the same picture of the social hierarchy and of class inequalities? How do they conceive the main divisions within society – as a sharp dichotomy or as a ladder-like hierarchy?

• Is it more appropriate to think of a range of positions along the continuum from “secure” to “precarious” employment? If so, what are the sociological implications in terms of the way in which workers think about themselves and their relationships with others?

• Finally, are the differences between the two (or more) types of workforce so marked that they should be seen as belonging to distinct social classes? Do they regard themselves as separate classes; do they see themselves as having conflicting interests, and are their interests in fact opposed?
Urban Anthropology

Head of Focus Group: Christoph Brumann

Doctoral students: Leah Cheung Ah Li, Pierpaolo De Giosa, Vivienne Marquart

The Global Political Economy of Cultural Heritage

The focus of this Group, launched in 2011, is the popular UNESCO World Heritage Convention. The Group combines multi-sited field research of the central World Heritage institutions with ethnographic studies of selected World Heritage sites in urban Eurasia, thus striving to understand both ends of this “global system of common difference” (Wilk). It explores how, through the increasingly widespread idiom of heritage, reference to the past underwrites and sometimes subverts present-day political and economic agendas.

Shifting to a New Gear: North-South tensions in a global arena

Brumann has completed his fieldwork in the UNESCO arena, observing a fourth session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 and adding further interviews with key actors. The first articles have been submitted to leading journals; further ones and a monograph are underway. Observation of the 2012 and (online) 2013 Committee sessions suggests that what was seen as an uncertain development in the previous report is a more momentous shift. Much of prior World Heritage debate was about how to make the notoriously Eurocentric World Heritage List more (regionally) balanced, credible, and representative. Now, however, the shared right of all nation states to have their candidates listed is paramount, whatever the consequences for the list.

More obviously than previously realised, this is the product of the disaffection of states from the Global South with the World Heritage institutions, mainly ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) but also IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) and the convention secretariat, the World Heritage Center. It is now commonplace for these bodies to be overruled at the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee (the central decision-making organ, consisting of 21 elected treaty states out of a total of 190). Lobbying and the exchange of favours among the states on and off the Committee prevail. The shift came at a moment when a particularly large number of strong non- and peri-European states (BRICS and G20 members and other regional leaders) were on the Committee, but incoming Northern members Japan and Germany have not challenged it and have focussed on shepherding their own candidate sites through the process. As a result, the Committee has become essentially toothless, unable to reject candidates with negative
evaluations or to take tough decisions on already inscribed sites. The tension as such is old but the blunt way of pushing aside the experts is new.

This is not just impatience with a slow and unpredictable process, obstructing high hopes for heritage-related tourism development, but a reaction to lingering Eurocentrism. ICOMOS has no qualms about approving yet another Baroque palace for listing but can be less enthusiastic about some non-European candidates. In spite of the efforts of the 1994 “Global Strategy” to broaden heritage conceptions, ICOMOS and IUCN are still perceived by many non-European delegates as Northern ‘clubs’. And indeed, ICOMOS representatives are still disproportionately Euro-American, and advisory bodies care little for the impression left when, for example, they all choose white Anglo-Saxons as speakers in a pre-session orientation meeting.

Transparency has done little to stop the new trend. The 2012 Committee session in St. Petersburg was the first to be web-streamed and fully accessible to the press. Yet the poorly concealed exchange of favours continues unabated, and delegates seem to be even more exposed to monitoring by their home ministries and site communities now, with some even on a text-message ‘remote control’. The restraining effect of transparency expected by reformers has yet to materialise.

The recent turn toward national self-serving is explicable through a commons paradigm: in the consensus-oriented environment of UNESCO, the strong interest of a single nation state usually wins the day. The long-term consequences in the form of an inflated list, overburdened administration, and diminished threat potential against conservation infringements are borne by all. Yet these costs pale compared to the immediate national benefits of an additional listing, a free hand for development projects, or the diplomatic returns for supporting a fellow state in need. Also, the success of the convention is premised on growth: new listings keep the states interested and make for happy news that the condition of the listed sites does not always provide.

The new course comes at a cost, however: the 2012 session saw a memorable standoff when the Islamist insurgents then in control of the northern half of Mali started to demolish Sufi tombs and mosque entrances in Timbuktu. They justified this by the Committee’s having placed them on the List of World Heritage in Danger a few days earlier, objecting that the sites were nothing but violations of sharia principles and none of UNESCO’s business. One might have expected a fundamental debate here, yet the news caught the Committee in the midst of its most eagerly anticipated business, the examination of new inscriptions. It was striking how, once its procedural machinery was rolling, the Committee had trouble even acknowledging a frontal attack on its authority and moral premises. It took three days to draft an official condemnation.

This is because the World Heritage Convention has a principal-agent problem: all of the agents empowered by its mechanisms are either weak – the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS lack funding and, like IUCN, can give recommendations only – or are more committed to their national interests. The convention as the
principal continues to grow as a global presence, as indirectly acknowledged even by the Timbuktu challenge, yet it thus has nobody to stand up for it. In the past, this was mitigated by the Committee states sending their heritage experts who, while certainly fulfilling their own national agendas, were firmly committed to the World Heritage idea. Now, however, delegations are led by career diplomats with unrelated professional backgrounds and frequent transfers, who serve their own career prospects best by closely following the order of their immediate principal (i.e. nation state). They have larger political concerns in mind, moreover, such as restraining inter-state conflicts over contested sites. Therefore, and in contrast to the usual predictions of the globalisation literature, the transnational players (ICOMOS, IUCN, World Heritage Centre) have been losing ground while nation-state interests have been significantly strengthened. Much more so than before, however, these nation states are now encountering each other as equals.

World Heritage on the Ground

The second component of this Group consists of field studies of urban World Heritage sites in Eurasia, all of them former capitals and hubs of empire that are icons for the respective nations and major destinations for cultural tourism. Their built heritage ranges from palaces, mosques, and temples to city walls, bazaars, and town houses. It is spread out rather than concentrated, thus complicating the task of conservation. The selected field sites – Istanbul, Turkey; Melaka, Malaysia (2012/13); and Xi’an, China (2013/14) – thus resemble Kyoto, the book-length study of which by Brumann (2012) serves as a methodological touchstone.
Despite the great difference in size, Istanbul and Melaka have been undergoing a similar transformation through a host of large-scale building projects. In Melaka, World Heritage and the boost it gives to (mostly inner-Asian) tourism and second-home construction for Singaporeans has been the main driver of this trend. By contrast, in Istanbul, heritage is just one force among many and tends to be overshadowed by modernist global city ambitions. Economic considerations dominate in dealing with heritage; the political value of Melaka’s heritage for a multicultural Malaysian nation and the benefits of restoring old synagogues for the AKP – Turkey’s ruling Islamic party – are less central. The political leadership and specialised bureaucracies are rather closed and autocratic in both cities, responding to clientelism rather than civil society initiatives (but see below).

In Istanbul, world-famous monuments such as Ayasofia or Topkapı Palace are in good shape while many of the historic town houses that also enjoy World Heritage status are disintegrating or being replaced by luxury residential developments. Controversial projects such as the Metro Bridge over the Golden Horn are pushed through and World Heritage Committee concerns shrugged off. In their shadow, however, a baffling array of uncoordinated restoration work by public and private actors is ongoing and iconic sites continue to be symbolically disputed (e.g. should Ayasofia again be used as a mosque?). The Malaysian authorities tend to follow World Heritage demands and conservation orthodoxy more closely for the protected core. Around it, however, high-rise development continues apace, pushing the historic port city ever further back from the coastline. Still, private entrepreneurial initiatives with ambitious conservation agendas are not being blocked, and reference to the past is normal even for large investors, as shown by the colonial-style shopping plaza located at Melaka’s fanciest condominium complex or the façade of the planned mall in Gezi Park, evoking a 19th-century army barracks on that site.

De Giosa established good contacts with the Chetti community, descendants of the first Indian immigrants, who served as colonial middlemen. In Chetti self-assertion against later Indian migrants, rituals and other forms of heritage play a major role. Marquart chose the redevelopment of Taksim Square as one of her case studies, not expecting it to become the trigger for the “Turkish Spring”. Her ethnographic observations of the unfolding of a national political drama will add a significant dimension to her study of how local citizens respond to appropriations driven by the political elite and investment capital.

World Heritage on the Ground: ethnographic perspectives was also the topic of an MPI workshop convened by Brumann and David Berliner (Free University of Brussels) in autumn 2012. In the first conference of this kind, 13 anthropologists with long-term field experience at World Heritage sites explored the parallels. African and Asian locations predominated, and in addition to historic cities, archaeological sites and cultural landscapes were also considered. The key role of national rather than transnational actors was confirmed. While local empowerment does occur, non-local elite personnel and institutions are more likely to assume control, and the profits
from increased tourism often almost completely bypass locals. The emergence of ‘heritage victims’, those who end up overlooked, dispossessed, and evicted, is by no means rare. A book publication of the revised papers is in progress.

A more narrowly focused MPI workshop, *Inside the UNESCO Heritage Conventions: ethnographic and historical approaches*, will be convened by Brumann and Aurélie Élisa Gfeller (The Graduate Institute, Geneva) in January 2014. It will assemble the small group of anthropologists, folklorists, archaeologists, geographers, and historians who have conducted in-depth research on the decision-making processes of the two UNESCO conventions on World Heritage and intangible cultural heritage.
Traders, Markets, and the State in Vietnam (Minerva Group)

*Head of Group: Kirsten W. Endres*

*Senior researchers: Christine Bonnin, Caroline Grillot*

*Doctoral students: Lisa Barthelmes, Esther Horat*

**Group Objectives and Organisation**

Established in 2011, this Research Group investigates local markets and other sites of small retail trade in the seemingly paradoxical context of Vietnam’s continuing socialist orientation, on the one hand, and contemporary neoliberal economic and social transformations, on the other. The Group currently consists of Kirsten Endres as Head of the Group, two PhD students (Lisa Barthelmes and Esther Horat), and, since April 2013, Caroline Grillot as postdoctoral researcher (replacing Christine Bonnin, who took up new assignments in January 2013). Besides holding regular informal meetings, the Group organises and participates in workshops and conference panels in order to place its findings in broader comparative contexts and to contribute to theoretical conceptualisations of the relationship between neoliberal reforms, economic restructuring, and changing state-society dynamics. In order to provide a visual illustration of the different research sites, three short movies were produced in cooperation with a Vietnam-based film production company.

**Market Development Policies in Vietnam Today**

Public markets have, in different times and places, commonly been sites of intense policing and regulation. Along with their growth, complex contestations emerged over important issues such as the institutionalisation and control of marketplaces, the levying of taxes, the use of public space, as well as, more generally, over changes in production and exchange relations. Vietnam is no exception in this regard. Neoliberal restructuring processes have affected Vietnamese small-scale traders in various ways. The transformation of urban public markets into trade centres and shopping malls is one salient case in point: large plots of state-owned real estate in the inner city of Hanoi are handed over to private investment companies for development, in the process of which thousands of small traders are ‘dispossessed’ of their means of economic survival in the marketplace. In spite of these larger processes that have so far become most evident in urban settings, large sections of Vietnam’s population continue to rely on small-scale trade and market vending activities in order to sustain their livelihoods.
The ‘appropriate’ development of traditional marketplaces has been on the Vietnamese government’s agenda since the early 2000s. New policies were issued in the areas of distribution network planning, general public market regulations and management issues, and the privatisation of market construction, renovation, and upgrading. In the capital of Hanoi, in particular, a number of long-standing public retail markets have been demolished and rebuilt as multi-story trade centres by private sector contractors. As a result, many small-scale market vendors, after years of struggling for economic survival in temporary markets awaiting relocation, now suffer the consequences of higher monthly fees, inadequate spatial conditions, and the loss of customers. In addition, since the mid-1990s, other ‘disorderly’ forms of commercial activity, such as street vending and hawking, have repeatedly been banned in government efforts to bring order to city streets and discipline citizens into becoming ‘modern’ urban subjects.

Yet the state’s modernising mission represents only one side of the coin. Equally important in explaining the elimination of traditional public markets is the current climate of wealth accumulation in Vietnam that takes place at the higher levels of an unholy confluence between clientelistic mechanisms of political power and capitalist opportunities to profit – opportunities that serve the interests of a powerful politico-economic elite by absorbing its overaccumulated capital. Consequently, the government’s attempts at civilising the marketplace have brought about significant changes in the distribution of social and economic entitlements.

These issues were discussed in detail at an international workshop organised in cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology at the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS) in Hanoi in April 2012. The workshop attracted wide interest and deepened the group’s collaborative ties with Vietnamese experts and research institutions.

**Rule by Uncertainty and Avenues of Negotiation**

Many of the rules and standards imposed by recent political economy changes run counter to the moral norms that govern the social, spatial, and temporal organisation of ‘traditional’ economic activity and therefore meet with various forms of resentment and resistance by those affected. In addition, rather than providing a consistent legal basis for their economic activity, the maze of rules and regulations relevant to Vietnamese small-scale traders does little in the way of reducing uncertainty. On the contrary, regulatory uncertainty (as well as coercion) has evolved as an efficient means by which the Vietnamese state exercises power over its citizens. Unlike in India or the Philippines, restrictions on the formation of associations persist and effectively block possible avenues for Vietnamese citizens to pursue and safeguard their interests. Vietnamese small-scale traders (particularly mobile street vendors) therefore engage in subtle everyday strategies of avoidance and compliance in order
to subvert, contest, and negotiate the enforcement of top-down planning policies and legal provisions that undermine their livelihood opportunities.

One way of negotiating the imposition of legal restrictions is through petty bribery. Whereas, generally speaking, Vietnamese citizens feel exasperated by the degree to which corruption in its manifold forms and manifestations has come to permeate their daily lives, small-scale traders commonly justify their own resorting to such practices by declaring them an essential means of economic survival. The tropes, analogies, and metaphors used in accounts of corruption not only frame and shape their (self-)perception and experience, but also transmit social commentary and political criticism. Kinh (ethnic majority) traders at the northwestern border between Vietnam and China, for example, rhetorically cast their petty bribe arrangements with officials as benevolent acts of providing access to economic opportunity for which they offer a token of appreciation – the bribe – in return. The metaphorical justification of the bribe as a means of economic survival, on the one hand, and as an act of the state official’s compassionate complicity, on the other, reflects small-scale traders’ moral claims upon the state to their right of making a substantial living and transforms this type of corruption into a legitimate practice.

**Informality, Moral Economy, and Household-Based Trade**

In Vietnam, more than forty percent of non-agricultural household businesses engage in trade-related economic activities. With formal business registration as the main criterion of distinction between the formal and informal sectors of the economy, three-fourths of these households are categorised as belonging to the informal sector. Whereas this classification certainly applies to mobile street traders and to vendors in temporary, unlicensed markets, the boundary between the formal and the informal already starts to blur when it comes to formally registered vendors in public markets managed by local authorities. Many licensed traders engage in ‘informal’ vending activities, for example by merchandising goods obtained through informal/illegal channels (i.e. smuggled or imported ‘duty-free’ across the border, or purchased from unregistered traders or producers), by employing ‘informal’ stall helpers, or by ‘informally’ subletting their vending space to other users. In Vietnam’s largely local, relationship-based economy, informality in fact constitutes a particular mode of social interaction and economic exchange and should, therefore, be treated analytically as an aspect of the moral economy rather than as a sector separate from the formal.

Vietnamese economic organisation remains deeply entrenched in prevailing social norms and values regarding filial obligations and family cohesion. In rural areas, the importance of the household as an economic unit becomes particularly apparent. In non-agricultural villages – i.e. villages that specialise in manufacturing and trading – family enterprises are the most common type of economic organisation. Some of these villages have been very successful: Ninh Hiep, for example, emerged as a dynamic regional trading community since the early 2000s that channels Chinese
textiles from the Vietnam-China border to various locations throughout Vietnam. Family enterprises are the most common type of economic organisation in this village, with each household specialising in a specific phase in the production and supply chain, i.e. importing fabric or ready-to-wear clothing from China, cutting and sewing garments, and selling textile products at the local market. While traditional gender roles continue to perpetuate male dominance and female subordination, it is the women who are perceived as both the main breadwinners and managers of the family economy. The prevailing preference for village endogamy and a low level of out-migration accounts for a steady growth in the number of household-based trading enterprises, as young couples usually set up their own business after marriage. Unlike in Hanoi, where the replacement of old-style markets by shopping malls has diminished spaces for traditional forms of vending, the recent construction of two new market buildings by private investors provides Ninh Hiep cloth traders with additional vending space that suits their economic needs and enhances the economic strength and reputation of the village as a major textile hub in Vietnam.

