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Preface

Chris Hann

The years 2014–2016 have been busy ones in the life of the department. We have continued to implement the research agenda which took shape in the years immediately following the foundation of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (MPI) in 1999. This report documents the following:

- In economic anthropology the Group investigating “Industry and Inequality in Eurasia” has completed its work (see my Final Report below, pp. 17–22). It has been followed by a new postdoctoral Group investigating “Financialisation” (see the report by Don Kalb, pp. 23–26).
- In urban anthropology, the Group “The Political Economy of Cultural Heritage” has completed its work. Christoph Brumann provides a final report below (pp. 29–36). He also provides a progress report on his current Group, “Buddhist Temple Economies in Urban Asia” (pp. 37–42).
- In historical anthropology, following his Habilitation at the Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg, Mikołaj Szoltysek has expanded his work on “Patriarchy and Familism in Time and Space” (pp. 44–52). Dittmar Schorkowitz has completed a major comparative project (Dealing with Nationalities in Eurasia: how Russian and Chinese agencies managed ethnic diversity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries) and is extending his research programme into “Ethnic Minorities and Multi-national States in Historical Perspectives” (pp. 53–58).
- The long-running Focus Group “Social Support and Kinship in China and Vietnam” completed its work at the end of 2016 (pp. 59–68).
- The Minerva Research Group “Traders, Markets and the State in Vietnam” led by Kirsten W. Endres has also completed its work (pp. 70–78). In 2017 Endres will begin a new project to investigate socio-political dimensions of electricity infrastructure in the Greater Mekong Subregion (pp. 79–82).
- Since July 2014, we have made steady progress in carrying out the research funded by my Advanced Grant from the European Research Council, “Realising Eurasia. Civilisation and Moral Economy in the 21st Century”. REALEURASIA is coordinated by Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (see our joint report, pp. 83–96).
- Founded in 2012, our International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE) has now admitted three cohorts of students. The first doctoral theses of ANARCHIE were successfully defended in 2016 (see the list on the inside of the back cover). A fourth and final cohort focusing on Representations will be admitted in 2017.
- The department has initiated a new Max Planck Research Centre linking Halle with the Department of Religious Diversity at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Cultural Diversity in Göttingen and with the Division of...
Using this Report

This report is produced primarily for the purposes of the Scientific Advisory Board of the MPI. That is why, according to convention, it opens with a full list of departmental researchers in this review period (2014–2016), and why it concludes with a comprehensive list of publications in this period. This list is structured according to categories used in previous reports. Books and edited volumes are listed at the beginning. To differentiate other references, the following superscripts are used:

- **chap** = book chapters (pp. 123–131);
- **TH** = articles published in a peer-reviewed journal included in the Thomson ISI Web of Science listed journals (pp. 132–136);
- **art** = other journal articles (pp. 136–140);
- **misc** = miscellaneous (pp. 140–144).

References to other works (including other publications by the department’s researchers) are provided in footnotes.
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INTRODUCTION
The department prior to a Wednesday morning seminar, May 2017. (Photo: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
(Front row, from left: Christoph Brumann, Kirsten Endres, Lale Yalçın-Heckmann, Anke Meyer, Chris Hann, Berit Westwood, Sascha Roth, Don Kalb, Mikołaj Szoltys)
Eurasia: topical agendas for an engaged social anthropology

Chris Hann

Almost all research in this department takes place within the boundaries of Eurasia, as set out in earlier MPI reports and in numerous publications. Encouraged by the Advisory Board of the MPI, I have devoted a further spate of publications to this subject in 2014–2016. My paper in Current Anthropology (Hann 2016a TH) has perhaps disseminated our Eurasia paradigm more effectively than previous publications. (A Chinese translation is forthcoming in China Scholarly.) In addition, I have propagated the concept of Eurasia continuously in my contributions to the “REALEURASIA” blog (see Part VII below, p. 95).

The key ideas can be quickly summarised. Eurasia, understood as the landmass of Europe and Asia, plus Africa north of the Sahara, differs from the rest of Africa and other world regions by virtue of the duration (over three millennia) of its experience with highly differentiated economies and polities. Eurasian civilizations developed new forms of economy, cosmology and legitimation which together provide the foundations for “modernity”. It is Eurocentric to attribute our modern world to industrialization as pioneered in Northwest Europe, or to the expansion of European colonial empires, or to earlier developments in the Mediterranean world. Rather, the Eurasian urban revolution of the Bronze Age was the decisive transformation – even more significant than the earlier spread of agriculture. This is the view put forward vigorously over many decades by anthropologist Jack Goody, with inspiration from archaeologist Gordon Childe. Goody is best known for his work on literacy and “technologies of communication” more generally, which led him to emphasize the cognitive advantages of a script (especially alphabetical scripts) for the growth of abstract knowledge. But the contrast drawn by Goody between Eurasia and sub-Saharan Africa is fundamentally a materialist one, based on differences in production systems and modes of holding and transmitting property. Within Eurasia, East and West have been systematically connected for thousands of years. Rejecting all versions of “European miracle” theorizing, Goody proposes instead a “Eurasian miracle” and a model of “alternating leadership” between East and West. Only in the nineteenth century did the gap widen dramatically, in the course of what historian Kenneth Pomeranz calls the “great divergence”. The advantage of the West was based on a combination of its new industries, technologies and military power. In the twentieth century the unity of Eurasia was expressed in the rise of socialist

---

redistribution across virtually the entire landmass (more or less democratic variants in the welfare states of the West and more or less repressive variants elsewhere). That era has since been replaced by a revival of market hegemony, seemingly on a global scale. However, the dramatic rise of East Asian economies in recent decades suggests that Goody’s notion of alternation retains its validity.