Yet most villages in the densely populated Red River Delta still depend, for better or worse, on agricultural production for the bulk of their income. Migration (temporary/seasonal) to urban areas has therefore become a common household strategy for economic advancement. Whereas, for example, female street vendors are often looked down upon as second-class citizens in the capital of Hanoi, their remittances back to their home villages contribute significantly to enhancing their household’s economic situation at the village level. Although they retain strong links with their rural-based families, many street vendors who spend the bulk of their time in the city also find it difficult to adapt to the tight social environment and set role expectations associated with Vietnamese village life upon their (temporary) return. The interrelation between the street vendors’ experience of migration and their sense of belonging and personal identity is one of the issues that shall be explored in greater depth during the subsequent phases of the project.

Cross-Border Trade, Mutual Perceptions, and Notions of Entrepreneurial Success

Vietnam’s love/hate relationship with China has been a persistent theme throughout Vietnamese history. After the brief but violent border war in 1979, official border crossings were shut down and trade came to a halt until the normalisation of bilateral relations in the late 1980s. Since then, the border gradually transformed from a line of demarcation between two hostile neighbours into a vital economic resource and thriving nexus of social and cultural interaction. On either side of the frontier, internal migrants moved (back) to the border area in order to seize the economic opportunities at hand. Along with the forging of new cross-border trading relationships, mutual images and perceptions evolved from the interstices of wider societal/political discourses and the localised, everyday experience of, and interaction with,
the neighbourly Other. Despite the fact that bilateral trade relations between China and Vietnam are clearly dominated by Chinese imports, cross-border economic ties are characterised by a high degree of mutual dependency, and small-scale traders on both sides are acutely aware of the fact that it is the very existence of the border that enables them to make a relatively decent living in this region. Yet whether Chinese or Vietnamese, the rules of the game are to a great extent determined by the side of the border on which the economic exchange takes place, and the degree to which traders conform to business practices that differ from their own plays a decisive role in determining Vietnamese and Chinese traders’ attitudes towards each other. Their mutual perceptions are thus informed as much by cultural prejudice and political tensions that shape public sentiment as they are conditioned by economic opportunity, individual self-interest, and face-to-face commercial transactions with suppliers, intermediaries, and customers from across the border.

Vietnamese ethnic-majority small-traders would certainly not deny that one needs to work hard in order to be successful in the market. The ways in which they conceptually frame their economic success, however, reveal that discipline, rational calculation, and personal skills are very much downplayed in personal accounts. Instead, a person’s propensity for trade and the wealth generated by it are narratively constructed as part of a person’s fate decreed by heaven, and a trader’s success in business is referred to as lộc – a key concept that relates to good luck, fate-fortune, prosperity, and divine benevolence. Lộc may be secured by moral virtue, enhanced by ritual practice, reciprocated in ritual exchange, distributed among kin, and transferred to future generations. It is thus in constant circulation: from ‘heaven’ to humans, from humans to deities and ancestors, and from deities and ancestors back to humans. Further research into the complex web of interlinkages between the economic sphere and the metaphysical assumptions that govern and guide Vietnamese perceptions of the self and the world is expected to contribute valuable insights to our understanding of local economic practices, the moral implications of wealth, and ideas about human agency.

Outlook

In the coming phase of the Research Group, a number of publications will be prepared. Besides individual articles in peer reviewed journals, the Group aims to produce a special issue of the Vietnamese Journal of Anthropology in collaboration with the Hanoi Institute of Anthropology. The EuroSEAS panel Traders and Peddlers in Southeast Asia Today: confronting risk, enhancing luck (Lisbon, July 2013) laid the groundwork for an edited volume on small-scale trade and traders in Southeast Asia. The Anthropological Atelier Risks, Ruptures, and Uncertainties: dealing with crisis in Asia’s emerging economies, jointly organised with the Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology in Vienna in December 2013, also intends to prepare a collective publication.
The expected results of this Research Group will contribute to a fuller understanding of complex market-society-state dynamics that inform, and are formed by, the social contexts in which the everyday economic practices of Vietnamese small-scale traders and market vendors are embedded. We anticipate that our findings will set the stage for further investigations that take up a broader historical and conceptual approach in order to situate the particularities of the Vietnamese experience within the wider trajectories of resilience and (post-socialist) transformation in Eurasia.
Department ‘Law & Anthropology’

Marie-Claire Foblets

Introduction:
The legacy of the Project Group Legal Pluralism

This report offers the very first opportunity for the new Department ‘Law & Anthropology’ to provide a description of its activities. To ensure a clear understanding of the overview below, a brief preliminary word of explanation is in order. The basic choice was made to take into account, when establishing the Department, the achievements in past years of the Project Group Legal Pluralism (hereafter Project Group) – notably by allowing the researchers who are still associated with the Project Group to complete their work in progress. This decision was in part a pragmatic one, with the aim of enabling researchers on a contract that exceeded the mandate of the Project Group to complete their work, while also forging a link between the Project Group’s research programme and that of the new Department.

The Project Group, the predecessor of the new Department at the Institute, has succeeded in establishing an outstanding reputation as Europe’s leading centre for the study of legal pluralism around the world. The research programme set up by the Project Group addressed the complex entanglements of various forms of normativity within both smaller and larger arenas in different parts of the world. By so doing, the Project Group initiated innovative legal anthropological scholarship in the area of legal pluralism that is respected worldwide. This legacy constitutes a formidable asset for the new Department.

One of the objectives of the new Department is therefore to build on this legacy. But at the same time, one of the principal reasons for establishing a new Department was to make it possible to broaden the scope of activities, to establish other emphases, as well as to set up longer-term research projects. By focusing on continuously emerging new settings, both within and outside Europe, that are the consequence of increased mobility across national borders, globalisation, and other situations created by various contacts between cultures, societies, and communities – both large and small – the Department seeks to further develop a critical perspective on issues that are becoming ever more important within the present context. These include the changing loci of organisational power, processes in which the state’s influence is receding, non-territorialised political communities, new sources of tension between states and non-state actors, transnational configurations of identity, and new practices of political power within which they are constituted. These are all issues that often trigger debates about how to accommodate diversity and divergent allegiances and create space for them in the contemporary plural context.

It is therefore also understandable that the new Department’s profile as presented in this first report is somewhat hybrid at this stage, since on the one hand it draws
on the work of researchers who were (still) attached to the Project Group and who were kept on by the new Department and, on the other hand, it already includes work only just begun by newly hired researchers.

In the years to come, four research priorities in particular will play a central role in developing the Department’s profile: 1. accommodating diversity in contemporary societies, with a particular interest in the increased interconnectedness of law and religion; 2. raising awareness of human rights in various settings; 3. promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice; 4. assessing the comparability of concepts, procedures, institutions, practices, etc., within and across normative orders. These four research priorities are necessarily provisional, but have the advantage of enabling to group together, for this reporting period of 2012–2013, the activities inherited from the Project Group and those which are now part of the new research programme launched by the Department. It is likely, however, that these priorities will shift as the new scholarly activities unfold and the profile of the emerging research unit evolves.

The following section sets out briefly what is meant by each of the priorities, before providing a short description of the way in which the work of each researcher attached to the Department during the reporting period fits within these priorities.

Four Research Priorities

1. Accommodating Diversity in Contemporary Societies (with a Particular Interest in the Increased Interconnectedness of Law and Religion)

The contemporary era is marked by an impressive proliferation of identities, affiliations, and allegiances – religious, linguistic, ethnic, regional, transnational, etc. – that are irreversibly transforming societies into new types of plural entities. Among the research priorities set by the Department is the endeavour to identify normative frameworks, judicial decisions (case law, both national and international), and practices that address this plurality and assess to what extent these are responsive to the expectations of the individuals/peoples to whom they apply. Two research tools are particularly helpful for the study of these frameworks and the accompanying practices: on the one hand, the careful collection of basic comparative data traced through the various types of legal documents (case law from different courts, legislation, legal opinions, expert reports, etc.) and the legal reasoning involved in these documents and, on the other hand, scrupulous ethnographic descriptions of particular practices and institutions, at times including life stories. The Department aims to become a centre of excellence in the study of accommodating diversity in the context of contemporary societies by combining an analysis of the legal sources
applicable to the topics under investigation with ethnographic (or biographical) data that serve to contextualise the analysis and provide it with an (empirical) foundation.¹

A field in which several researchers at the Department have been involved over the past months is the (increasing) interconnectedness of law and religion at a time when faith-based identity claims seem to be returning to the forefront in different ways in various parts of the world. The Department has thus begun to prioritise comparative research, based on in-depth ethnographic description, on the different ways in which the demands of state laws are, in practice, reconciled with the desire of individuals and groups to (continue to) observe the rules of conduct dictated by their religious (or other) convictions. In ‘Western’ legal thinking, diversity is usually embraced from the perspective of individual freedom of religion or thought, guaranteed as a fundamental human right; ethnographic studies show, however, that this is not necessarily an approach that resonates with the people’s own perception of group identities and traditions. The legal anthropological research undertaken by the Department seeks to provide an approach that, based on accurate ethnographic data, may lead to a new understanding of faith-based identities and their underlying assumptions. Such an approach stresses internal diversity and challenges reified notions of religion and belief, recognising instead that one of the effects of globalisation is that people tend to move away from homogeneous conceptions of religion and religious membership towards a conception of faith based on autonomy, choice, and reason. With the work of Turner, Billaud, Ramstedt, and Foblets, the Department has already started looking more closely at topics such as mechanisms for the incorporation of religious rules into civil law, the autonomy of the will (optio iuris) in family matters, and recourse to religious arbitration for certain types of disputes. At this stage, these are just stepping stones, the aim being to further assess (legal) techniques that facilitate the coexistence of different normative registers.

2. Awareness of Human Rights in Various Settings

A second related area of research which has been prioritised from the very beginning of the new Department is the – much debated – issue of the acceptance of pluralism within international human rights law.

¹ As explained in more detail below, from January 2010 to April 2013, Foblets was the coordinator of a European research project (“Religare: Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe. Innovative approaches to law and policy”, see www.religareproject.eu), funded by the European Commission (FP7, 2010–2013), and comprising 13 teams based in 10 European countries. It compiled the most complete documentation possible on cases of accommodation on grounds of religion. The systematic gathering of specific cases of accommodation – some hitherto unpublished – has yielded an unprecedented information resource that allows for comparative analyses and indicates, on a case-by-case basis, ways in which accommodation is made for religious diversity within the internal legal order of various European countries. This tool makes possible different types of research, both legal and anthropological in nature. It is this type of documentation that lies at the basis of the plan to put forward the subject of accommodating diversity as a priority topic in the research programme of the new Department.
Over the past few years, human rights have exerted growing influence on traditional international law, to such an extent that state policies, whether they regard individuals or collectivities, as well as NGOs, multinationals, and other non-state actors are increasingly viewed through this lens. As it has developed, however, the mainstream literature on human rights often builds on pre-existing mechanisms of power and made a case for individual human rights that are expected to be of benefit to all. Today, individual human rights are enshrined in most formal state laws. They constitute formal grounds for sanctions designed to ‘eradicate’ what are considered inappropriate or unacceptable practices. Legal anthropology does not neglect this, but accords at least as much importance to the particular way a society or a group views identity, affiliations, and allegiances as they evolve in response to historical circumstances. Ethnographic studies explain in detail the obstacles that may arise in the course of the advancement of a mainstream concept of human rights focused on the individual. These obstacles are numerous. One such obstacle is the fact that the notion of individual human rights, as protected by most international human rights treaties to date, has emerged from historical circumstances that did not affect all human societies. As a result, their supposed universality is not in fact obvious to everyone. Anthropology shows that the reality of individuals and of the groups they form cannot simply be summed up as a (widespread) violation of international human rights law. Instead, through ethnographic observation, anthropologists explore the degree to which the acceptance of pluralism within international human rights law can serve as a response to dealing with diversity within and among societies.

Anthropology offers a precious tool-kit (ethnographic, conceptual, and theoretical) that allows us to accurately describe the different ways human rights operate in various settings. As part of its contribution to more comprehensive (ethnographic) studies, the Department has, in the past months, started negotiations on cooperation with several other research centres working on human rights in and outside Europe, a growing number of which have begun to listen to the voices of anthropologists on the subject in recent years. This is an opportunity that should not be missed.

3. Promoting the Integration of Anthropological Research and Legal Practice

A third priority on the research agenda of the new Department is the intensified collaboration between basic research in anthropology and legal practice.

In recent decades, anthropological investigations have started attracting the attention of governments, investigative agencies, the judiciary, etc., whenever these bodies seek to gain reliable insight into legal cultures unknown to them. The number of courts and public officers that are looking for (plausible) expert findings and opinions that may disclose relevant anthropological information is increasing, at least in the U.S. and Europe. There is a significant and expanding array of roles for basic ethnographic research to play in government, international development programmes, community-based organisations, etc., where it can provide a valuable
angle of observation and interpretation for engaging with concrete legal problems. The question of analysing ethnographic material in relation to legal practice (including policy aims) is particularly crucial. This was also partly the case in earlier times, but the terms of the discussion have changed in contemporary contexts, in which a wider range of parties is involved: not only government, business, and NGOs concerned with development and change, but also the communities and peoples concerned. Consultancy work represents an increasingly significant contemporary form of applied anthropology. The Department seeks to be of service in at least two ways to the promotion of an interdisciplinary rapprochement between anthropology and legal practice.

This occurs, firstly, by contributing to the growing body of literature in which anthropological insights are incorporated into the judicial process and legal practice more generally. The ethnographic expertise involved can improve understanding of historical processes and by so doing help develop policies for the future, particularly with baseline studies (e.g., development policies, integration policies, policies of accommodation, etc.).

Secondly, the Department aims to offer a unique setting to which to invite anthropologists from around the world who are variously involved in government service or consultancy work more generally, to reflect and provide insight into their own experiences. In this way, Halle can serve as a prominent forum for the discussions inherent to anthropological practice today, thereby helping to define the new role of legal anthropologists who do consultancy work. Issues of the kind that concern the purposes, dilemmas, vicissitudes, and conflicts as well as the empirical findings and the ethical problems raised by consultancy work are bound to arise ever more frequently, thus obliging consultants to address such dilemmas as: what is the anthropologist’s position in the societies he or she studies, that of a relatively detached observer or someone committed to a programme of action in relation to the socio-legal problems studied; and how is the study affected by his or her commitment? Questions such as these – which revolve around the positionality of the ethnographic consultant – highlight ethical and other questions at stake in producing expert statements. They have preoccupied, among others, social and cultural anthropologists who serve as ‘expert witnesses’. Yet research on anthropological expert witnessing presents just one facet of a more complex, emergent situation in which consultancy work places anthropologists today. This situation requires a sharpening of the understanding of specific professional matters – theoretical, ethical, and material – that accompany some forms of consultancy work. Such matters are certainly of interest, given the problems they raise for every anthropologist who specifically engages in legal issues. There is a clear need for the further development of professional rules, and the Department will make a strong case for rigorous professional rules.

Promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice thus constitutes a particular focus within the field of research activities being developed by the Department. A variety of meetings are envisaged, both among anthropolo-
gists themselves and bringing together scholars of anthropology with various practitioners of law (lawyers, magistrates, parliamentarians, civil servants, etc.) with responsibility for decisions on legal questions. In the medium term, the objective is to produce a richly documented reflection based on concrete experience regarding ethnographic consultancy in the legal field, and incorporating these experiences into an unfolding research programme on the inclusion (or exclusion) of ethnography in the legal realm. There is no shortage of topics that lend themselves ideally to this sort of encounter: conflict resolution practices (restorative justice), property law and the elaboration of common property regimes, gender and citizenship, the nature of legal and social personality, restitution after civil conflict, the growing importance of Islamic law within the context of contemporary legal pluralism, the use of the cultural defence as a mitigating circumstance in criminal cases, etc.

4. Comparison and Comparability of Concepts, Procedures, Institutions, Practices, etc. within and across Normative Orders

The fourth priority might at first glance appear somewhat less original. In studying and interpreting specific legal practices they have come across through field research, legal anthropologists often proceed to comparisons. Through comparison, one can hope to check an initial understanding of the features of a particular (local) context against a broader (cross-cultural) field of data and expertise. Cross-cultural comparison is, however, an extremely tricky enterprise: fundamental to the task of cross-cultural comparison is the basic question of how the anthropologist talks about the events and institutions he or she is studying at a local level, how he or she ‘translates’ them. The labels given to data may exert decisive influence over what can then be done with those data. The risk of ‘false comparisons’ is a core ethnographic problem, since it is ethnography that generates the basic data which subsequently feed into cross-cultural comparison. In the research activities and projects they set up, members of the Department are thus asked to devote particular – and systematic – attention to the risks, causes, and (possible) effects of ‘false comparisons’ in their analysis of empirical (fieldwork) data and to be critical in examining the processes of translation and comparison that generate such falsifications or distortions. By increasing sensitivity to issues of comparability and translation and by systematically drawing attention to the epistemological, linguistic, and methodological difficulties that come with comparison and translation, the Department can help refine, where necessary, the conceptual framework and accompanying theoretical models available in legal anthropology for studying and comparing legal and judicial mechanisms and identifying normative thresholds (formal/informal; state/non-state; secular/religious; legal/illegal, etc.) in and among various settings. Anthropology has a key role to play in this regard. The Department will seek to provide support for this role.