During the years 2014–2016 I have continued to engage with Goody’s ideas in a variety of contexts. Though his voice has fallen silent (Goody died in July 2015 at the age of 93), his contribution to scholarship is monumental and seems sure to provide inspiration for scholars in anthropology and adjacent fields for a long time to come (see p. 117). In some areas, however, it is already possible to develop a critique. For example, Goody tended to dismiss Karl Polanyi as romantically opposed to the market and blind to the role of commercial exchange in the transmission of goods and ideas. I argue that this rejection is short-sighted (Hann 2015c[11]). However, Goody’s instincts are sound concerning the basic connectivity of East and West. The urbanizing Eurasian societies of the Bronze Age provided the baseline for the global dialectics of capitalist political economy. Capitalism is a pan-Eurasian phenomenon. The emergence of an industrial proletariat in Northwest Europe from the end of the 18th century was of fundamental importance, but wage-labour has a much longer history. In an alternative formulation that has gained currency recently, we might say that the Eurasian revolution created the social relations that form the preconditions for the epoch of the Anthropocene (Hann 2016e).

This is an argument that privileges Eurasia rather than Europe. Some will question whether it is necessary to privilege any spatial entity whatsoever. After all, we know that animals and crops were domesticated in other parts of the world as well. Comparable phenomena to the hierarchical polities and legitimating cosmologies of Eurasia can be found elsewhere. Conversely, very large parts of Eurasia did not participate in the developments initiated by the Bronze Age empires until quite recently – long after connectivities to extra-Eurasian territories had been consolidated.

But these facts do not undermine the value of an approach which, instead of positing a unique European path from Antiquity through feudalism to modernity, allows for the tracing of comparable trajectories in other macro-regions of the landmass (e.g. in East Asia, where Chinese influence spread to Korea and Japan in ways analogous to the spread of Christianity across Europe). Nowhere outside of Eurasia did the “Neolithic package” have the same long-term consequences. To make this claim is not to fall into a crude Eurasia-centrism that replicates the Eurocentrism we criticize. Spatial and temporal categories must be deployed according to what it is one wishes to explain. A focus on Europe is entirely justified in accounting for the scientific and industrial revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries, when North-West Europe led the way. At the other extreme, according to the latest genetic studies the origin of our species, with its unique cognitive capacities, lies in Africa. But if one is interested in explaining the evolution of human societies to their present scale
and complexity around the planet over the last three millennia, there is no escaping the centrality of Eurasia.

This perspective is hardly original but it remains unfamiliar, or at any rate difficult to operationalize, in mainstream social science. Like Jack Goody, Eric Wolf also recognized the basic equivalence of East and West. Yet by confining himself to the period that opened with the expansion of European empires overseas, by defining capitalism strictly with reference to the industrial revolution, and by including only Europe in the title of his magisterial study, Wolf implicitly reinforced the meta-narrative of Western social theory. His conceptualization of the “tributary state” is a welcome complement to Goody’s emphasis on mercantile activity. Arguably, however, neither Wolf nor Goody paid sufficient attention to changes in the field of religion, in particular to the emergence of unprecedented forms of universalism. Whereas most theorists of the “Axial Age” have taken transcendence to be a pan-Eurasian phenomenon, Prasenjit Duara draws a distinction between the explicitly transcendental character of the Abrahamic faiths and the world religions of Asia. He argues that this cleavage is relevant to understanding contemporary dilemmas, including those of economic growth and environmental sustainability. This terrain forms the background to the project “Realising Eurasia: Civilization and Moral Economy in the 21st Century” (see Part VII below). For the purposes of this project we use the concept of civilization in the plural and define it primarily with reference to religion. At the same time, however, similarities and interconnectedness allow us to identify a common “Eurasian civilization” (singular) from approximately the beginning of the Iron Age onwards.

Jack Goody seldom used the concept of civilisation. When he did so, he preferred the archaeological universalism of Gordon Childe to what he saw as the Eurocentric distortion of the term by Norbert Elias. Relations between civilizational analysis in sociology and attempts to revive the concept of civilization as it was used by Marcel Mauss and others in anthropology were the subject of a Workshop convened by Johann P. Arnason and myself in Halle in summer 2012. The proceedings of this meeting, edited by the conveners under the title *Anthropology and Civilizational Analysis: Eurasian Encounters*, will be published shortly by the State University of New York Press.

Apart from this collaboration with a distinguished historical sociologist, it has been a pleasure to welcome historians as guests in Halle from time to time. My own research in South-East Poland has profited greatly from long-running cooperation with Stanisław Stępień (South-East Scientific Institute, Przemyśl), and also

---

6 For further discussion, see Chris Hann. Long live Eurasian civ. towards a confluence of anthropology and global history, under review at *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*.
from exchanges with Paul Robert Magocsi (Ukrainian Studies, Toronto). The latter has recently published his definitive history of the Carpatho-Rusyn populations of Central Europe.\(^8\) The first draft of this opus magnum, the author explains in his Introduction, was written during his fifth sojourn as “historian-in-residence” at the MPI, which he describes as an “intellectually inspiring and peaceful environment”.

Although I continue to delve into local and regional history in Hungary (Hann 2015b\(^{TH}\), 2016\(^{TH}\)), I make no claim to be an historian. To realize our goals in the historical anthropology of Eurasia, I committed the Department in the first years of its existence to the creation and funding of a senior (“W2”) position. The strategy was delayed for some time by financial and other circumstances, but eventually Dittmar Schorkowitz took up this position in 2009. In earlier Reports he has outlined the work of the Group he led until 2014, “Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia”. In Part IV below he reports on his recent activities, including the international conference he organized in July 2016, “Forms of Continental Colonialism: The ‘other’ Colonialism”. Also in this section, historical demographer Mikolaj Szołtysek sums up the results of his recent investigations into patriarchy in Eurasian family systems and the wider implications of patriarchy for inequality and development.

While historic Eurasia in the sense of Jack Goody provides an overall framework, it does not exhaust our spatial choices. Members of the department are not required to engage explicitly with Eurasian history. We do not aspire to cover all the macro-regions of the landmass. For many years our main focus was on the countries that

espoused varying forms of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialism. Between 2012 and 2015 our research Group “Industry and Inequality in Eurasia” broke new ground with field projects in India and Egypt. Members of the successor Group investigating “Financialisation” have selected specific locations on the Eurasian landmass as their prime field sites, but they also pay attention to other nodes of the global financial economy. It makes no sense to impose a rigid spatial demarcation when investigating contemporary developments in a thoroughly globalized world. This brings me to our own moment in history.

*Our Moment in History: neoliberalism*

My concept of Eurasia is historical, but it is premised on the notion that evolved patterns originating in Eurasia have a bearing on contemporary politics for the entire planet. For example, I argue that Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialism and the “electoral socialism” of Western Europe are better seen as close relatives, rather than as the opposing camps of the Cold War. Since 2008 elderly villagers in even the most remote regions of the People’s Republic of China are paid old age pensions by their state. The sum is small but the fact that it is paid at all suggests that the values of inclusive citizenship still have unifying traction across the landmass (see my report on the Social Support and Kinship Focus Group, below Part V). Welfare states are increasingly fragile in the present global conjuncture and care is increasingly commoditized, often transnationally. It is thus vitally important to draw scientific attention to resilient commonalities.

In practice, however, most members of the department pay rather little attention to the deep past. We study the present and many of us, especially in the field of economic anthropology, make frequent use of the term “neoliberal”. We are aware of the criticisms of inflationary use of this term in recent years, but it remains the best short descriptor for the era of global political economy that replaced “social democratic” or “Keynesian” forms of capitalism in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Neoliberalism refers both to an economic ideology that emphasizes the market principle and a “minimal state”, and (paradoxically) to a rapidly changing global economy in which state intervention frequently turns out to be the indispensable means to keep the market-dominated system functioning. Most researchers in the department concentrate on the ethnographic documentation of neoliberalism in the latter sense, from large cities to remote villages, in production as well as in consumption, and in all walks of life. Examples are provided below in the sections on economic anthropology (Part II).

When engaging with political economists, we tend to privilege classical sources. I have repeatedly drawn attention to the renewed relevance of Karl Polanyi (Hann 2014a*TH, 2015c*TH, 2016a*TH). The work of scholars such as David Harvey and Wolfgang Streeck has also been important for us – not because their analyses of capitalism at the macro-level can provide satisfying answers to the regionally more specific
questions addressed, e.g. by Christoph Brumann in his “Buddhist Temple Economies in Urban Asia” project (Part III) or by Kirsten Endres in her project on “Traders, Markets and the State in Vietnam” (Part VI), but because such localized investigations require an understanding of the global dynamics in which they are embedded.

**Organization of the Department**

The structure of the department has not altered significantly in recent years. The Director is responsible for allocating the funding made available by the Max Planck Society. I share leadership and coordination responsibilities with a small number of senior staff at the professorial and Privatdozent level. Somewhat larger numbers of researchers who have only recently obtained their doctorates are employed as Research Fellows on short-term contracts (usually of three years). Most of the department’s core personnel budget is allocated to support the work of these senior and postdoctoral researchers. The remainder supports doctoral students. In recent years the number of PhD students in the department has risen to match that of postdocs, thanks to additional funding obtained through my European Research Council grant REALEURASIA (Part VII) and through our multi-disciplinary International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia ANARCHIE (Part VIII). The department also has a small number of Associate Members, including Alumni who, although they may have moved on from Halle, are continuing to cooperate with one of our research Groups. The total number of department members at any one time in the years 2014–2016 was approximately 50. The average number of participants in our weekly seminar is roughly half this figure (because apart from the non-resident Associates, roughly a quarter of staff is typically absent for field research).