All four above-mentioned priorities are situated at the level of reflection on the nature and aims of the work done by anthropologists interested in law, including legal
practice. They are also intrinsically linked to the scholarly research currently being done in the domain of law and anthropology. Given that the results of that research are often drawn upon for practical applications by political or judicial decision-makers, this presents a serious set of challenges to the discipline. No anthropologist today can afford to ignore the real or potential impact of the knowledge he or she disseminates through reports and publications, in particular when these appear to be of particular relevance, whether for the treatment of minorities, protection of heritage, or land conflicts, to name but a few relevant issues. In the years to come, the Department, by means of targeted activities, could contribute to filling that gap, and will seek to contribute to the critical reflection on these implications.

These four fairly broad priorities and the range of associated questions that need closer investigation have already served as guidelines in the selection of both the first cohort of postdoctoral researchers\(^2\) who joined the Department in early 2013 and the six doctoral researchers who took up their positions in January 2014.\(^3\)

\(^2\) Katrin Seidel, Julie Billaud, Maria Sapignoli, and Miia Halme-Tuomisaari.

\(^3\) Their names and research topics are listed below.
Ongoing Research Activities at the Department

Marie-Claire Foblets (Director)

In the reporting period, the focus of Foblets’s activities was on developing the four above-mentioned priorities to be addressed within the research programme of the Department. A number of the commitments undertaken before she had assumed the position at the Institute full-time in July 2012 were still underway during the reporting period. These projects are in line, at least in part, with the new initiatives undertaken in the course of launching the new Department; insofar as these give a more accurate picture of the entire range of activities carried out by Foblets in 2012 and 2013, these commitments are also briefly outlined below.

From the start Foblets launched a series of exploratory workshops with a view to developing a collaborative network that involves scholars from different places who have done a large amount of recent work on topics related to the four above-mentioned priorities. The first two meetings, held on 12–13 and 13–14 September 2012, were devoted (1) to the exploration of the purposes, dilemmas, and problems linked to anthropological expertise and consultancy work, and (2) to the methodological challenges posed by the comparative studies of legal cultures. The events brought together anthropological and legal scholars with judicial and legal practitioners from around Europe and beyond, all of whom face the issue of cultural diversity in their scholarly or practical work. An academic publication is in preparation.

The third workshop (4 October 2012), organised jointly with the FP7 (EU) RELIGARE project,4 ReligioWest (EUI), and the law faculty of the University of Milan, was devoted to The European Court of Human Rights and the US Supreme Court Case-Law on Religion in the Public Space: a comparison. Two other workshops followed in Florence in January 2013 and in Berkeley, California in September 2013. An application for external funding for a comparative US-EU project on the protection of the freedom of religion is in preparation. The fourth workshop was held in May 2013, and addressed the concept of personal autonomy, the aim being to prepare a larger conference on the subject to be held in Halle on 26–28 May 2014.

Another of Foblets’s major research activities during this period, completed in January 2013, was the coordination – already mentioned – of the “Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe: innovative approaches to law and policy (RELIGARE)” project funded under the European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme (FP7-SSH, Theme 8: Socio-economic sciences and humanities, 2010–2013, EUR 2,699,943).5 Led by a consortium of 13 partner universities (in 9 EU Member States and Turkey), the three-year project has yielded several monographs, edited volumes, special issues of peer-reviewed journals, an online database, and five policy briefs.

---

4 See note 1, above.
5 See note 1, above.
Department ‘Law & Anthropology’

A closing conference was held in December 2012 in Brussels, attended by over 200 scholars and EU officials with a view to assessing the research findings. The final Publishable Summary Report was submitted to the Commission in May 2013, and an academic volume of articles in which around 40 academics and practitioners, including legal professionals and policy-makers, NGOs and EU institutions respond to the findings and recommendations of RELIGARE is in progress and will be published by Ashgate Press (UK) in 2014. Several contributions to thematic volumes emerging from the RELIGARE project (on family law and the accommodation of religious diversity in the workplace) have also appeared in the course of the reporting period. The RELIGARE project has been designated one of the three best (of 500) FP7 projects at the Catholic University of Leuven (award conferred on 11 December 2013).

Following on her earlier research on the Moroccan Family Code (Moudawana) at the time of its introduction in 2004, Foblets recently launched a project to assess the effects of this code (between 2004 and 2013) on Moroccan citizens living in Europe. The project involves data gathering by a team of 6 research partners, who are conducting a comparative study of the way in which the provisions of the Code are applied by Moroccan courts as well as by the consulates, administrations, and courts of the five main European countries where Moroccan nationals reside today (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain). To date, over 700 cases have been collected with regard to marriage, divorce, and filiation among Moroccan nationals living abroad, and are being studied on a comparative basis. This is the first research of its type since the Code went into force ten years ago. The Code was praised when it was enacted, but a critical examination of its application in Europe remains to be done. A conference bringing together the researchers and presenting their findings will be held in 2014 to mark the tenth anniversary of the new Code, and a publication of results will follow.

With a view to promoting the integration of anthropological research and legal practice (as explained above), Foblets has also begun preparatory discussions with the board of the European Network of the Councils of the Judiciary (ENCJ). The ENCJ has 10,000 members, all judges and prosecutors, spread over 17 European countries. The goal is to set up a series of activities that bring about a systematic dialogue between legal practice and expertise in cultural diversity. Two activities are in the pipeline: first, to conduct a survey among the ENCJ members on the difficulties encountered in practice by the judiciary on issues of cultural diversity, and second, to invite judges to participate in a moot court to be held in May 2014. Around 10 judges from different parts of Europe will take part.

In 2012, Foblets agreed to serve as the general rapporteur on the topic of Law & Migration for the International Academy of Comparative Law (IACL) in preparation for their 2014 Congress (Vienna). To date, around 30 national reports have been commissioned and will be used to prepare a comparative report on the topic. She invited Jean-Yves Carlier (Université Catholique de Louvain) to join her in drafting
the report. Together they will edit a volume containing a selection of the national reports (negotiations with Springer Verlag ongoing).

During the reporting period, Foblets also began to set up collaborative arrangements for joint research projects, with three finalised to date:

1. “The State and Indigenous Legal Culture: law in search of legitimacy”, where she is a member of the coordinating team. The project includes investigators from 13 universities (funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the University of Ottawa, and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, awarded May 2013 for 6 years: CAD 1,901,645).


3. “Patterns of Governing Religion”, funded by the International Research Acceleration Programme at the University of Ottawa, led by Lori Beaman (September 2012–September 2014), for which Foblets is ‘lead collaborator in a foreign institution’ (official title given as per the SSHRC grant).

The Department will further extend the network of collaborative arrangements as the research programme takes shape.

All other activities by Foblets, such as supervision of doctoral work and membership on thesis committees, teaching activities at the Catholic University of Leuven, peer review for journals, editorial board memberships, papers given, and attendance at conferences and workshops, are mentioned in the annex.

Postdoctoral Researchers from the Project Group Legal Pluralism

Bertram Turner

The last two years of Turner’s work was dominated by the dynamics related to the development of the new Department. Since Turner’s integration into the new departmental structure, his major objective has been to contribute to the development of the new research unit. Turner’s own research agenda and activities during the reporting period have indeed corresponded to the main fields of research outlined in the basic and programmatic texts on the research profile of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’ as presented in this volume.

During the reporting period, Turner’s research activities were concentrated mainly within three domains. The first field of research involves the issue of human security and the politics of securitisation. This was particularly linked to Turner’s contributions to the research agenda of the International Max Planck Research School Retaliation Mediation Punishment (IMPRS REMEP). This research had an impact on the conceptualisation and work on the edited volume On Retaliation, which will bring together the contributions to the International REMEP Conference on Retali-
ation (2011). Meanwhile, human security has been chosen as a central focus of the new REMEP research agenda.

The second domain combines the continuation of research on the entanglements of law and religion as elaborated within the framework of the Project Group, with a focus on religion as a component of settings of cultural and legal diversity. While other projects within the Department (including those of Billaud and Foblets) look at how the freedom of religion and belief is constitutionally guaranteed and regulated by state law, Turner’s research looks mainly at how such normative frames affect the social working of law and the legal agency of people in environments that are characterised as multicultural or culturally diverse.

On the basis of data from fieldwork (e.g., in Morocco at the end of 2011) Turner investigates new dynamics in the ways in which law and religion (including ‘non-religion’) are intermingled and how perceptions of these dynamics are changing within rural Morocco as well as in the Moroccan diaspora in Canada. In the reporting period, Turner devoted two main publications to this field of research, one in the volume Religion in Disputes and another on translocal faith-based dispute management (see annex). Presentations on these topics and in the field of law and religion included a discussion in of the theoretical approaches and methodologies with which the EU-funded RELIGARE Project operates (Louvain and Brussels, 2012), the Recode workshop in Madrid (April 2013), and a lecture at the MLU in Halle (December 2013).

Argan woodland with crop cultivation. (Photo: B. Turner, 2011)
The third domain of topics to which Turner devoted his research during the last two years is based on the data he collected over 15 years of research that addresses the intertwining and coproduction of normative and technological strands in the politics of resource extraction. The case study looks at the emergence of argan oil on the world market. The research combines the study of the normative framing of extraction politics in natural resource management with the areas of law, science, and technology, and shows how argan woodlands products have begun to capture the market. It also shows how this process affects not only scalar arrangements within the legal universe, but also knowledge regimes and the everyday lives and living conditions of ordinary people. In the near future, Turner’s aim is to focus on the completion of a monograph on argan oil in Morocco as an example of the complex normative realities that combine resource extraction with nature conservation, the integration of niche products into the world market, commodity chains, technological innovation, work organisation, and other fields of normative regulation.

A long-term project has now been planned in cooperation with Thomas Sikor and the University of East Anglia, UK, bringing together various strands of Turner’s outlined research profile, in particular the normative and social consequences of migration, the impact of transnational law on local settings, and the ensuing transformation of property regimes, all very much in tune with the Department’s agenda for the upcoming years. The central question is how international migration translocalises and transforms dynamics of property management. The project’s focus will be on migrants from the Global South to the European Union, how they influence negotiations over rights to land, other resources, and valuable goods in their places of origin, and how consecutive changes in property dynamics modify the politics of social justice in and beyond migrants’ home villages. The initial emphasis will be on rural property. It is envisioned to combine the analysis of concrete case studies within the framework of joint PhD projects with comparative research that involves contributions from the disciplines of development studies, social anthropology, and legal studies.

Martin Ramstedt
Since the inception of the new Department, Ramstedt’s activities have been informed by the following four objectives: (1) to help bring to a fruitful conclusion the research directed under the auspices of the Project Group; (2) to feed data and insights accumulated from previous research as a member of the Project Group into the research perspectives of the new Department; (3) to complete his Habilitation; and (4) to design a new individual research project in the field of law and religion in Europe: The Case of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin.

Conclusion of the Research Directed under the Auspices of the Project Group:
In both 2012 and 2013, Ramstedt co-edited – together with Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Bertram Turner – the book Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes (see annex). The publication of
the book was the final result of the Project Group programme “Religion in Disputes”, concluded in 2012.

Ramstedt’s analysis of the concept of local citizenship in Bali’s new village jurisdictions, which formed part of his contribution to the book, motivated him to co-organise the Joint Institutes’ Colloquium Series on “Citizenship Today” for the 2013 Summer Semester (in collaboration with Tabea Scharrer and David O’Kane from the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’ at the Institute, as well as Katharina Schramm of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg).

The official end of the Project Group in 2012 was marked by the International Conference, Temporalities of Law, at the Institute, which Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Ramstedt convened on 28–30 November 2012. A selection of the conference proceedings will appear as a theme issue of the Journal of Legal Pluralism in honour of Franz von Benda-Beckmann, edited by Melanie Wiber and Ramstedt (publication scheduled for March 2014). The content of the theme issue – how different temporalities structure and are structured by law – meshes well with the fourth research priority of the new Department, i.e., the concern with the comparison and translation of concepts, procedures, institutions, practices, and the like within and across legal orders.

Contribution of data and insights accumulated from previous research as a member of the Project Group to the research perspectives of the new Department: In April 2012, Ramstedt participated in the Symposium ‘Das Recht im Blick der Anderen’, organised by Thomas Moos of the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research of FEST (Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft or Protestant Institute for Interdisciplinary Research) in honour of Prof. Dr. Eberhard Schmidt-Assmann. The concept of law proffered at this meeting comes close to the general approach adopted in similar research programmes on the social life of law throughout Germany (in particular, “Law as Culture” in Bonn, “Rechtskulturen” (“Cultures of Law”) in Berlin, the Cluster of Excellence “The Formation of Normative Orders” at the University of Frankfurt, and other smaller programmes).

On the occasion of the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association, Ramstedt organised a panel with the title “What Is Lost and What Is Gained in Translation? ‘Indigenous Peoples’ in different socio-legal spaces”, with the purpose of providing an opportunity to discuss how to further advance the methodology of ‘translation’. In the past few years many anthropologists have applied the concept of translation to projects of comparison, taking a closer look at how, in the context of globalisation, legal concepts, institutions, and practices have been translated into different socio-legal spaces. The panel sought to take the methodological reflections a step further by focusing on a concrete legal category.

---

6 Richard Rottenburg, Professor of Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, was instrumental in putting translation on the agenda of the anthropology of law and of organisations in Halle. Over the years, Sally E. Merry has contributed to this discussion in Halle.
On 19 October 2013, Ramstedt participated in a symposium titled *Das Recht indigener Völker an natürlichen Ressourcen und die Sorben/Wenden* (The Rights of Indigenous Peoples to Natural Resources and the Sorbs/Wends) at the Brandenburg University of Technology in Cottbus. With representatives of key Sorbian institutions on hand, Ramstedt was able to witness an incipient translation process of the rights claims of the indigenous peoples’ movement in the German/European context. One of the results of the symposium was to move from reflections on this movement towards an application for external funding.

*Habilitation Project:* Ramstedt’s chapter in the edited volume *Religion in Disputes* constituted the final chapter of his cumulative *Habilitation* thesis, *The Social Construction of “Indonesian Hinduism” in Bali and Beyond: religion, law, and nation-building in modern Indonesia.* In accordance with the regulations of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, concerning cumulative *Habilitation* projects, his *Habilitation* thesis consists of a series of previously published chapters. These chapters revolve around a common topic as indicated in the title, and are preceded by an introduction, which Ramstedt finalised in 2013.

*Translating Buddhism into Different European Jurisdictions: the case of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin:* According to the findings of the RELIGARE project (see Foblets’s activities report, above), legal debates on religion in European countries tend to revolve around two issues: (a) religious dress and (b) places of worship.

During the reporting period, Ramstedt began to investigate the latter issue by focusing in particular on Buddhist temples in Europe, an issue which thus far has remained largely underinvestigated. Ramstedt will start with a case study of the Shaolin Temple in Berlin, which is the only branch in Europe of the Songshan Shaolin Temple in Dengfeng, Province of Henan, People’s Republic of China, which was added to the list of UNESCO World Heritage Sites in 2010. In 2009, the Shaolin Temple Berlin applied to the Berlin Senate to buy five hectares of land at Tempelhofer Feld, the former airfield at the closed-down Tempelhof Airport, in order to build a huge temple compound combining both Chinese aesthetics and modern, energy-efficient technology. The permission of the Senate of Berlin is still pending, however. One of the reasons is that the petition for a referendum (Initiative “100 & Tempelhofer Feld”) opposing all existing plans to construct new buildings on the grounds of the former airport. In contrast, the Şehitlik Mosque located on Columbusadamm adjacent to Tempelhofer Freiheit, a newly developed park and open space, was granted a piece of the Tempelhofer Feld by the Senate for the extension of its cemetery. Further fieldwork will elicit more details about the development of the temple construction project.

Should the land be granted in the end, the Shaolin Temple Berlin will be able, on an even greater scale than is already the case, to develop social engagement projects such as prison work, the training of military personnel, training of the German Olympic teams, interreligious dialogue, the operation of a psychosomatic clinic, chaplaincy, and the like. Further fieldwork will document these activities as they
already exist and unfold. Ramstedt was able to accompany a Shaolin Temple delegation to the interfaith dialogue organised by the ‘Berliner Forum der Religionen’ in November 2013.

**Latest development:** In late November 2013, Ramstedt received confirmation that he has been selected for a fellowship (2014) at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg in Bonn, within the framework of its “Law as Culture” programme. Ramstedt will take this opportunity to concentrate on co-editing the proceedings of the above-mentioned LSA panel in Boston on the topic “What Is Lost and What Is Gained in Translation?” Moreover, this will give him a unique opportunity, shortly after having finished his Habilitation, to prepare a monograph tentatively titled “The Global Indigenous Peoples Movement and the Politics of Indigeneity in Bali”, which will be based mainly on empirical data collected during his past research at the Institute in Halle. He also plans to continue his fieldwork on the Shaolin Temple in Berlin.