We continue to cover broad swathes of socio-cultural anthropology, as reported in detail below. In the present reporting period I was responsible for the Groups Social Support and Kinship in China and Vietnam and Economic Anthropology (in collaboration with international partners). Christoph Brumann and Kirsten Endres continued to lead their respective Groups (two in the case of Brumann). They enjoy substantial autonomy in devising their research agendas, and in planning fieldwork, conference organization and participation, and publication strategies. Lale Yalçın-Heckmann has been a member of the department since its inception. The final dissertations of her Minerva Group “Citizenship from Below in the Caucasus” were defended in the present reporting period. She is currently the Coordinator (50%) of the REALEURASIA project and (within its framework) is carrying out new field research in Anatolia (see Part VII). Together with Dittmar Schorkowitz and Mikołaj Szoltyszek, who previously worked as a historical demographer at the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research in Rostock, all of these senior staff have been active in the supervision of doctoral students in our International Max Planck Research School, ANARCHIE (Part VIII).
Recruitment and Working Conditions

I am often asked about recruitment practices and the basic conditions of work at the MPI. Whenever a new initiative is launched, all positions are advertised at the homepage and in other appropriate media internationally. (For example, we shall shortly be recruiting 12 students for ANARCHIE, to start in October 2017. Kirsten Endres plans to appoint two PhD students for her new project on electrical infrastructures in Southeast Asia, also with effect from October 2017). We regret that we are unable to consider ad hoc individual enquiries.

Doctoral students generally obtain their degrees from the Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg, but other arrangements are sometimes possible. Since 2016, following new guidelines from the headquarters of the Max Planck Society, all new researchers are offered full contracts of employment (rather than stipends). Doctoral students are allocated a fourth year of funding when this is warranted (as tends to be the case when the entire second year is spent conducting fieldwork). The working conditions have not changed significantly over the years. The MPI has excellent facilities, above all its library. It provides generous financial support for fieldwork and conference participation. Researchers have no need to worry about their technical equipment or to bother with writing supplementary funding applications. Student assistants support researchers in mundane tasks. Senior members of the department are expected to contribute to teaching at the Martin Luther University. Other post-
doctoral researchers may volunteer courses, in German or in English, if they wish to gain teaching experience. English remains practically the exclusive scientific language in the department (and the MPI as a whole). Some knowledge of German is helpful for social integration in Halle and we offer courses for beginners. The city has been transformed since the days of the German Democratic Republic. The Martin Luther University is the largest in the Bundesland of Saxony-Anhalt. Our institute is located near the river Saale, within walking distance of most university departments and the city centre, in a quiet neighbourhood of great architectural distinction. The department is housed in a beautiful villa of the Gründerzeit.

Cooperation

In addition to the links that individual researchers forge with partners in the countries of their specialization and with academic experts worldwide, some cooperative ties have a larger institutional significance.

Beginning on the doorstep in Halle, we have developed close ties with our Faculty colleagues in the disciplines of archaeology and history as well as social anthropology at the Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg. The principal instrument of this cooperation is our International Max Planck Research School ANARCHIE (see Part VIII).

Many of our activities in economic anthropology have been based on research collaboration with high profile international partners. The prototype was the Group which investigated “Economy and Ritual” between 2009 and 2012, in which Stephen Gudeman (University of Minnesota) played the key role. Two volumes representing the work of this Group were published in 2015 in a new series “Max Planck Studies in Anthropology and Economy”, published by Berghahn Books (Gudeman and Hann 2015a,b). Between 2012 and 2015 the theme of “Industry and Inequality in Eurasia” was investigated by a new Group also comprising 6 postdoctoral researchers. Leadership was shared between myself, Catherine Alexander (University of Durham) and Jonathan Parry (London School of Economics). These projects were completed in 2015, when an international conference was held (see pp. 17–20). A volume based on those papers, edited by Hann and Parry, is forthcoming in the Berghahn series. Between 2015 and 2018–2019 the designated topic is Financialisation and the international partner is Don Kalb (University of Utrecht, Central European University and University of Bergen). Don himself provides a progress report on this research below (pp. 23–26). In each of these Groups, the research partners have spent significant periods of time in Halle, working intensively with the Group and interacting with the department as a whole.

In terms of institutional partners outside Germany, it is appropriate to begin by putting on record our long-term debts to colleagues at the Vietnamese Academy of Sciences in Hanoi and at the Minzu University in Beijing, China. Without their help, our research in East Asia during the last decade would not have been possible.
Closer to home, I have retained numerous links to the communities in which I was trained, especially that in Cambridge. I am equally pleased to maintain close links to the University of Kent, where my Honorary Professorship has been repeatedly renewed. In addition, the present reporting period saw the culmination of cooperation dating back several years with University College London (UCL), and in particular with the Centre for Research on the Dynamics of Civilisation (CREDOC), where the key partner has been archaeologist David Wengrow. Immediately following Wengrow’s Goody Lecture in Halle on 8th July 2015, we convened an international Workshop titled “Inequality, Scale and Civilization”. In addition to other distinguished guests, this meeting was built around a strong nucleus of archaeologists and anthropologists from both Halle and London. Principal Faculty representing all three disciplines of IMPRS ANARCHIE presented papers at this meeting (see p. 109).

Public Engagement: “the uncomfortable science”

The department is committed to the public relevance of social anthropological research. I know of no better assessment of the issues involved than the speech given by Sir Raymond Firth (1903-2004) when presented with the Malinowski Award by the Society for Applied Anthropology in 1981. In Firth’s opinion, “an interest in application of anthropology to practical affairs goes far back into the 19th century”. The entire career of this New Zealand born scholar refutes the jibe (still heard occasionally) that the discipline was compromised through being the “handmaiden of imperialism”. Firth was temperamentally suspicious of radical positions and argued for “engagement” rather than political commitment. Researchers may have a greater impact if they critique “within the system”, rather than attack its fundamentals and experience prompt marginalization by power holders. The MPI is undoubtedly a kind of “ivory tower”, but Firth argues that such institutions should serve as bases for forays into thorny problems of the real world, rather than a bolthole to escape it. Ultimately these are challenges to which each researcher must formulate an individual response. There is no getting away from “tough questions” and slogans such as “working for the people” are sure to be facile. It is to be expected, according to Firth, that through their fieldwork anthropologists will be better at illuminating problems than at formulating comprehensive solutions. The situation on the ground is typically replete with tensions and contradictions. Firth (who had studied economics before turning to anthropology) concluded that:

As in times past, economics was sometimes called “the dismal science”, social anthropology may become “the uncomfortable science” if it identifies human

---

factors in ways people do not expect. But if we cannot become popular we may at least gain respect.\(^\text{10}\)

Much of what Firth set out nearly four decades ago would be endorsed by most anthropologists today. The need for detailed local knowledge based on long-term fieldwork is surely as great in the 21st century as it was in the 20th. Yet it is also true that much has changed. Many of the problems facing contemporary European societies derive from the accelerated mobility of capital (including “human capital”) and associated inequalities. This seems highly pertinent to the rise of right-wing populism in countries such as Hungary, where I have examined micro-level developments in the same village for 40 years. In a number of blogposts intended for a wider public as well as in academic journals, I have put forward explanatory arguments and presented the local point of view (Hann 2015\textsuperscript{misc}; see also Hann 2016d\textsuperscript{11}, 2016a\textsuperscript{art}).

But presenting the point of view of those who vote for populist nationalists can easily lead to situations of discomfort akin to those noted by Raymond Firth. In the late Summer of 2015 I was in the village of Tázlár and able to switch between TV channels to compare how the “migrant crisis”, with its epicentre in Budapest, was being reported in the mainstream media of Hungary and Germany. The coverage differed radically, as did the political messages; but the pedagogical intent was equally strong. German audiences were encouraged to form negative judgements of fanatical Hungarians, unable to empathise with helpless refugees and thus betraying elementary human rights. They were also told that the migrants would be a boon to the labour market in Germany (which was the preferred destination for the majority), where they would not take away the jobs of any native workers. Hungarian villagers, whether they obtained their information through TV, social media, or other channels, generally held quite different views. These were influenced by the dire state of the labour market in Hungary, which forced many (especially the young, including many with tertiary qualifications) to seek work abroad. It seemed patently obvious to villagers that the great majority of those seeking passage through Hungary to Germany were better off than themselves. Granting these migrants privileged access to the German labour market seemed unfair; why was there no comparable scheme to help their own people? Why could the European Union not organize more effective redistribution to create more jobs and raise wage-levels in Hungary?

When I reported this perspective to academic audiences in late 2015, both in Budapest and Hamburg I encountered a measure of suspicion. Did I perhaps harbour some sympathies for these dreadful nationalists? Should I be bracketed with the equivalent groupings in Germany, the \textit{Alternative für Deutschland} party or even the PEGIDA movement? An East German once told me that he was isolated in his canteen by West German colleagues when he expressed reservations about the policy to distribute refugees across the country, including regions in Eastern Germany

\(^{10}\) Ibid. p. 198.
where labour market conditions are little better than those found in Hungary. I have yet to be shunned in this way by liberal colleagues in the MPI canteen, but I cannot help but notice how wider social tensions are reflected even in our own small community. The reality in Saxony-Anhalt, where our MPI is located, seems to be that few migrants enter the local labour market at all; many move on as fast as they can to those regions where their labour is needed. But in *Mitteldeutschland* as in rural Hungary, populist parties are growing in strength. Anthropological research at the micro-level can illuminate the conditions in which these processes are unfolding and thereby correct some of the stereotypes held by many journalists and NGO activists who seldom venture far from the big cities.