**Judith Beyer**

Beyer also joined the new Department after the conclusion of the Project Group. Beyer’s ongoing research project, “Law and Religion in Myanmar. (de-)constructing religious communities”, is concerned with legal pluralism and religious diversity in Myanmar. As part of the wider Indian Ocean region, Myanmar has a long history of transmaritime connections through the exchange of people, goods, and innovations, with law and religion being among them.

Probing the concept of the ‘ethnocratic city’ (Yiftachel), Beyer’s project investigates the dialectics of ethno-national urban control, on the one hand, and the ethnic and religious minorities’ strategic manoeuvring of land policies and planning policies, on the other. The project pays particular attention to the role of religion in disputing processes concerning land and property. At the moment, the focus lies here on several case studies, investigating the question, “What is the relationship of changing land and property legislation, urban development and foreign investment to the construction and deconstruction of religious communities in Yangon?” The project investigates the construction of religious communities in the sense of creating new communities, often along ethnic lines, but also in the literal sense of constructing new church buildings or expanding existing ones. Both activities are entangled with recent political and legal changes. One of the case studies is concerned with the large-scale renovation of existing churches and other religious buildings as effects of modernisation as well as changes in land and foreign investment laws. A second case study investigates patterns of migration to Yangon and ethno-religious settlements around churches.

A third case study is concerned with the construction of new churches (‘church planting’) and the general drive towards missionary work in Buddhist neighbourhoods. The project traces the different strategies used by Christian communities to expand their missionary activities spatially.
The first findings of Beyer’s research show that throughout history, land and property regimes in Myanmar have regularly been subject to political change. Since the country opened up in 2011, new land laws and foreign investment laws have been implemented, as well as new import and export regulations. Additionally, the recent lifting of international sanctions has triggered a massive increase in foreign trade and interest in investment. Land grabs are taking place on a large scale. While this phenomenon is already being studied in rural areas, the complexity of urban land transactions and especially the role of organised religion are still little understood.

The project is aimed at the publication of scholarly articles and a post-doctoral thesis (Habilitationsschrift).

Apart from this ongoing research project in Myanmar, Beyer’s other interests and engagements in the Department fall within the research priority of ‘Promoting integration of anthropological research and legal practice’. She is listed as a country of origin expert for the FAHAMU refugee programme, a UK-based legal aid network that pools resources for use by refugee legal aid advisors and advocates.7 Her expertise covers, in particular, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Myanmar.

---

7 See http://www.refugeelegalaidinformation.org/about-us-0#sthash.N2bvJ3wN.pdf
In October 2013, she organised a panel, “Anthropology and Law outside the University. New challenges for legal anthropology”, at the biannual conference of the German Anthropological Association (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde), which will lead to an edited volume in collaboration with Tobias Kelly, Anthony Good, and Marie-Claire Foblets. Beyer regularly provides expertise for developmental organisations, part of which consists of evaluating and advising on judicial aspects.

She is also part of a mentoring programme of the Central Asia Research and Training Initiative (CARTI) of the Open Society Foundations, where she is advising a legal scholar in Kyrgyzstan (Dr Natalia Alenkina). Alenkina’s research project builds on Beyer’s previous research in Kyrgyzstan on the courts of elders (aksakal courts). In addition to supervision and joint publications, she is working on the possibility of setting up a “Legal Anthropology” module as part of the curriculum for law students at the American University in Central Asia (AUCA) in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.

During the reporting period, Beyer submitted her monograph, According to Customary Law. Legal pluralism and the ordering of everyday life in Kyrgyzstan, to the University of Pittsburgh Press, where it is currently under review. She also continued expanding her longstanding research interests in the role of law in connection with emotions and well-being and in ethno-methodology, resulting in two peer-reviewed articles, “Constitutional faith. Law and hope in revolutionary Kyrgyzstan”, published in Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology, and “Ordering Ideals. Accomplishing well-being in a Kyrgyz cooperative of elders”, published in Central Asian Survey.

First Cohort of Postdoctoral Researchers (January 2012–)

As a means of enabling the Department to develop the most active profile possible in terms of scientific output, from the first months following its launch, the Department began to recruit a number of postdoctoral researchers. Four researchers were appointed, with varied but complementary profiles, each in her own way working on at least two of the Department’s four research priorities. During their first few months in the Department, all four postdoctoral fellows devoted their time to finalising, revising, and developing pieces of writing as well as to participating in various international conferences that had already been started or planned prior to their joining the Department. These activities are also mentioned here, as they are part of the researchers’ scientific profiles and in line with the Department’s research programme. In 2013, the process of recruitment was set in motion to appoint seven PhD students, who started in January 2014. Their names and research projects are listed on page 100 of this report.
Julie Billaud

Julie Billaud joined the Department on 1 January 2013. Her research interests fall, each in its own way, within the four main research priorities of the Department.

Billaud is currently finishing up a monograph based on her PhD dissertation. Entitled *A Voice of One’s Own? Women in public life in ‘post-war/reconstruction’ Afghanistan*, the monograph will appear in the University of Pennsylvania Press’s “Ethnographies of Political Violence” series. The book critically addresses the intended and unintended effects of transnational discourses and practices aimed at promoting ‘women’s rights’ and the ‘rule of law’. The book is structured around two main parts: the first focuses on the historical and political backdrop upon which women’s issues are discussed, in the context of a complex process of nation building. In the course of a history marked by forced modernisation and Islamic fundamentalism, Billaud’s book shows how the state has remained a phantom-like figure that haunts the collective imagination of Afghans in powerful ways. In the second part she shows how Afghan women routinely respond, through embodiment and performance, to the various sources of pressure pertaining to their visibility in public life. The book offers an actor-oriented approach, a close-up on the struggle of ordinary women to remain in control of their lives while preserving ‘honour’, ‘reputation’, and community cohesion. It shows how women, as agents involved in a project of self-legitimation, find their inspiration in culturally intelligible forms. Billaud’s book contributes to Afghan, Central Asian, and Islamic studies by providing a gender perspective on the effects of conflict-induced state-formation processes.

Prior to joining the new Department, Billaud participated in the research project “International Human Rights Monitoring at the Reformed United Nations Human Rights Council: an ethnographic and historical study”, directed by Prof. Jane Cowan (University of Sussex) and funded by the British Academy. This ethnographic study investigates the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), a new mechanism of rights monitoring put in place by the reformed UN Human Rights Council in Geneva. The UPR is conceived as a public audit ritual grounded in a broad social and political field constituted through specific encounters, institutional codes, norms, knowledge practices, and documentation processes.

Through a series of case studies, interviews with various actors involved in the UPR (NGOs, diplomats, international civil servants), observations of UPR sessions, and participant observation at the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights’ (OHCHR) Secretariat, the research to which Billaud has been contributing seeks to define the nature and function of this new monitoring exercise. The research highlights the intended and unintended effects of a cyclical repetition of audits. As part of her analysis of the data collected over the course of her fieldwork, Billaud has written a chapter, “Keepers of the ‘truth’”, for a volume entitled *Assessing the Universal Periodic Review: rights, ritual, ritualism* (Cambridge University Press), edited by Hilary Charlesworth and Emma Larcking of the Australian National University, Canberra. Recent ethnographic accounts of bureaucracies have focused on
the technologies (Latour 2010), aesthetics (Riles 2006), and governance techniques (Strathern 2000) that participate in the production of ‘expertise culture’. Billaud’s research interests engage with this vibrant scholarship, but also add nuances: by studying the everyday documentation practices of Secretariat drafters, her study provides insight into the concrete modalities through which core UPR principles such as ‘transparency’, ‘non-politicisation’, and ‘neutrality’ are upheld. She also shows how the language of ‘transparency’ and ‘non-politicisation’ presents the world it is supposed to ‘objectively’ depict in a decontextualised and technical manner. Billaud, moreover, engages within the affective life of documents (Navaro-Yashin 2007): she shows how the circulation of documents from a ministry or an NGO office located somewhere in the world to the UN Secretariat in Geneva contributes to the creation of specific affective regimes and social imaginaries. These transnational circuits of affects play an important role in fostering a sense of moral agency among the various actors involved in the UPR, creating an imagined ethical community of actors responsible for ‘making human rights real in the world’.

With her appointment at the Institute, Billaud is embarking on a new research venture that seeks to explore the Islamic legal culture of England. Since 2009, she has conducted several periods of fieldwork in various British cities where shari’ah councils have been set up. From September 2013 until March 2014, she conducted more fieldwork at shari’ah councils as well as at law firms specialising in shari’ah law and at banks offering shari’ah-compliant financial products.

A major aim of her new project with the Department is to map out and define the nature of the multiple political and social ‘fields’ where Islamic legal referents have made their appearance in Britain over the past decades. Because globalisation has displaced centres of Islamic knowledge production, religious sources and authorities have multiplied and become more easily accessible. As a result, Muslims’ relationship to their sacred texts, to conventional discursive methods, and to traditional authority figures has been deeply transformed. Muslims are now confronted with new forms of textuality (personalised pious narratives) articulated by modern professional thinkers without formal religious qualification, who weave together elements of philosophy, modern populism, expertise culture, and Koranic references. This decentralisation of knowledge, which has always existed in Islam, has intensified in recent years, depriving Ulama of the exclusive monopoly on ijtihad (interpretation). While structures of authority have become more fluid, a movement involving contestation of the normative basis of religion has emerged. The expectation is that Billaud’s new study will offer an empirically grounded and historically informed account of the various ways in which shari’ah has become de facto British, by describing the processes of ‘identity commoditisation’, legal interpenetrations, and cultural transformations that are produced in the encounter between Islamic norms and British legal orders. Finally, this research will contribute to the theoretical understandings of Islamic ethics and the power of Islamic norms in the shaping of ‘Muslim subjects’ in Britain.
Billaud is now editing a special issue on this topic for the journal Archives des Sciences Sociales des Religions.

Maria Sapignoli
Maria Sapignoli joined the Department on 1 January 2013. Her three main projects are briefly described here:

**Global and Local Impacts of the Discourse on Indigeneity: the transnational San social movement and the peoples of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve:** Sapignoli’s fieldwork over the last seven years has mainly taken place in southern Africa (Botswana) and at the United Nations meetings on indigenous peoples’ rights. It ranges from the global (UN) and the regional (Sub-Saharan Africa) to the national (Botswana High Court and Government offices) and local (the Central Kalahari Game Reserve and rural communities, including resettlement sites in the country). This research addresses indigenous peoples’ rights and identity formation in southern Africa and the ways that local people are affected by, and have an impact on, institutions such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR), and on the development, refinement, and implementation of documents, policies, and law concerning indigenous peoples’ rights. Sapignoli also examines the social movements aimed at promoting indigenous and minority rights (e.g., San movements, African indigenous movements, and global indigenous movements). At the national and local levels, she considers how indigeneity shapes the relationships among groups and individuals, and between groups and the state, law, and institutions; and how global concepts of rights, justice, and equality are experienced and shaped in practice by those who see themselves as the subject of rights (San and other minorities) and by those that either accept or deny such rights (southern African states and transnational corporations).

The work is part of an ethnography of globalised processes and the ways in which international institutions are in a dialectic with local groups who articulate their identities and requests at different levels and scales.

**In the Name of the State: law, governance, marginality, and local realities in Botswana:** In this project Sapignoli looks in particular at the roles of leadership, community-based organisations, local courts, and national-level courts, including the High Court and the Court of Appeal in the Republic of Botswana. Part of the research looks at the variation in the ways in which the kgotla, a traditional Tswana legal and political institution, is used by different groups in the country, and at the
sources of law that are used by the headmen/headwomen in cases in local courts.\textsuperscript{8} The Republic of Botswana is often presented as a social and economic ‘miracle’. It is an example of a country in which British and Roman-Dutch common law systems and state customary law are applied. Since independence, however, questions have been raised nationally and internationally about the treatment of San and other minorities. Only the eight major tribes are recognised in the Constitution of Botswana and have seats in the House of Chiefs. In recent years, several NGOs have worked to include minority groups’ rights in the Constitution and state policies.

This research considers how the San are treated in court and how they adapt, understand, resist, and modify what the state recognises as indigenous and customary law in Botswana, which derive in part from Tswana, Bakgalagadi, and colonial and state law; and how San representatives argue for the recognition of their ‘indigenous customary law’ in accordance with international discourses.

This research focuses also on the relationships among state, civil servants and local communities in Botswana in matters of land rights, ownership, and access. It considers the contradictions, continuities, and exceptions among practices, norms, and juridical decisions, with particular reference to issues relating to the land, natural resources, social care, and safety nets among indigenous communities in Botswana, an area where there are ongoing conflicts over state- and local-level policies and procedures.

\textit{Exclusion, Inclusion and Marginality: conservation and development. Rights, responsibilities and indigenous peoples}: In her third research project, Sapignoli analyses the international and state policies, guidelines, procedures, and legal machinery that deal with the issue of extractive industries, corporate social responsibility, environmental conservation, involuntary resettlement and displacement, and the ways local people respond to, engage in, are affected by, and resist them in their daily practices. Although the issue of the displacement of peoples has been a major subject of discussion internationally for the past several decades, there are relatively few comprehensive legal instruments that deal directly with resettlement. The United Nations issued a set of guiding principles (\textit{United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement}) which have been helpful in providing a body of standards for organisations working with Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) (Oliver-Smith 2012). Other organisations have also developed resettlement guidelines. Private mining and oil companies, among others, have issued their own guidelines on corporate social responsibility (CSR), which devote some attention to issues of resettlement.

\textsuperscript{8} This project will also be linked to the Canadian grant-funded project mentioned on p. 84 with which the Department is collaborating and which provides comparative material on the use of traditional mechanisms of dispute settlement and mediation in different contexts (including non-African). This project, funded by SSHRCC (Canada), is entitled “The State and Indigenous Legal Cultures: law in search of legitimacy”, and is being conducted by Ghislain Otis (University of Ottawa), Jean-François Gaudreault-DesBiens (Université de Montréal), and Marie-Claire Foblets, with the involvement of 13 other partners.
Issues surrounding the corporate social responsibility of transnational corporations and agencies have become significant areas of debate in recent years. This research focuses on the impact, both of conservation and of extractive industries, on southern Africa (Botswana), and looks at the legal, social, economic, and cultural implications of resettlement and the loss or regaining of access to land, considering, in particular, the case of the San and their access to justice in the context of resettlement. This is part of a larger comparative study of the legal aspects of resettlement and of the social and environmental implications of conservation-related resettlement, which is on the rise in eastern, central, and southern Africa.

During the reporting period, and while working on the three above-mentioned projects, Maria Sapignoli also did part of her fieldwork at the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (May) and in Botswana (August–September 2013). In addition, she is also preparing several publications: (1) a monograph on indigenous peoples (accepted by the School of Advanced Studies, Human Rights Series, University of London Press), with particular reference to the African context; (2) an edited volume (to be published by UNICOPLI, Milano) on indigeneity in the African context with insights into the roles indigenous peoples play at the global, regional (African), national, and local levels; (3) and a monograph (People, Parks, and Power: the ethics of conservation-related resettlement), co-authored with Robert Hitchcock (accepted by Springer, New York/Amsterdam, Anthropology and Ethics Series). During the reporting period, Sapignoli also submitted two journal articles for peer review: one titled “In the Age of Humanity: human rights, citizenship and indigeneity in the Central Kalahari” for a special issue on ‘Humanity and the San’, and the other a review article for the journal Reviews in Anthropology, titled ‘Mobility, Land Use, and Leadership in Small-Scale and Middle-Range Societies’.

Sapignoli is currently preparing a workshop for the Department (scheduled for spring 2015) entitled Indigenous Peoples between Law and Justice. She is also the spokesperson for the Department in the Working Group on “Diversidad Cultural y Protección Jurídica” (“Rights, Justice, Cultural Diversity”) with the MPI for European Legal History (Frankfurt). Finally, she is taking part in the international project entitled “The State and Indigenous Legal Cultures: law in search of legitimacy”, already mentioned above.9

Katrin Seidel
Katrin Seidel joined the Department on 1 November 2012. Her research interests are situated at the intersection of legal pluralism and forms of heterogeneous statehood. Even though legal pluralism has become a widely used analytical tool for grasping the legal reality of plural societies, it appears in reality to be finding its way only hesitantly into (trans-)state legal reforms and policies. Seidel’s studies

9 See page 84.
focus on state actors’ ways of constitutionally ‘recognising’ local and religious legal orders within broader rule of law approaches and policies. The principal site of her research is the Horn of Africa. A research assumption in Seidel’s work is that the constitutional recognition of religious and local law opens up space and a forum for continuous negotiation processes between diverse actors. These negotiations, in turn, continuously (re-)structure power relations. In certain situations it appears that the constitutional ‘recognition’ of so-called non-state normative orders offers a way to deal with the *de facto* marginal influence of state law. Major research questions in Seidel’s work are: How, where, and among whom are negotiations of different normative values taking place? What are the institutional designs for the negotiation spaces in which manifold legal perceptions and normative values interact? To what extent are plural normative realities reflected in state legal frameworks, and in judicial bodies in particular? How do state actors acknowledge diverse local judicial institutions and represent themselves organisationally and ideologically in relation to them?

The research approach that Seidel has embarked upon since she joined the Department is based on her previous work, which resulted in her PhD dissertation, *State-Recognised Legal Pluralism in Ethiopia: interdependent relationships between Islamic law and state law*. In her thesis she assessed the potentials and challenges of integrating local and religious normative orders into a constitutional framework (*in casu* Ethiopian). In her postdoctoral research project Seidel focuses on state emergence in the Republic of South Sudan. For the aims of Seidel’s postdoctoral research, South Sudan presents itself as a particularly relevant case, since its ‘statehood’ in itself, and in particular the constitution of the emerging state, is still under construction. The study focuses on current constitution-making efforts. The ongoing constitutional drafting process has been officially delegated to the National Constitution Review Commission (hereafter: NCRC). In order to grasp the complexity of activities that accompany these processes, attention is drawn not just to negotiations by the manifold South Sudanese actors, but to influences by regional and international actors as well. One focus of the study is on the *de jure* and *de facto* efforts of integrating so-called customary law, including related dispute resolution mechanisms, into the South Sudanese judiciary. With a view to studying these efforts empirically, a series of fieldwork periods in South Sudan have been planned. Seidel already spent a first period (March 2013 through May 2013) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and in Juba and Rumbek, South Sudan. The troubled political situation

---

10 State recognition may be described as challenging processes of conflict and accommodation between ‘state identity’ and the self-regulation claims of social groups.
in the country permitting, extended and follow-up fieldwork is scheduled for 2014 and 2015.\textsuperscript{11}

From Seidel’s preliminary observations, it appears that the internal ‘legitimacy’ of state actors is still being negotiated. Civil society actors launched a ‘citizens’ constitution-making process in 2011 in all ten states of South Sudan with the aim of contributing towards ‘a constitution that reflects the will of the people’ and promoting ‘popular ownership’ (normative frame of reference). Citizens were consulted via focus groups, the regional representatives of traditional authorities, women’s groups, youth groups, civil society organisations, state assemblies, religious groups, members of parliament, and local government actors, etc., to discuss the meaning of the national constitution and to encourage people to submit as many ‘suggestions’ as possible to the National Constitution Review Commission (NCRC).\textsuperscript{12}

In its own way, Seidel’s current project on South Sudan fits into the new Department’s research plans, as it seeks to contribute to the production of cross-cultural comparative knowledge on heterogeneous statehood, constitutionalism, and the role of the judiciary in a plural context.\textsuperscript{13} On the potential and the challenges of external legal interventions and on ‘applied’ legal anthropology, Seidel’s observations – both in Ethiopia and in South Sudan – show that legal standards such as \textit{rule of law} and \textit{access to justice} are far from self-evident: legal categories such as the distinction between criminal and civil law are being challenged, as is the notion of ‘customary law’. Seidel’s efforts can enrich debates on the role and challenges of ‘applied’ legal anthropology.

Seidel has recently published a number of works: a monograph (based on her PhD thesis), \textit{Rechtspluralismus in Äthiopien: Interdependenzen zwischen islamischem Recht und staatlichem Recht} (“Legal Pluralism in Ethiopia: interdependences between Islamic and state law”), appears in Rüdiger Köppe Verlag’s series “Recht in Afrika” (November 2013); When the State is Forced to Deal with Local Law: approaches and challenges for state actors in emerging South Sudan. In: Hoehne, 11 Methods of data collection will be participant observation, semi-structured oral interviews and collecting legal documents, including information disseminated via newspapers and the local media, whenever relevant. Methods of interpretation will include legal interpretation and techniques for comparing legal documents, the critical-historical analysis of historical documents, the content analysis of oral and written material, as well as discourse analysis.

12 During her 2013 exploratory fieldwork, Seidel was also able to access and study a number of decisions of the South Sudan Supreme Court (Juba) as well as of the Court of Appeal of Bahr el Ghazal (Rumbek), with a view to examining the role of local law in legal practice and observing how the interactions among various legal orders play out in disputes. She also contacted local chiefs’ courts in Rumbek as well as members of statutory courts, who introduced her to the various mechanisms of judicial proceedings as well as to the rules governing interactions between the local and the statutory courts. Unexpectedly, she was also given access to the \textit{Juba Archives}, which house a multitude of legal documents from the colonial period. These will allow her to trace back the development of the plural judiciary, and in particular the way the Anglo-Egyptian administration approached the predominantly local legal orders (\textit{indirect rule}).


**Miia Halme-Tuomisaari**

Miia Halme-Tuomisaari joined the Department on 1 January 2013. She has a PhD in law and a background in anthropology and critical legal theory.\(^{14}\) Her ongoing research venture is titled “Expert Knowledge and Shifting Subjectivities: exploring UN human rights treaty bodies”. This project studies how the expansion of the contemporary human rights phenomenon has been accompanied by the growing importance of implicit knowledge held by human rights experts. It examines these developments and their consequences through the practices accompanying the compilation and processing of periodic state reports submitted to UN human rights treaty bodies. Halme-Tuomisaari’s research seeks to combine the analysis of empirical data of the transnational human rights framework at key intersections of the different participants – governments, international organisations, non-governmental organisations, and experts – with systematic theoretical discussions. In her view, these themes have, despite the vigorous ‘engagement’ following decades of ‘disengagement’ by the discipline,\(^ {15}\) remained marginal in the anthropology of human rights, as the functioning or implications of the transnational human rights framework have not yet become fully developed and theoretically robust subfields. With her study, she wishes to contribute to the anthropology of human rights bureaucracies, the study of expert knowledge, and the study of global governance. The project will produce a number of individual chapters and articles, with the final aim being a monograph.

To concretise her query, Halme-Tuomisaari’s study focuses on a single document, Finland’s 6th State Report on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to be submitted to the Human Rights Committee. Finland enjoys the reputation of being a ‘model state’ in human rights issues and a Nordic democracy that fares well in international assessments of the ‘world’s best places to live’. Finland’s State Report will be examined as an illustration of the vast number of documents produced and expected today by states as they participate in the different documentary cycles in the ongoing international human rights ‘dialogue’. In this analysis

---


the recent scholarship on contemporary expert practices is helpful, particularly the recent ethnography of documents. As the Finnish Foreign Ministry prepares its state reports, it has begun, over the past few years, to attempt to incorporate ‘shadow reports’ into its official reports. In practice this means that consultations are held with chosen NGOs whose solicited comments on the draft state report are selectively incorporated into the finalised report. Instead of this practice receiving criticism for compromising the access of treaty body members to factual information on the Finnish human rights situation, it has been widely acclaimed by UN treaty bodies due to the country’s favourable standing in the world of international human rights as well as its recognised democratic mode of governance.

Halme is also co-editing a book with Pamela Slotte titled *History of Human Rights: continuities, gaps and coincidences*, as she continues, for this project, her earlier investigation of the contributions of American NGOs to the adoption of the UNDHR.

**Doctoral Students (2013—)**

Two doctoral students began their work at the Department in 2013: Lucia Facchini, also a member of the International Max Planck Research School REMEP (topic: Formal and Informal Migration Management in Italy: local, national and transnational factors; see also REMEP activities report); and Sajjad Safaei (topic: The Politics and Poetics of Human Rights in Contemporary Muslim Context). In January 2014, seven other doctoral students joined the Department: Harika Dauth (topic: Roma in Europe and Legal Pluralism); Marcus Klank (topic: Internal and External Autonomy of Religious Minorities in Germany); Kalindi Kokal (topic: Understanding the Litigant’s Approach to Dispute Resolution in India); Annette Mehlhorn (topic: Indigenous Justice in Bolivia: human rights in Latin America); Kiran Morjaria (topic: Dispute Management among Gujarati Indians in Kenya and the United Kingdom); Mareike Riedel (topic: Accommodation of Jewish Law in Germany); and Beate Backe (topic: Yemeni Conditions in Law: Islamic law, customary law, and Western law in conflict).

Three other students will join the Department in early 2014 for a shorter (writing) period: Jonas Bens (topic: Equal treatment of ethnic groups in the German legal order); Agathe Mora (topic: Transitional justice in post-war Kosovo, with focus on property rights); and Ian Kalman (topic: Migration and indigenous difference at the

---


Canada–US border). Other short stays have been offered to a number of additional doctoral students for subsequent periods (after 2014).

**Legacy of the Project Group Legal Pluralism**

As mentioned in the introduction, the Department brought under its umbrella the remaining activities of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, including the ongoing project ‘Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary’. Their activities for the reporting period are succinctly sketched out below.

**Project Group Legal Pluralism (with special attention to the activities of Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann)**

Three events marked the conclusion of the Project Group: (1) the publication of *Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes*, edited by Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, Martin Ramstedt, and Bertram Turner (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), which came out of the group’s six-year research programme “Religion in Disputing Processes”; (2) the publication of Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann’s monograph, *Political and Legal Transformations of an Indonesian Polity: the nagari from colonisation to decentralisation* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), which contains what may be described as the culmination of the Benda-Beckmanns’ research in West Sumatra; and (3) the organisation of the international conference *Temporalities of Law*, the proceedings of which will be selectively published in a theme issue of the *Journal of Legal Pluralism* in March 2014.

The edited volume *Religion in Disputes: pervasiveness of religious normativity in disputing processes* (see also under Ramstedt) focused on the role of religion in diverse disputing processes in and out of court. In their introduction, the editors sought to deepen the understanding not only of the impact of religion on disputing in more complex ways than is commonly considered, but also of how it is often itself transformed in the process. The volume offers a set of comparative cases on the entanglement of religion (in the form of tenets of faith, values, norms, authorities, and institutions) in different dispute settings.

In their book *Political and Legal Transformations of an Indonesian Polity*, the Benda-Beckmanns proffered a long-term study of the historical transformations of the *nagari* (a Minangkabau customary polity), property relations, and the ever-changing dynamic relationships between Minangkabau matrilineal *adat* law, Islamic law, and state law. The study thus presents cases that can be compared along a historical vector. While the focus is on the period since the fall of President Suharto in 1998, the book charts a long history of political and legal transformations before and after Indonesia’s independence in which the continuities are as notable as the changes. It also sheds light on the transnational processes through which legal and political
ideas spread and acquire new meanings. The multi-temporal historical approach adopted is also relevant to more general discussions of the relationship between anthropology and history, the creation of customary law, identity construction, and the anthropology of colonialism.

The official winding up of the Project Group at the end of 2012 was marked by an international conference, *Temporalities of Law*, convened by Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, and Martin Ramstedt at the Institute on 28–30 November 2012. The purpose of the conference was to contribute to the empirical and comparative study of the temporalities of law in society with special reference to plural legal orders. It was demonstrated that law is influenced by different notions of social time present in society at large. Moreover, law is dependent to a significant degree on the temporalities of other academic disciplines that help establish evidence, the culpability of the culprit, and so forth. These insights are not purely of theoretical value; they can be of utmost practical importance as well, for instance, when one has to deal with divergent understandings of timeframes in cross-cultural disputing, as several contributions submitted to the discussions showed. As mentioned above, a selection of these contributions will be published in a theme issue of the *Journal of Legal Pluralism* in March 2014.

In April 2012, Keebet and Franz von Benda-Beckmann participated in the international workshop *Where Now? Moving beyond traditional legal geographies*, organised by the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy at the University of Buffalo, New York. There they presented two joint papers: the first, “Interdisciplinary Legal Scholarships: experiences, probabilities and suggestions”, offered a social-science perspective on the study of law and space. The paper draws on the anthropology of law, with its emphasis on plural legal constellations in which dissimilar and often contradictory notions of space and boundaries, and their legal relevance, come to co-exist in mutual interdependence within the same physical or socio-political space. The paper furthermore highlighted the temporality of legal space- and place-making, suggesting that the fading in and out and the multiple legalities of spaces are the least understood aspects of the temporality of space. These aspects are, however, critical to the power relations within multi-normative spaces and to the degree of legal uncertainty that persons living in these spaces face. Presenting the paper in Buffalo and then again in July 2012 at the Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association in Honolulu served as preparation for the aforementioned *Temporalities of Law* conference in November 2012. The second paper, “Interdisciplinary Legal Scholarships: experiences, probabilities and suggestions”, focused in on the theoretical and practical problems of interdisciplinary legal studies.

In September 2012, Keebet and Franz von Benda-Beckmann attended a symposium, *Pluralism, Transnationalism, and Culture in Asian Pluralism*, in honour of M.B. Hooker, whose analyses of Indonesian and other Asian legal systems have become classics. In their paper “Legal Pluralism, Comparative Law and Legal Anthropology”, they revisited Hooker’s classic *Legal Pluralism* (1975), in which
Hooker sketched an impressive comparative picture of plural legal orders in Asia and provided a detailed overview of the colonial legal and legal anthropological scholarship. In their view, the main role of comparative law is to provide an understanding of diversity in law rather than to promote uniformity of law. This understanding should be grounded in a thorough assessment of the history of legal pluralism and the painful experiences with the many earlier policies that endeavoured to create more legal uniformity. Such an assessment will also inform the research on comparison and comparability to be carried out at the new Department.

Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia

The project “Local State and Social Security in Rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia” was completed in 2012. Launched in 2008 under the VW initiative “Unity amidst Variety? Intellectual foundations and requirements for an enlarged Europe”, the project explored the interrelatedness of local state formation and social security arrangements in rural Hungary, Romania, and Serbia. It concentrated on two major fields of state regulation: access to productive resources and access to social assistance. The project’s most important outcome has been the development of an ethnographically grounded relational perspective of the state expressed in a compilation of comparative articles, most of which are the result of collaborative efforts among the team members (Tatjana Thelen, Larissa Vetters, Mihai Popa, and André Thiemann).

The project was carried out within the framework of the Project Group under the leadership of Tatjana Thelen and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann from the MPI, and Katalin Kovács, a Hungarian anthropologist/rural sociologist from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. During and after the project, some members left the group and developed further research perspectives and collaborations.

Tatjana Thelen, who had initiated the project proposal and served as lead researcher and main coordinator, completed her Habilitation thesis (defended at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg in 2012). She has since accepted a professorship in ethnographic methods and social network analysis at the University of Vienna.

Over the course of the project, Larissa Vetters, Agnieszka Pasieka, and Duška Vranjes acted as assistant coordinators. After defending her PhD thesis, Agnieszka Pasieka was awarded a Bronislaw Geremek Junior Visiting Fellowship at the Institute of Human Sciences in Vienna and is now a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences. Her continued cooperation with Rebecca Kay and Tatjana Thelen resulted in a publication (Pasieka 2012) in a special issue of the journal Rural Studies, edited by Rebecca Kay, Sergej Shubin, and Tatjana Thelen.

Duška Roth, together with Stefan Dorondel, organised a panel at the annual forum of the Leibnitz Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe (IAMO), at which several project members presented papers in June 2012. Roth is currently a research fellow at the University of Munich (Leopold Kretzenbacher
Fellowship) doing archival and ethnographic research on the religious and political meanings of a Marian apparition in a Dalmatian village in Croatia in the late 1980s. Stefan Dorondel is continuing his research on natural resources with a grant from the Romanian National Research Agency, in a new project dealing with the social, economic, and ecological effects of damming the Lower Danube in the 20th century, the effects of which are still felt today in both Romania and Bulgaria.

Gyöngyi Schwarcz has been employed as a researcher at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre of Regional Studies, since June 2012. She continues to cooperate with Alexandra Szőke, digging deeper into topics already explored within the project. Alexandra Szőke handed in and defended her PhD thesis at the Central European University in 2012, with Thelen as an external examiner. She is currently a postdoctoral fellow attached to the University of Vienna and is working on her new project, “A ‘Road to Work’? – Public work and (un)employment in the Hungarian countryside”, financed by the ERSTE Foundation as a Fellowship for Social Research. The public work programme is examined both in terms of ‘social integration’ and of labour market reintegration, as well as from the perspective of the various effects on the local labour markets and the ways it transforms generational and gender relations within the families affected.

Larissa Vettas took up a position as full-time lecturer at the Institute for Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (2011–2013), and continues to be associated with the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’. Since October 2013 she has been a postdoctoral fellow (one year appointment) within the project initiative “Recht im Kontext” (“Law in Context”: Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin/Institute for Advanced Study). Of the project’s two PhD students, Mihai Popa and André Thiemann remain associated with the new Department; their activities are described in more detail in the annex. Both plan to defend their doctoral theses during the first semester of 2014.