Of course, anthropologists can do more than present the viewpoint of those whose voices are otherwise unlikely to be heard. As well as paying close attention to vernacular concepts, they will also scrutinise key concepts in the academic and media debates, such as “economic migrant” or “populist”. It sometimes transpires that the villagers’ perceptions are closer to the “scientific” facts than some liberal elites are willing to concede. Immigration does serve the interests of capitalist employers. It may also serve the general interest in countries which experiencing ageing and dramatic demographic decline. But, at the same time, most forms of migration pose a real threat (material as well as symbolic) to significant sections of the host population. These implications should be addressed and not swept aside in a spirit of cosmopolitan political correctness. This may lead to awkward moments in social-science podium discussions (not to mention personal discomfort) but it is consistent with the stance of Raymond Firth. In the example I have given, I see no contradiction between accountability to the public “at home” which funds my research (primarily German taxpayers) and my ethical obligations to the people I write about (in this example Hungarian villagers whose precise location I have never tried to disguise). Other researchers, such as those who work with certain categories of migrant, are likely to face more acute ethical problems; as Firth stressed in an age before ethical review was institutionalised, there are often no easy solutions.

---

11 This is born out in economics research with a quantitative rigor that few anthropologists can match. For example, *The Economist* recently quoted a 2008 House of Lords report to the effect that “every 1% increase in the ratio of immigrants to natives in the working-age population leads to a 0.5% fall in wages for the lowest 10% of earners (and a similar rise for the top 10%).” (A portrait of migrantland. *The Economist* 15 April 2017, pp. 25–26). For the case of the United States, see National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *The economic and fiscal consequences of immigration*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Apart from their impact on wages, immigrants may displace native workers in certain sectors of the economy; they may also impact negatively on prior immigrants. These effects are not inconsistent with the conclusion that large-scale immigration has positive fiscal impacts and boosts economic growth. But anthropological researchers will tend to be more interested in the consequences for social stratification, perceptions of unfairness and subjective feelings of identity. They are likely to rely on qualitative research methods; more collaboration with economists, demographers and other specialists is needed to explain the causalities at work.
Conclusion

I sometimes wonder whether, if Raymond Firth were still with us today, he might be inclined to adopt a more radical critique of the direction that global capitalism has taken in the last four decades. Like him, I identify myself primarily as an economic anthropologist. My research programme can be summarised as a historically informed comparative economic anthropology, with a particular focus on the (ex-) socialist countries of the Eurasian landmass. I draw theoretical inspiration from Polanyi’s substantivist school, which has a renewed pertinence in the present era of globalized “market fundamentalism”, as well as from the historical-anthropological agendas of Jack Goody and Eric Wolf, as noted above.

The department is predicated on a historical concept of Eurasia that also has contemporary political relevance. It differs radically both from the Russian nationalist notion of Eurasia and from common Area Studies usage in the West. Philosophies of history which pit “Europe” against “Asia”, treating them as equivalent continental units, are a source of dangerous myopia in our century. At a time when uniquely chaotic conditions prevail in the western macro-region of the Eurasian landmass (not to mention trends in North America), much academic and political debate has focused on how to make governance more efficient by “deepening” the central institutions of the European Union. But Britain’s vote in June 2016 to leave the EU is the most dramatic evidence so far that this path (as advocated by the likes of Jürgen Habermas) is hardly a viable option. The rise of populist political movements provides support for the theses of my Cologne colleague Wolfgang Streeck: democratic capitalism is undergoing a profound crisis, and perhaps only a strengthening of national parliaments can restore a modicum of legitimacy. But from the wider Eurasian perspective, the debate between Habermas and Streeck remains parochial.\(^\text{12}\) Both scholars concentrate on Western Europe. They do not engage seriously with the eastern half of this macro-region, let alone with the rest of Eurasia. Even our most gifted intellectuals are blinkered by the legacies of Eurocentrism and Cold War binaries. They fail to see that the way forward is to forge new institutions on the foundations of commonalities – economic, political, cosmological – which have evolved across Eurasia since the Bronze Age. These connections are illuminated – implicitly as well as explicitly, often from new angles and in surprising ways – in all the projects documented below in this report.

II

ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY
Industry and Inequality in Eurasia (2012–2015)

Final report by Chris Hann

Group Leaders: Catherine Alexander, Chris Hann and Jonathan Parry

Research Fellows: Michael Hoffmann, Eeva Kesküla, Dimitra Kofti, Dina Makram-Ebeid, Andrew Sanchez, Tommaso Trevisani.
Associates: I-Chieh Fang, Christian Strümpell

The Maelstrom of Neoliberalism

This project was launched in 2012 and its agenda was set out in previous MPI reports. As a climax to the activities of this Group, just a few months before its members dispersed, in May 2015 we collectively organised an international conference in Halle at which all six Research Fellows and the two Associates presented papers. In addition to other paper-givers (some of whom ranged far outside Eurasia), we were joined for the occasion by numerous distinguished colleagues who served as discussants. Michael Burawoy delivered a keynote lecture and summarized the proceedings at the close. All in all, this was an exhilarating meeting. The papers, edited by Hann and Parry, have been accepted for publication by Berghahn Books.