The team was also supported by Andrew Cartwright (Center for Policy Studies, Central European University) as an external advisor and specialist on rural development policies in postsocialist countries, and by Rebecca Kay (Professor of Russian Gender Studies, Department of Central and East European Studies, University of Glasgow), who works on social security in Siberia. The latter collaboration resulted in the joint editorship of “Rural Realities in Post-Socialist Space”, a special issue of the Journal of Rural Studies (Kay, Shubin, and Thelen 2012).

Of the central topics that emerged in the “Local State and Social Security” project, several, such as the link between local states and social security, the regulation of natural resources, and questions of inclusion and exclusion, continue to shape the research activities of former Project Group members.
Siberian Studies Centre

Directors: Chris Hann and Günther Schlee
Coordinator: Joachim Otto Habeck

Joachim Otto Habeck

Highlights

• In 2012 Wieland Hintzsche, a Halle-based historian, and Joachim Otto Habeck published a collected volume of papers on the history of exploration and scientific documentation of Siberia, summarising the results of a series of conferences in collaboration with the Francke Foundations in Halle, Russian archives, and Siberian universities.

• In cooperation with geographers of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography in Leipzig, Habeck co-edited a collected volume on Nomadic and Indigenous Spaces: productions and cognitions, published by Ashgate in December 2013. The volume has resulted from research in the DFG-funded Sonderforschungsbereich on the interrelations of nomadic and sedentary societies (SFB 586, 2004–2012).

• In September 2012 Joseph Long received the J.B. Donne Essay Prize on the Anthropology of Art for his essay “The Buryat circle dance and the aesthetics of belonging: Meaning to perform and performing to mean in Southern Siberia”.

• Three PhD dissertations have been published as monographs in 2012 and 2013: Katharina Gernet on young indigenous women’s (im-)mobility in a Kamchatkan village; Anett Oelschlägel on plural world interpretations among the Tyva of South Siberia; and Stephan Dudeck on representations of indigenous lifestyles between taiga encampments and oil workers’ towns in West Siberia.

• In January 2013 Habeck defended his post-doctoral dissertation (Habilitationschrift) on The House of Culture in Russia: performance of an ideal state at Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg. The manuscript will be published in mid-2014. Habeck has been offered a professorship at the University of Hamburg and will commence his work there in April 2014.
Introduction and Overview

Siberia, in both Russian and international perception, has been continually perceived as a frontier, characterised by particular – and particularly strong – dynamics of development. The scope and speed of development have recently increased in nearly all spheres: in the domain of economic development (as exemplified by the expansion of mineral resource extraction into the shelf of the Arctic Ocean); environmental change (global warming and permafrost degradation); migration processes (a growing influx of migrants from China and Central Asia); and administrative shifts (centralisation, territorial mergers, and the reframing of indigenous entitlements).

Being aware of the tension between political peripherality and the new geopolitical importance of their region, the inhabitants of Siberia experience their everyday existence in terms of both marginalisation and participation in the state’s renewed quest to modernise the entire country. Siberia’s history as an internal colony has created multiple hierarchies and regimes of exploitation, along with niches of retreat or resistance. The region has a contradictory past of freedom and totalitarian surveillance, and this very contradiction comes to the fore in many families’ biographies and individual experiences. Anthropology, in pursuing the task of examining social change in its most obvious as well as most subtle nuances, has drawn on Siberia to explore rapid processes of modernisation and concomitant shifts in social organisation and self-perception.

Research in Siberia has been conducted at the MPI for Social Anthropology from its very beginnings and it has steadily contributed to the Institute’s theoretical advancements, initially through its focus on property relations in indigenous communities and institutional changes in the spheres of hunting, fishing, and reindeer herding. The research agenda of the Siberian Studies Centre has been extended over the years to include additional aspects of social change in Siberia and, more generally, Russia:

1. Traditional livelihoods and access to land have remained important topics and the most innovative contribution in this regard has been achieved through the Centre’s special focus on perception of the environment and orientation in space. Methods of navigation, travelling skills, and conceptualisations of space have been studied from both phenomenological and cognitivist perspectives. Of these two, the latter has been pursued intensively by Kirill Istomin, who initiated a cross-disciplinary pilot study on spatial cognition as a spin-off activity, collaborating with colleagues from other MPIs and advancing the field of neuro-anthropology.

2. The team of Siberianists found it necessary to overcome the conventional focus on indigenous peoples, expanding social-scientific research to include all parts of society in Siberia – indigenous and non-indigenous. If earlier fieldwork took place almost exclusively in rural areas, it became obvious that urban settings and rural-urban connections also had to be studied, so as to embrace the entire spectrum of present-day indigenous livelihoods. Moreover, mobility and mi-
migration, access to resources, economic opportunities and inequalities affect all parts of the population, in highly differential ways that cannot be explained by ethnic affiliation alone.

3. We examined official displays of identity and solidarity hosted by state-supported institutions at the local level, notably through multi-sited fieldwork in the House of Culture (dom kul’tury), the socialist and post-socialist equivalent of what arts centres or community centres are in Western countries. A state-controlled institution with branches in nearly all settlements, the House of Culture continues to play a major role in setting standards in amateur arts, cultural production, and artistic expression of ethnicity. The institution participates in the promotion of ‘unity in diversity’, the basic principle of the state’s attempt to maintain justice among the many ethnic groups and retain their loyalty towards the federal state.

4. Initially, we considered indigeneity and ethnicity to be prime registers of identification, but then broadened the perspective to include other forms of identity. Central to this endeavour was to apply the concept of lifestyle – thus far used in sociology – to Siberia as a domain of anthropological research. This concept has enabled us to examine how social norms, individual reflexivity, aesthetic conventions, and habitualised practice interact in processes of identification. In addition, it has helped to understand ways of belonging that depend on voluntary forms of identification, on the one hand, and new forms of popular culture, on the other, which have hitherto been largely ignored in Siberian studies. The political relevance of this becomes evident in present debates on morality, healthy lifestyles, the social order, and loyal citizenship in present-day Russia. Results of this research will be published shortly.

The following section highlights our most recent activities in these fields.

Main Fields of Research, 2012–2013

**Perception of the Environment, Navigation, and Movement**

Shortly before the completion of the DFG-funded Collaborative Research Centre on *Difference and Integration* (SFB 586, 2004–2012), the focus of which was on the interaction between nomadic and sedentary groups, members of the Siberian Studies Centre (Schlee, Habeck, Istomin) prepared a conference on *Nomadic and Indigenous Spaces* in collaboration with geographers of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (Judith Miggelbrink and colleagues), convened in Leipzig in early 2011. Habeck is one of the co-editors of the ensuing volume, which contains chapters by Kirill Istomin, Joseph Long, and former MPI researchers Brian Donahoe and Florian Stammler, among others. The volume explores perceptions of space, wayfinding and navigation, technological change, and experiences of movement and dwelling with special attention to pastoral (nomadic) groups in the Far North and elsewhere.
Throughout the volume, an intensive debate unfolds among geographers and anthropologists on phenomenological, cognitivist, and political interpretations of spatiality and mobility in Far Northern and other nomadic settings. Several authors offer critical views on the oft-quoted idea of striated versus smooth (‘nomadic’) space, proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Others argue against Tim Ingold’s tenet that cognitive approaches alone cannot fully embrace how humans actually perceive their environment. Ingold himself, in the epilogue of the volume, counters by emphasising that many cognitive approaches tend to reduce knowing and knowledge to the spatiality of the brain, all too often neglecting the processuality and the bodily movement without which knowledge cannot happen. He likens neuro-imaging to the production of maps, a device of authoritative knowledge and a technique of depiction that cannot really capture temporality.

**Infrastructure, (Im-)Mobility, and Life Projects**

We have examined the topic of mobility and spatiality in Russia’s peripheries from manifold perspectives. These include migration in search of employment and income from China to Russia and the ways it is discussed in China (conducted by Artem Rabogoshvili) and informal, web-based practices of international mobility across Siberia (Denis Zuev’s research on couch-surfing).

Our research highlights that the land, in its spatial quality, is not necessarily an asset for the inhabitants of Siberia, but rather frequently a problem. Roads, railways, and other infrastructure were mainly built in Soviet times: they largely reflect the strongly hierarchical character of the administrative division. Zuev and Habeck describe how rural dwellers’ activities and itineraries are shaped by this ‘dendritic infrastructure’ in its remotest ramifications, and identify vernacular strategies to compensate for the lack or absence of transport. Using the example of the Terskii Coast, Kola Peninsula, Nakhshina shows how local inhabitants try to carve out their existence in face of the difficulties of immobility and the withdrawal of the state.

Contemporary Russian city dwellers often think that those who live in the village – especially young people – miss out on ‘modern life’ (Gernet, too, has documented this belief). Nakhshina further suggests that a more optimistic view of contemporary life in rural Russia should also pay attention to the villagers’ creative engagement with their environment, which is a source of personal fulfilment and satisfaction for many. Some Kola villages, and also certain areas of Siberia, have increasingly witnessed an influx of seasonal or weekend residents. This novel trend of affluent, jaded urbanites purchasing houses in rural areas has been providing a more stable basis for the further existence of the place, while however also bringing unrest to the old residents’ community.

**Lifestyle**

The above paragraphs tie into the theme that was chosen to become the main project of the Siberian Studies Centre for the last few years: *Conditions and Limitations*
of Lifestyle Plurality in Siberia. The project, which is now in the course of being completed, has studied the dynamics behind people’s choices of how to furnish their lives with meaning. We argue that the range of options that an individual or group is given in terms of pursuing different ways of life has been changing, and we want to understand the factors shaping that range.

In terms of theoretical advancement, our task is to find out whether and how a basic concept of social-science theory – a concept that centrally connects social structure, inequality, normative practice, and expressive modes of identification – can be extended beyond its conventionally urban, Euro-American explanatory context, and employed in a regionally different field.

Taken as an expressive mode of identification, the concept of lifestyle can be an important element in the further development of a comprehensive theory of identification. The anthropological study of Siberia, greatly shaped by inquiries into ethnicity, can benefit from a fresh, sociologically informed perspective; and by the same token, sociological theory will benefit from an analysis of how lifestyle plays out in regions far from urban centres, where ‘tradition’ allegedly prevents people somehow from developing any notion of lifestyle, as some sociologists have claimed. Siberia, as a region where neo-traditionalism itself has emerged as one among several options of asserting one’s identity and rootedness, is a prime terrain for scrutinising the tenet that the relevance of lifestyles is limited to ‘Western’ or capitalist societies. In addition, regarding lifestyle as being exclusive to the better-off segments of the population involves a fundamental misunderstanding of this body of theory, and its power to elucidate social change in the contemporary world. Key to the lifestyle concept is the insight that the expressive choices individuals make are themselves integrated into contemporary forms of social structuration.

Depictions of Happiness, Accounts of Incompleteness
Research for the Lifestyle Plurality project comprised photo elicitation interviews, conducted by Siberianists in 11 locations, rural and urban, with a total of 70 interlocutors. These were asked, well before the interview, “to choose six pictures which best characterise you as personality in different periods of your life”. Jaroslava Panáková (Bagdasarova) conducted a first analysis of the 480 photographs collected during these interviews. She observes that when shown to others, photographs serve to give testimony to moments of happiness and to mark one’s place in some type of collective: family, friends and peers, voluntary associations, or the collective at work.

This self-within-the-collective message is of even higher importance than the intention of creating a biographical account (or “biographical illusion”, as Bourdieu

pointed out). Decisions as to which pictures can be chosen for self-presentation reveal pervasive expectations on gender roles and social status.

In contrast to the depictions of achievement and happiness, the verbal accounts around the photographs, which came up in the photo elicitation interviews, were often stories of longing or lack, conflict or divorce, and generally the failure to sustain the collective (marriage, family, etc.) as the source of personal happiness.

Moreover, Panáková has examined the aesthetic conventions that come to the fore in the process of photographing. These follow the standards promoted over several decades by educational and cultural institutions (as the Houses of Culture, see below), with regard to both the selection of motifs and the composition of the picture. These comprise, for example, the ubiquitous photograph of the newlywed couple at the local monument to war heroes. Another example is the family photograph in front of the wall carpet in the living room, expressing social status, ‘culturedness’, wealth, and cosiness. Such practices are common throughout Russia, with very little regional variation.2

Differences between ethnic groups can be found, however, with regard to the composition of another visual medium – drawings – as has been shown by Istomin, Panáková, and Patrick Heady in a study on Nenets, Chukchi/Yup’ik, and Russian children’s drawings, published in Cognitive Science. They corroborate earlier findings on cultural differences in perceptual processing and artistic style and they argue that the research on cognitive aspects of environmental perception should not be dismissed. This position is also held by Brian Donahoe, as mentioned above.

2 Typical part of wedding rituals in Russia: bride and groom pose for a photo at the memorial of the Great Patriotic War, 1941–1945, emphasising their connection with earlier generations.

(Photo: I. Schröder, 2011)
Habeck’s Habilitationsschrift (post-doctoral thesis) builds on the Centre’s earlier research on the House of Culture yet shifts the analysis towards the role of the self in public performances of ‘culturedness’, arguing that it can be understood as an aestheticised act of self-improvement and self-disciplining. The thesis manuscript will be published by Transcript Publishers in mid-2014.

Eleanor Peers has been working on a related issue, discussing the ways in which a peculiar version of aesthetics, developed since the 1930s, continues to determine how presentations of ethnicity in the public sphere should be framed. Much of the responsibility for such performances rests on the shoulders of such groups as national-cultural organisations (natsional’no-kul’turnye organizatsii). On the example of the Baikal region, Artem Rabogoshvili has been exploring how these groups are constituted and how they participate in public displays of ‘unity in diversity’, organised with the support of regional administrations, but also how some activists express their dissatisfaction with the highly formal and at times old-fashioned character of such presentations.

Buryatia and the wider Baikal region is the area where over the last few years, Halle Siberianists have been most intensively studying processes of politico-administrative changes, reformulations of nationality policies, and public spaces for the assertion of ethnicity. Administrative mergers indicate an important shift in Russia’s policy as concerns the rights of ethnic groups: namely, the transition from a territorial model of national autonomy initially implemented by Lenin towards a model of cultural autonomy that dispenses with territorial entitlements. Effectively, ethnic self-awareness is now relegated to the ‘cultural’ rather than the political sphere (as has been argued, among others, by Long and Peers). While in line with international conventions that defend the rights of ethnic minorities, centralisation entails a diminution of ethnic entitlements and the influence of national elites in the Russian Federation.

The mechanisms whereby cultural and pedagogical institutions seek to channel ethnic and national sentiments are also explored by Ina Schröder in her research on ethnic summer camps in Western Siberia, where educators try to awaken a sense of self-awareness and worth by teaching indigenous (in this case, Mansi) language and traditional skills. In these summer camps, children and youth do experience a sense of personal development, where the continuation of Mansi traditions is choreographed in an improvised, ‘fantasy’ mode of existence. For the majority of participants who are from ethnically mixed families, the camp offers a social hub and the discovery of ancestral practices as a dream-like alternative to their experience of deficient social ties, the marginalisation of Mansi identity, and economic hardship in their home villages.
This trope of withdrawal from a dull ‘real’ life is also studied by Tatiana Barchunova and Natalia Beletskaya. Role playing is a temporary ‘escape’ and transcendence of the social norms of everyday life. Depending on the degree of commitment (or obsession), it can turn into the only desirable mode of existence. Role playing can be compared with other practices of withdrawal, for example, retreat to a dacha (weekend home) or to the forest (see below). These are spaces individuals use in order to live according to their own moral judgments and rules. Just as ethnic identity is, for some, the prime source of elation and exclusivity, so can self-made personal affiliations produce emotional – and at times fanatical – practices of distinction and discrimination.

_Luck, Control, Withdrawal_

Numerous publications on the anthropology of Siberia have discussed the linkage of spirituality and land use. Of those written by Halle Siberianists and guests of the Centre, four will be mentioned here. Csaba Mészáros, a guest researcher from Hungary, has shown in an MPI Working Paper how cattle breeders in the central part of Yakutia (Sakha), in their search for hay fields, try to take control of open areas (alaas) in an otherwise forested landscape, that is considered by them to be a generally hostile environment. These meadows, even if far away from the village, are like islands of intensive activity, connoted with ancestral ties and (generally benevolent) ancestral spirits. Such description of ‘control’ markedly differs from accounts (usually, of hunting societies) that discuss human-animal relations in terms of sharing, giving, and mutual sacrifice.

Ludek Broz and his co-author Rane Willerslev propose, on the basis of fieldwork among Yukaghir and Altaians, that hunting luck is double-edged: what appears to be the exceptional luck of the hunter may be seen by local master-spirits as theft – as a provocation that requires revenge; or the spirits may try to lure the hunter into an act of reciprocity, by which the hunter becomes subject to the animals’ world. Hunters can try to influence their interrelations with local masters and animal spirits, but they can hardly hope to exert control over the web of life that they are part of (not even partially, as the Yakut cattle breeders try to do). These ethnographies contrast indigenous worldviews with those of settlers – in the Siberian case, mainly Russians – and with the master narrative of technological domination and appropriation, so fervently promoted by the Soviet state.

Anett Christine Oelschlägel argues that among the communities she has lived with in Western Tyva, both worldviews – domination over the natural environment versus interaction and interdependence – continually exist in a complex and contradictory interrelation: they create situative frames for the identification of causal explanations and guide further action, and they come with different normative orders that can hardly be reconciled or brought into a coherent whole.

Stephan Dudeck provides a similar example of contradictory normative orders, exploring how Khanty/Nenets reindeer-herding families commute both physically
and mentally between their forest encampment and an oil worker boom town in Western Siberia. Both Oelschlägel and Dudeck emphasise their interlocutors’ notion of distinct spaces – niches, parallel worlds, and alternative modes of existence wilfully kept apart from interference from state institutions. These can be fractal in character, so that even the most official and solemn event – such as the carefully arranged display of ‘unity in diversity’ – entails moments of informality and conscious isolation.

Halle and the History of Siberian Explorations
Since 2004, the Siberian Studies Centre has co-organised workshops on multiple aspects of the history of science in Siberia with Wieland Hintzsche, a Halle-based historian, the staff of the Francke Foundations, and the Georg Wilhelm Steller Society. These workshops continue the city’s long tradition of academic exchange with Russia and scientific interest in Siberia, enhancing the visibility of Siberian Studies as a component of the city’s cultural and intellectual life. From the workshop contributions of 2008–2011, Hintzsche and Habeck selected a set of exemplary papers, supervised and edited translations from Russian, and published the papers in a collected volume, *Die Erforschung Sibiriens im 18. Jahrhundert* ['The Exploration of Siberia in the 18th Century']. The authors include MPI research associate Han Vermeulen and Sayana Namsaraeva, a former MPI Siberianist. The ensuing volume is meant to initiate further research into the ways that expeditions and scientific studies of Siberia fed into, and were informed by, the Russian Empire’s projects and administrative requirements vis-à-vis its newly acquired Eurasian colonies. The history of science in Siberia, and of the attempts of state institutions at controlling space and native populations, are a field where the research activities of the Siberian Studies Centre converge with those of the focus group on *Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia* (led by Dittmar Schorkowitz). This research should be pursued with a focus on the 19th century, as this period has previously received comparatively scant attention.
International Max Planck Research School ‘Retaliation, Mediation, and Punishment’ (IMPRS REMEP)

Bertram Turner

Outline

The International Max Planck Research School ‘Retaliation, Mediation, and Punishment’ (IMPRS REMEP) was constituted as an interdisciplinary research network connecting four Max Planck Institutes and two universities. The contributing partners during the reported period were the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg/Breisgau, where the central administration of the Research School is based, the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg, the Max Planck Institute for European Legal History in Frankfurt/Main, and the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle/Saale. The cooperating universities are the Albert Ludwigs University of Freiburg and Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg. The research activities of IMPRS REMEP in Halle are organised in particular by the Department ‘Integration and Conflict’, headed by Günther Schlee, and the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’, headed by Marie-Claire Foblets. The Research School’s university partner in Halle/Saale is the Institute for Social Anthropology in connection with the Graduate School Society and Culture in Motion (GSSCM), represented by Richard Rottenburg. The REMEP coordinator in Halle is Bertram Turner.

IMPRS REMEP appeals to young researchers in criminology, disciplines of jurisprudence such as criminal law and international law, legal history, and social anthropology, especially the anthropology of law and conflict. An integral part of the interdisciplinary Research School is a PhD programme integrating dissertation projects within the framework of the REMEP research focus. The total number of students involved in the network is currently 25, and the number of alumni 17.

Scheduled at first for two cycles within a period of six years, the research interest of IMPRS REMEP goes beyond the scope of a doctoral programme and aims at the establishment of an interdisciplinary dialogue between social anthropological and jurisprudential research. Regular winter schools with international experts featuring workshops and conferences on specific topics have been included in the research design.

Obituary

With great sadness and dismay, IMPRS REMEP takes leave of its faculty member, member of executive body, and former head of the Project Group Legal Pluralism, Franz von Benda-Beckmann, who died in January 2013. He was a dedicated and
enthusiastic teacher and very active and stimulating supervisor at our Research School. Just one month before his unexpected death, he was still teaching together with his wife, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, at the Halle-REMEP teaching course, which took place the very morning after of the official farewell conference organised in their honour at our institute.

The Department ‘Law & Anthropology’: a new contributing partner

After taking over the position of the director of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’, Marie-Claire Foblets joined IMPRS REMEP and gave new impetus to the research agenda including an emphasis on cultural diversity, migration, and the role of religion in the field of human security. REMEP, a transdisciplinary network uniting scholars from legal studies and social anthropology, constitutes an excellent tool to intensify internal cooperation among the Departments ‘Integration and Conflict’ and ‘Law & Anthropology’. It also provides a platform that allows us to pursue the new departments’ research agenda involving legal practice and applied legal anthropology as well as the comparison of legal cultures and processes of normative translation in a wider network. The REMEP framework thus meshes perfectly with the department’s aim to engage in research and teaching in dialogue with the field of legal studies.

Research Agenda Updated

Following the extremely positive evaluation upon the completion of five of the six years of the first term, REMEP applied to the Max Planck Society for a second research term of six years. The application for extension was used as an opportunity to modify the overall REMEP research profile by taking into account the research results produced during the first phase of the IMPRS and to adapt the scientific agenda according to the findings achieved so far. This led us move toward associating the existing profile with the issue of human security. The version of the updated agenda, as reproduced here, is an abridged version based on the detailed one Bert Turner has outlined on behalf of the Department ‘Law & Anthropology’. The extended version, to which all partners have contributed, will be posted on the REMEP website.

REMEP has its focus on the fundamental question of how peace, social order, and human security are negotiated, maintained, and re-gained. In this context we examine, on the one hand, retaliation, mediation, and punishment as three related aspects of dealing with the violation of rules. This approach implies a retrospective view of things and focuses on subsequent attempts to restore order after it has been disturbed. On the other hand, we examine attempts to establish rules with the intention of preventing disorder and conflict in the first place. Practices and technologies aiming at producing order and human security are thus unavoidably based on the presupposition that at least certain aspects of social development can and should be
anticipated or regulated. They also imply the conviction that the actors responsible for producing anticipatory knowledge and for designing and implementing preventive measures and regulations, according to this knowledge, can and should be held accountable for the effects of their interventions.

The profound processes of social, economic, and legal transformation of the last several decades have demonstrated an urgent need to join interdisciplinary research efforts with the aim of new analytical insights into global attempts to maintain or restore human security.

In order to deal with the complex relations of local and translocal processes and to grasp the different ranges of ordering practices and technologies, REMEP is designed as a ‘scaling project’ to link three interconnected scales.

The first scale and point of reference for all our considerations remains the nation state with its legislative, judiciary, and institutional apparatus. In a historical perspective, the emergence of the modern state and the monopolisation of violence have established criminal punishment as the only legitimate form of violence and state-organised coercion as the only legitimate form of coercion when the maintenance of social order within the framework of a state and on its territory is at stake. However, the relationship between punishment (by the state), mediation, and retaliation in the attempt to establish and maintain social order and human security is far more complex and less evident than has been suggested by conventional normative and social theory focussing on the nation state as a given unit of analysis. Moreover, while colonialism has exported the European model of the nation state to all corners of this world, in many regions, a functional state with effective institutions does not always persist. In some cases of dysfunctional states, transnational actors intervene to generate new forms of normative and institutional hybridity; this, however, often leads to new breakdowns.

The second and smallest scale we have chosen refers to segments of society that, for various reasons, are widely exempted from the rule of law guaranteed by the state. In a wide range of arenas, recourse to law and administration is either severely restricted or even entirely prevented. Instead, order is maintained to a large extent by agents who are not acknowledged by the state and who apply their own techniques, among them mediation, but also violence. Over the last several decades, policy makers have not only encouraged conflict regulation, victim-offender conciliation, and mediation beyond the judiciary, but provide a statutory basis for inserting mediation into formal justice systems. This shift towards reconciliation and mediation is an attempt to prevent future disturbances and conflicts and improve human security.

The third scale refers to processes of globalisation and transnationalisation. The governance of human security at the transnational level has recently attracted increasing interest. Security requirements find expression in the production of normative templates that address a variety of issues ranging from protection against threats to public safety to any given domain relevant to livelihood security. In this context, global governance institutions dominate the politics of securitisation by setting up
legal frameworks of security for essentially all domains of life. In this field, the monopoly of power and the nation state often step back behind international and transnational forms of policing and military cooperation, which are expressed, for instance, in the development of cross-border systems of collecting and exchanging information as well as in the emergence of supranational interventions and task forces.

Finally, as we distinguish among these scales, we are particularly interested in transscale processes. Some of them have gained importance due to increased human mobility and the emergence of multiple forms of belonging. Others are connected with globalised market developments, financial flows, and the circulation of technologies and models for organising processes. And lastly, some are linked with the contemporary trend towards subjecting states to international law. This trend is expressed most significantly in the establishment of the International Criminal Court as an institution conceived to improve human security. The relationships between retaliation, mediation, and punishment are of particular interest in this field, as the institutionalisation of international criminal law appears to be in use as a laboratory for experimentation. Within this laboratory, the scope of punishment seems limited, as are mediation and the reference to violence. The increase of truth commissions working parallel to ICCs underlines the necessity to create a balance between punishment on the one hand and techniques of mediation and reconciliation on the other.

Current PhD Projects

During the reporting period (2012–2013), IMPRS REMEP has entered into its next cycle. Lucia Facchini and Anne Fleckstein, who were recruited by GSSCM, our partner at the MLU, also joined REMEP, thus acting as a link between the two institutions. Another two members of the Halle team, Kaleb Kassa and Ameyu Godesso Roro, were recruited in Ethiopia and now strengthen the Africa segment of the Halle group.

The existing Halle group was thus reinforced by four more students. The students of the previous cycle have since begun their final phase of writing, handed in, or completed their PhD projects. Four of the current cohort, Immo Eulenberger, Zahir Abdal Kareem, Fazil Moradi, and Stefanie Bognitz, have completed their fieldwork while Lucia Facchini is currently doing field research in Italy. The two who joined most recently, Kaleb Kassa and Ameyu Roro, are now preparing their field stays in Ethiopia. The PhD projects cover a wide range of topics within the REMEP research agenda.

The Promise of Access to Justice in Rwanda (Stefanie Bognitz)
The project analyses mediation in Rwanda. In the organisation of access to justice, mediation is introduced as a mandatory, neo-institutional, and community-based level of jurisdiction. Mediation oscillates between the reinvention of tradition and
high-modernist state projects backed by the rule of law and good governance programmes. The mediation apparatus is ingrained in decentralised, administrative structures and provides access to justice for virtually anyone. However, a judiciary based on the principle of subsidiarity allows the state back in to govern ‘alternative dispute resolution’.

**Negotiating Social Justice in Post-Ba’ath Iraq: the recognition and reparation campaign against the Iraqi state** (Fazil Moradi)
This research project is set in the current context of conflictual politico-legal processes in post-Ba’ath Iraq. The politico-legal shift in Iraq has come to entail a space of possibility for the survivors of Operation Anfāl (literally, ‘spoils’) to claim reparations, which is now nationally and internationally recognised as a case of genocide, committed by the Ba’ath regime against its Kurdish population in 1988. The ethnographic study thus explores the ways in which involved civic and political actors make use of existing domestic legal avenues, international human rights norms, and global models of reparations to articulate and negotiate a measure of social justice for Anfāl survivors.

**The Ateker Region: entangled frontiers and ethics of interaction** (Immo Eulenberger)
This project examines the importance of retribution and mediation for the patterns of social organisation in a Northeast African border region where nomadic pastoralists coexist with an expanding modern order. Studying the Ateker region of Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, and South Sudan, the project employs context and discourse analysis as well as in-depth studies of collective violence as a systematic practice to explain the resilience of cultures of ethnic warfare and their entanglement with the local manifestations of global phenomena.

**Processes of Ethnic Identification in the Course of Land-Based Conflicts in South Gedaref State, Eastern Sudan** (Zahir Musa Abdal-Kareem)
The project investigates the issue of identification in relation to land-based conflicts in southern Gedaref state, eastern Sudan, with reference to the relations between mobile herders and sedentary farmers. The key question is whether land-based conflicts are affected by land overutilisation. Ultimately, more complex webs of conflictive parties turn out to be involved.

**Changing Pattern of Conflict, ‘Retaliation’ and Mediation: the Hamer-Dassanech areas, southern Ethiopia** (Kaleb Kassa)
Conflict has continued to be a ‘common feature’ among the postural communities in southern Ethiopia. This region of the country has been considered to be one of the ‘hot-spots’ of conflict in East Africa, reflecting the higher rate of conflicts and its effects, and the complexity of the resolution process. Against this background, this
project aims to address how conflict, retaliation, and mediation are conceptualised, integrated, and reflected in the everyday lives of Hammer-Dassanech communities.

_Transformation in Gumuz-Oromo Relations: identity, conflict, and social order in Ethiopia_ (Ameyu Godesso Roro)
The study aims at examining the dynamism of Gumuz-Oromo relations in the framework of conflict and social order. It focuses on the general question of how the formation of regional states in Ethiopia after 1991 led to the re-examination and exacerbation of relationships between the Gumuz and Oromo neighbours.

“Establishing as Complete a Picture as Possible”. _Media and technologies of truth in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission_ (Anne Fleckstein)
The project deals with the procedures, technologies, and media which contribute to the establishment and authorisation of epistemological and political order and the passing on of historical knowledge. It seeks to introduce cultural and media studies analysis into the discourse on political transitions and to highlight the connection of media, law, politics, and historiography.

_Formal and Informal Migration Management in Italy: local, national and transnational factors_ (Lucia Facchini)
This project is focused on the phenomenon of international migration in Italy. Widespread, deep-rooted institutional gaps have led there to the diffusion of precarious and informal immigration patterns, in which the access to services tends to be non-homogeneous and particularly dependent on local contingencies. In such a context, it is crucial to investigate the various roles played in the prevention or exacerbation of social tensions among individuals as well as collective actors – from authorities to trade unions and NGOs, including criminal groups. My main effort will be to recognise and evaluate institutional and informal practices in dealing with such problematic situations.
REMEP Activities

The reporting period was extraordinarily intensive in terms of both research and other activities. The Halle group actively contributed to the general REMEP agenda, to the prominent inclusion of an evaluation in Freiburg in February 2012 and the Winter Universities in Hinterzarten in February 2012 and in Heppenheim in February 2013. The Halle team was particularly involved in the organisation of panels on transitional justice, on ritual, on survivors’ responses to past and present injustices, and on conflict, cooperation, and security.

In addition to the general REMEP agenda, a number of events took place at the local level in Halle. After recruitment was completed in October 2013, a new round of introductory workshops at all four contributing Max Planck Institutes for the newcomers followed. A teaching course, moreover, took place in Halle in December 2012 bringing together new REMEPs from Freiburg and Halle.

In view of the upcoming international conference on the same issue, Fazil Moradi and Stefanie Bognitz organised a preparatory workshop in October 2013, which was entitled: On Mediation: forms, models, and theories. REMEP faculty members, PhD students, and invited guests attended this workshop.
The regular REMEP Round Table was resumed, focusing on the issue of human security and the ways the concept is related to the core subject area of REMEP. As can be seen in the individual lists of activities, REMEP students were involved in publication projects and actively participated in conferences and workshops beyond the REMEP framework.

**Outlook**

After the evaluation and successful re-application, the second six-year term will begin in January 2014 and end in 2019. Apart from the new emphasis on human security in the framework, the new term brings with it a number of changes in the organisational and personal structure at IMPRS-REMEP, and particularly the change in the lead from Prof. Albrecht to Prof. Schlee, who will take on the role of spokesperson from January 2014 as Prof. Albrecht becomes deputy spokesperson. The IMPRS administration will, furthermore, shift from Freiburg to Halle, connected with the move of the position of the central coordinator from MPI Freiburg to MPI Halle. Bert Turner withdrew as a coordinator of the Halle team and remains a faculty member.

The first event in 2014 will be the International Conference *On Mediation* to take place in Frankfurt in February. The timing of the event involves another shift, namely the postponement of the REMEP University from its traditional winter date to the summer.
International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE)

Daria Sambuk

Introduction

The International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE) was launched in 2012 as a cooperative project of the “Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia” Department of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology and three institutes of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg: the Institute of History, the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, and the Institute for Art History and European Archaeology. In addition, two graduate schools of the university contribute to the recruitment and funding of ANARCHIE students: “Society and Culture in Motion” and “Enlightenment – Religion – Knowledge”.

ANARCHIE is governed by a Principal Faculty consisting of senior staff in the participating disciplines, who also supervise the doctoral projects. The Faculty is headed by three Speakers, and overall responsibility lies in the hands of Chris Hann, who also represents the field of anthropology. In setting up the school, Hann worked very closely with Michael G. Müller, who has recently been replaced as the representative for history by Andreas Pečar. François Bertemes plays the leading role for archaeology. The ANARCHIE coordinator is Daria Sambuk.