At the centre of this Group’s investigations were questions of labour force restructuring in neoliberal conditions. It is often pointed out that the term neoliberalism occludes as much as it illuminates, yet the influence of this ideology in the last half century is incontestable. Grounded in economics, more specifically in the doctrines of an Austrian School that emphasizes the necessity of markets and private property rights for economic efficiency, the political implications of neoliberalism have always been controversial. Much hinges on the role of the state. Despite the rhetorical claims of ideologues, who stress that its role is limited to regulation, the state is usually the dominant actor in the implementation of neoliberal policies. Moreover, despite the privatization that has occurred in the postsocialist states and elsewhere, in many countries, particularly in sectors of heavy industry such as steel, the state continues to own and operate large factories and employ large numbers of workers. This is the case not only in India (Parry, Strümpell) but also for the steel industry in Egypt (Makram-Ebeid).

Among the keywords of neoliberal economic organization are marketisation, deregulation, privatisation, and the flexibilisation of labour. All this has generally translated into substantial reductions in the size of the permanent labour force, exemplified in privately owned steel plants such as those studied by Kofti (2016bTH) in Bulgaria and Trevisani (2016bTH) in Kazakhstan. Where the core plants have not been privatized, a significant increase in outsourcing to private contractors has taken place. This has similar consequences in terms of reducing wage bills and increasing
insecurity throughout the labour force. That privatisation does not always have these effects is demonstrated by the case of the Kazakstani coal mine where Keskiä carried out her research; here, the new foreign owner has so far refrained from imposing radical change due to lack of familiarity with the sector and concerns for safety.

The power of trade unions has weakened almost everywhere. The usual pretext for ignoring workers’ voices is that any opposition to management proposals (e.g. to wage cuts, longer working hours, or an intensification of the labour process) will surely result in capital flight and the liquidation of the enterprise. However, the trend is not universal. The new food enterprise studied by Hoffmann in Nepal has unusually buoyant unions, associated with Maoist political parties (Hoffmann 2014TH). This Himalayan exception may have something to do with the sector and the relatively small scale of the industry. But here too, as in all our studies, the workforce can hardly be characterized as a homogenous proletariat. The general effect of the economic pressures of the neoliberal era has been to accentuate the significance of socio-cultural variation within the workforce. For example, Trevisani noted new ethnic tensions between Russians and Kazaks in the context of a steelworks nowadays owned by the same global conglomerate which has purchased nearby mines. In Bulgaria, Kofti noted deprecating stereotypes of Roma.

Neoliberalism is a helpful classifier of economic organization across a very wide range of contemporary societies if we apply it in the spirit of “family resemblances” (i.e. none of the features identified above need be present in each and every case). Recent developments are best grasped as accentuations of principles familiar from capitalism’s long history of the relentless pursuit of profit. This search for profit was significantly impeded by the gains made by labour in the heyday of the welfare state. In the neoliberal era, the pendulum has swung back dramatically towards capital, but the instability of the entire system was revealed in the financial crisis that began 2007–2008. In the context of industrial work, this is playing out in the rise of new forms of precarity and arguably the emergence of a new class, “the precariat”.1 Although several of our researchers critiqued this term, there was general agreement that traditional patterns of class struggle are taking new forms. In the pre-neoliberal era, especially where states played the dominant role but also in large private firms such as India’s Tata motors (Sanchez 2016), a cleavage opened up between workers who held permanent contracts and those denied such security, even when they might be carrying out the same or similar tasks. Those who obtained these secure jobs developed aspects of a middle class consciousness. This was based not only on secure employment and good wages but on a range of perks such as access to company housing, schools and healthcare.

The changes of the neoliberal era have a strong generational aspect that has undermined these arrangements. Fewer people nowadays enjoy the lifetime job security that used to be the great attraction of jobs in the formal sector, whether publicly

---

1 Standing, Guy. 2011 The precariat. The new dangerous class. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
or privately owned. Whereas that pre-neoliberal era offered many workers some prospects of upwards mobility into the “citadel” of the formal sector, our researchers found this to be significantly reduced; moreover, even those inside the citadel had been rendered newly vulnerable. It was the ability to pass on privileged jobs to one’s children that moved this segment of the labour force beyond the category of “labour aristocracy” and lent it a class-like character. These processes have been significantly undermined if not completely interrupted in the decades of neoliberalism. Today’s children must either wait patiently for years in the hope of being taken on, or seek their fortunes elsewhere. Yet, although the labour aristocracy may have been unsettled and “precarity for all” was a recurring theme of the conference organized by the Group in May 2015, the long-term contraction of this section of the labour force has done little to narrow the gap separating these workers from those outside the citadel.

In addition to economic ideology and the actual organization of the political economy, neoliberalism can also be studied from more culturalist perspectives, where the methods of the ethnographer yield insights not available to other social scientists. Researchers of this Group found that economic agents continue to pay a lot of attention to their family, their co-workers, co-ethnics and so forth. Yet they are also encouraged to view themselves as entrepreneurial individuals, always ready to adapt their behaviour to the general thrust of market rationalities and a retreating public sector. In the words of sociologist Nikolas Rose, through a process of “responsibilisation” of the self, the neoliberal person becomes the key actor: a self-reliant micro-entrepreneur in the economic domain and an active citizen in the political. This person is supposed to break the ties of traditional social relations and make choices by deploying new forms of technical and scientific knowledge, if only in order to cope with the new forms of “audit culture” in which s/he is enmeshed.