IMPRS ANARCHIE is designed for three cohorts of twelve PhD students, each involving all three disciplines. The first cohort was recruited in 2012; the others will follow in 2014 and 2015. Each cohort works around a core theme: “collective identifications” for the first, “religion and ritual” for the second, and “economic and demographic drivers of social change” for the third. Each of these themes can be addressed in the broadest possible time span, from the Neolithic to the present day, across the entire Eurasian landmass.

The ultimate aim of ANARCHIE is to renew interdisciplinary contact between anthropology, archaeology, and history. Jointly taught courses in the first two semesters lay the theoretical and methodological foundations of the programme. Winter and summer schools offer platforms to discuss the projects with the local scientific community and with internationally renowned experts.
Research Agenda

The impulse behind ANARCHIE was born out of the awareness that contacts between these three fields of study have weakened in the course of the professionalisation of the academy. It might be argued (and still is in some places) that archaeology and anthropology are both latecomers, “subsidiary” to the classical discipline of history. In modern universities they are often to be found outside the humanities, the traditional home of Clio. Anthropology has successfully reinvented itself to escape from its longstanding association with the Naturvölker. Both in terms of empirical range and theoretical innovation, the discipline has been dynamic in the postcolonial era. Arguably, however, the changes have been greater in archaeology, above all as a result of a rapprochement with the natural sciences and ever more sophisticated methods. The disciplines have been going their separate ways for a long time, such that nowadays, even when archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians ask similar questions, they lack the training and knowledge that would permit them to consider the perspectives of their erstwhile colleagues.

Although ANARCHIE does not support projects devoted exclusively to disciplinary history, the curriculum does provide coverage of the main trends. Dialogue between the disciplines has been encouraged from the very beginning of the programme, together with an awareness of the big questions underpinning all three. The introductory courses into methods and theoretical concepts explicitly open up comparative and interdisciplinary approaches. Although every PhD student has a clear disciplinary affiliation (a requirement of the Martin Luther University, which does not award joint degrees), each project is expected to draw significantly on at least one of the other two disciplines; this is reflected in the composition of each student’s Advisory Committee.

Using the vocabulary of multiple temporalities, IMPRS questions established modes of periodisation. With the notion of multiple geographies, it explores the construction of historical regions, as well as states and ethnicities. Ultimately, ANARCHIE postulates the Eurasian landmass from Japan to the British Isles as a unity, thus pushing against Eurocentric scholarship, which has long insisted on a “continental” divide between Europe and Asia. We emphasise interaction and the movement of people, ideas, goods, and technologies. It follows that some of the theories devised to analyse contemporary capitalist globalisation may be relevant (albeit on smaller scales) to phenomena of the preindustrial era. In recent and contemporary scholarship, historians such as Jürgen Osterhammel, archaeologists such as Andrew Sherratt, and anthropologists such as Jack Goody have gone against the grain of disciplinary specialisation. ANARCHIE students are encouraged to respect and follow such trails.
Interdisciplinary Cooperation

Interdisciplinary dialogue is fostered by focusing on multivalent contested concepts such as ‘culture’, ‘society’, ‘civilisation’, ‘ethnicity’, ‘class’, ‘network’, ‘identification’, and ‘state’. Can we agree on common definitions and operationalise them?

In conceptualising their projects, students are encouraged from the outset to consider insights from the other disciplines. That no social, cultural, or economic phenomena can be understood and made plausible without historical grounding, has become evident to the MPI anthropologists, who have learned that written historical sources can also be approached with anthropological questions and techniques that often originate in anthropologically inspired historical research. From archaeologists, they may acquire greater awareness of the built environment and the constructed character of space.

As for archaeologists, whose research is unthinkable without a materially based concept of culture, they have much to learn from anthropological warnings of the pitfalls of assuming tight connections between material traces and ethnicity. Archaeologists, who cannot rely on written sources, may instead, if the proper caveats are entered, make constructive use of recent anthropological research to draw parallels or analogies with the modes of communication or production techniques of the non-literate, non-industrial groups they study. Both archaeologists and historians can profit from fresh developments in network analysis and debates over the performative aspects of social action, fields very actively developed in anthropology. For historians, one benefit of close cooperation with anthropologists is the refinement of methods of oral history; here again there can be reciprocal benefits for anthropologists, as several ANARCHIE anthropologists are combining oral history research with archival work.

Synergies between the individual projects have already been numerous, leading to unlikely but fruitful further questions. Does the construction of the past and its instrumentalisation in the course of identity formation follow a similar logic in Early Modern England and contemporary Mongolia? Did the transfer of goods and technologies affect the local societies of the Bronze Age Aegean and medieval Central Europe in basically similar ways? Can a detailed study of local networks in a German town in the late Wilhelmine era reveal mechanisms that might help to reconstruct social relations as among the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Etruscans?
Current PhD Projects

The first cohort of PhD students, those who started their work in Halle in October 2012, is conducting research which falls in one way or another under the umbrella topic of collective identifications. The group consists of twelve internationally recruited young researchers, four from each discipline. Their projects focus on various regions across Eurasia: the Aegean, Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and China. The chronological framework of the first cohort stretches from the Bronze Age to the present. The anthropological projects typically pay close attention to uses made of the past in the present, and to how different versions of the past are promoted by different actors.

*Morphing “Chineseness”: the negotiation between history and modernity in Xi’an* (Leah Cheung Ah Li, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Graduate School “Society and Culture in Motion”)

This research project investigates the process of heritage making in Xi’an, the most ancient city in China, which is currently experiencing intensive industrial and urban development. Leah Cheung analyses how historical and archaeological sites are used to represent Chinese “history” in order to construct a common Chinese identity.

*Oral Traditions and Moral Citizens: historical anthropology of Kyrgyz oral poetry performances* (Mustafa Coşkun, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)

Mustafa Coşkun’s research aims at a comparative analysis of oral poetry in Soviet and post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan, where oral poetry performances have long been embedded into the moral and political language and constitute a prominent aspect of the social life of the population. Since oral poetry performances have become a fertile ground for the circulation of moral vocabulary and expression of socio-political commentary, their study will lead to new insights into both socialist and postsocialist modernisation projects.

*Acculturation in Thracia and Moesia Inferior from the 1st to the 4th century AD. The role of the settlers of the eastern Roman provinces as a cultural medium* (Daniel Delchev, archaeology – Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)

On the basis of archaeological evidence, epigraphic, numismatic, and written sources, Daniel Delchev studies the eastern Balkans as a bridge for cultural exchange between eastern and western parts of Eurasia. The aim of the project is to analyse the role of settlers as a cultural medium: their origins, and their impact on material culture and society as a whole.

By examining the oeuvre and reconstructing the social environment of the historian Paul Rapin Thoyras, a French Huguenot émigré, Miriam Franchina seeks to shed light on the European identity discourse of the early 18th century. Thoyras’ best-seller, *The History of England*, reflects the emerging interest for the national past as a key to understanding the present and to creating a new identity based on the potentialities of human reason.

**European Stoneware. Innovation and transfer of technology during the medieval and post-medieval period** (Nadine Holesch, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)

This project analyses changes in European pottery, one of the most important materials in human daily life, across time and space. Nadine Holesch focuses her research on the diffusion of technology. The reconstruction of potters’ lives and working conditions allows her to draw conclusions about contacts between different regions and the nature of the relevant collectivities.

**Forms of Respect and Disregard in Mongolian Culture** (Elisa Kohl-Garrity, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)

Elisa Kohl-Garrity’s project tackles Mongolian notions of respect, which are very important for an understanding of history as moral authority. The study looks into the changing formats and framing of respect in various historiographical projects, which will be analysed in their specific socio-economic contexts.

**Communication Networks of the Southern Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Minoan Era** (Tobias Neuser, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)

In order to analyse the functioning of Aegean and east Mediterranean communication networks, Tobias Neuser focuses on storage and consumption vessels imported to the island of Tavşan Adası, where he has been excavating alongside François Bertemes. A study of the archaeological remains of these vessels permits original conclusions concerning trade and colonisation.

**The Architecture of Tavşan Adası in Its Aegean Context** (Michael Rechta, archaeology – Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)

Like his colleague Tobias Neuser, Michael Rechta is dealing with Tavşan Adası, formerly a peninsula and now an island off the Turkish coast. Approaching the mechanisms of regional exchange via architecture, he aims to shed new light on communication within the network, and also on the social and economic structure of the island in the Middle, Late Middle, and Early Late Bronze Age.
Between Luxury and Cruelty – Etruscan otherness in Greek and Roman literature
(Karoline Rolle, history – Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Karoline Rolle examines Greek and Roman descriptions of the Etruscans. By scruti-
nising the topoi, stereotypes, and arguments used in the writings, the project uncov-
ers the self-perceptions of the Greeks and the Romans, and the ways in which they
constructed and fostered their collective identities.

(Sascha Roth, anthropology – Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Graduate
School “Society and Culture in Motion”)
Sascha Roth sets out to compare socialist and postsocialist notions and practices of
family, marriage, and appropriate housing in Azerbaijan’s capital, Baku. The ways
in which families negotiate their values, norms, and relations and how they cope
with transformation and discontinuities are crucial for understanding contemporary
Azerbaijani society.

The Cross and the Hammer: the reception of social thought in the Catholic Church
in the first half of the 20th century (Jakub Štofaník, history – Institute of History)
The social programme developed by the Catholic Church and wider Catholic com-
munities in response to new challenges such as industrialisation, urbanisation,
the formation of a working class, and migration patterns is the subject of Jakub
Štofaník’s dissertation. Focusing particularly on Belgium and Czechoslovakia, he
examines the socio-political circumstances promoting and hindering the growth of
this diffuse movement.

Social Agents in Small Towns. The town of Delitzsch before the Nazis came to power
(Hendrik Tieke, history – Institute of History)
Hendrik Tieke sets out to reconstruct local social agents in a small town in Saxony in
order to reveal their everyday networks, alliances, and factions. A detailed examina-
tion of documents pertaining to associations, schools, marriages, etc. will enable a
more subtle and accurate picture of German society in this period than is possible
by focusing solely on political cleavages.
Activities

The launch of the Graduate School in October 2012 was marked by a distinguished lecture delivered by Stephen Shennan, Director of the Institute of Archaeology at University College, London. In his talk titled “Patterns of Long-Term Change in the European Neolithic” Shennan addressed the fluctuation of populations and their impact on social, economic, and cultural patterns, raising questions that can only adequately be addressed via a unified archaeological-anthropological approach.

The ANARCHIE winter school in Wittenberg in February 2013 featured keynote lectures by Louis D. Nebelsick (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw), Debora Gerstenberger (Free University of Berlin), and Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (University of Pardubice). Unlike this winter school, the summer school in Naumburg in July was organised primarily by ANARCHIE students themselves, who set up the programme, selected the external speakers, and coordinated their own presentations in the light of the entire programme as it evolved in the course of the year. Under the title “Identities in (Ex)Change: Interdisciplinary Approaches and Challenges”, the School was divided into three sections corresponding to central interests of this cohort: continuity within change; ritual and exchange; and social (f)actors of change. Alexander Etkind (University of Cambridge/European University Institute, Florence), Bruce Grant (New York University), and Roberto Risch (Autonomous University of Barcelona) delivered keynote lectures and greatly enriched the discussions.
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François Bertemes (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Christoph Brumann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Helga Bumke (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Kirsten Endres (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Georg Fertig (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Chris Hann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Christian Mileta (Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Michael G. Müller (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Andreas Pečar (Institute for History, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Dittmar Schorkowitz (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle), Hans-Georg Stephan (Institute for Art History and European Archaeology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg), Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle).
Publications

This list also includes publications based on research done while at the MPI although the researchers are no longer with the Institute.

Department ‘Integration and Conflict’

Books


**Edited Volumes and Special Issues**


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


—. 2013. see Hoehne, Markus Virgil and Dereje Feyissa. 2013.


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


Sancak, Meltem. 2012. see Finke, Peter and Meltem Sancak. 2012.


**Articles in Journals**


**Miscellaneous Publications**


Tubach, Linda and Peter Finke. 2013. Pastoralism in Western Mongolia: current challenges and coping strategies. In: Peter Finke and Günther Schlee (eds.).

—. 2012. Le pétrole de Doba, quels changements pour la zone. Tchad et Culture (311): 11.


—. 2013. see Finke, Peter and Günther Schlee (eds.). 2013

—. 2013. see Finke, Peter and Günther Schlee. 2013


—. 2013. Portrettengalerij: Instituut Culturele Antropologie en Ontwikkelingssoc
logie en Ontwikkelingssociologie, pp. 34–74.
Persoon, Gerard A. and Han F. Vermeulen. 2013. From Encyclopedic Collecting
to Global Challenges: the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development
Sociology. In: Joop van Holsteyn, Reineke Mom, Ineke Smit, Henk Tromp and
Gezinus Wolters (eds.). Perspectives on the Past: 50 years of FSW. Utrecht:
—. 2013. Van encyclopedisch verzamelen tot Global Challenges. In: Gerard A.
Persoon, Floor Hendriks, Iris van Genuchten and Anna de Keijzer (eds.). Gre
nzeloos: antropologie in Leiden. Leiden: Instituut voor Culturele Antropologie
een Ontwikkelingssociologie, pp. 10–24.
—. 2013. Van encyclopedisch verzamelen tot Global Challenges: Instituut voor
Culturele Antropologie en Ontwikkelingssociologie. In: Joop van Holsteyn,
Reineke Mom, Ineke Smit, Henk Tromp and Gezinus Wolters (eds.). Vensters
Department ‘Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia’

Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


Brumann, Christoph. 2012. Re-uniting a Divided City: high-rises, conflict and urban space in central Kyoto. In: Christoph Brumann and Evelyn Schulz (eds.).


—. 2012. see Bellér-Hann, Ildikó and Chris Hann. 2012.


—. 2013. Schools, Ritual Economies, and the Expanding State: the changing roles of Lao Buddhist monks as “traditional intellectuals”. In: John Whalen-Bridge


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


Sekerdej, Kinga. 2013. see Pasieka, Agnieszka and Kinga Sekerdej. 2013


**Articles in Journals**


Miscellaneous Publications


Makram Ebeid, Dina. 2013. And the Workers Demanded “Coal Mr. President!”.
*Al-Shorouk Newspaper*.


Department ‘Law & Anthropology’

Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


**Articles in Journals**


Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


**Chapters in Edited Volumes**


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


**Articles in Journals**


**Miscellaneous Publications**


Siberian Studies Centre

Books


Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes

—. 2012. see Ljarskaja, Elena and Stephan Dudeck. 2012.


Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals


Articles in Journals


**Miscellaneous Publications**

Max Planck Fellow Group

Edited Volumes and Special Issues


Chapters in Edited Volumes


**Articles in Thomson ISI (Web of Science) listed Journals**


**Articles in Journals**


*Miscellaneous Publications*


Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology

Working Papers, ISSN 1616-4568

Year 2012


No. 136: Christoph Brumann: Multilateral Ethnography: entering the World Heritage arena

No. 137: Csaba Mészáros: The alaas: the interplay between environment and Sakhas in Central-Yakutia

No. 138: Dorothea Heuschert-Laage: State Authority Contested along Jurisdictional Boundaries. Qing legal policy towards the Mongols in the 17th and 18th centuries

No. 139: Chia Ning: Lifanyuan and the Management of Population Diversity in Early Qing (1636–1795)

No. 140: Martin Ramstedt: Islamisation by Law and the Juridification of Religion in Anomic Indonesia

No. 141: Patrice Ladwig, Ricardo Roque, Oliver Tappe, Christoph Kohl, Cristiana Bastos: Fieldwork Between Folders: fragments, traces, and the ruins of colonial archives

No. 142: Artem Rabogoshvili: Between Idel and Angara – the search for recognition and identity issues among Tatar organisations in Siberia
Year 2013

No. 143: Günther Schlee: Ruling over Ethnic and Religious Differences: comparative essay on empires

No. 144: Jennifer R. Cash: Charity or Remembrance? Practices of pomană in rural Moldova

No. 145: Michael Peter Hoffmann: Labour Unionism in a Post-Conflict Context: Maoists, unionists, and formerly bonded labourers in an urban municipality in the western Tarai

No. 146: Minh T.N. Nguyen: ‘Đi chợ’ and ‘Mở Bãi’: gendered performance and space production in a rural-urban waste economy of Vietnam

No. 147: Don Kalb: Regimes of Value and Worthlessness: two stories I know, plus a Marxian reflection


No. 149: Christian K. Højbjerg, Jacqueline Knörr and Anita Schroven: The Interaction of Global and Local Models of Governance: new configurations of power in Upper Guinea Coast societies

No. 150: Roberta Zavoretti: Be My Valentine: bouquets, marriage, and middle class hegemony in urban China
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