This new form of personhood does not mean that local cultural understandings cease to matter for subjectivities. The neoliberal person who emerges from Islamic spiritual training for employees in the case study of an Indonesian steel plant presented at our conference by Daromir Rudnyckyj has little in common with the individualism propagated by an Indian-owned corporation in postsocialist Kazakhstan (even though here too the dominant religion is Islam). In their contribution to our conference, sociologists Jeremy Morris and Sarah Hinz analysed the impact of

\[\text{For more on the citadel metaphor (which he first employed in the 1970s), see Holmstrom, Mark. 1984. Industry and inequality: the social anthropology of Indian labour. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.}\]

\[\text{This is argued most forcefully by Jonathan Parry, forthcoming: Classes of labour in a central Indian steel town. New Delhi: Social Science Press. See also Parry 2014\textsuperscript{TH}; Strümpell 2014\textsuperscript{TH}.}\]


Western models in postsocialist Russia. They showed that, in spite of inefficiencies and low pay, some Russian workers still yearn for the old Soviet forms of personhood and the sociality of the brigade.

How far do workers and their families internalise the allegedly “hegemonic” subjectivities propagated by neoliberalism? Some appear gullibly to accept fantastic forms of individual achievement, notably the Chinese migrant workers studied by Fang (2015art, 2016art). These village youth pursue their economic goals not through acting egotistically, but by working hard on their networks (guanxi). Since few of them can possibly come close to realising their aspirations to build an entrepreneurial career, we are perhaps too credulous if we take what they say about their aspirations to social mobility at face value. Do they really believe that their fate lies in their own hands? Sanchez’s explanation for why scrapyard workers in the Indian city of Jamshedpur do not bother to vote seems more compelling: his interlocutors, at the very bottom of the hierarchy and well outside any privileged citadel, have a more realistic appreciation of their capacities to effect change, whether by class action or self-fashioning.
Three Classical Theorists

During this project the core members of the Group had many discussions about theory and method. We did not always reach a consensus. The enthusiasm of several researchers for a Marxian class analysis came through strongly in several of the conference papers, usually in a Thompsonian variant (Sanchez and Strümpell (eds), 2014; Kesküla 2015). Yet the general patterns of the early twenty-first century could hardly differ more from those studied by E. P. Thompson for the case of early industrial England. Makram-Ebeid argued for retaining the framework of class, yet she found that its language in Egypt drew more on the cosmology of Islam than on any secular ideology. Similarly, threat of redundancy was repackaged by astute Indonesian management theorists as a challenge set by Allah (Rudnyckyj).

The application of class analysis has a special poignancy in the case of ex-socialist countries. Kofti reached similar conclusions to those of Makram-Ebeid: precarity affects the core of permanent employees at the Greek-owned enterprise she studied in Bulgaria, as well as all the various kinds of contract and temporary workers. In Kazakhstan, miners used to be the vanguard of the labour movement and local identities remain strong; but since there is no longer any guarantee that sons will replace their fathers, the social reproduction of the working class is jeopardized (Kesküla). On the evidence of our studies, with workers struggling to unionise effectively, even in those large-scale industries where the prospects for Marxist theory should be most promising, the future for class politics looks bleak.

The classical alternative to Marxist class analysis is the Weberian approach to multi-dimensional social stratification. While it is clear that different sections of the labour force have a different “class situation” due to the resources they own and their opportunities on the labour market, for Weber this is insufficient to enable predictions of social action. It is necessary to consider other sources of power and prestige beyond those related directly to economic factors. Our researchers found many examples of differentiation with respect to status/honour, e.g. contempt for uncouth diaspora Kazaks unfamiliar with city life in Temirtau, or certain categories of tribal in India and Nepal (Strümpell 2016b). In Hoffmann’s account, even the powerful Maoist unions in Nepal appear to serve particularist interests. Inequalities defined with regard to income, job security, and the labour process are modulated by a host of other attributes in the Indian steel towns studied by Parry and Strümpell. One factor adding to the complexity but commonly forgotten in textbook theories of industrialisation (because it was not of great significance in the prototypical British case) is the extent to which many factory workers continue over generations to retain close links to their villages of origin. Chinese migrants have no choice due to legal impediments to urban relocation, but the worker-peasant was also a key element in the industrialization of socialist Eastern Europe. Kofti shows for the case of Bulgaria how neoliberal labour discipline is obliging steelworkers finally to abandon the
mutual aid groups in which they have previously continued to participate in their native settlements (Kofii 2016b).

In addition to Marx and Weber, a third, increasingly popular source of theoretical inspiration in the neoliberal conjuncture is Karl Polanyi. Many commentators have seen his *The Great Transformation* (1944) as the key text for understanding the present revival of market ideology, long after Polanyi had dismissed this ideology as “obsolete”. Polanyi approached labour as a “fictitious commodity”, something that ought not to be reduced to the status of an unprotected good, to be bought and sold on a market. Whichever part of the globe one considers, there can be little doubt that labour is more crudely commodified today than it was before the era of neoliberalism. Yet the weakening of the citadels of industrial employment, in the West as in the former Second World, has also led to significant decommodification, as well as greater inequality and insecurity. Noting these trends, Michael Burawoy (in his contributions to our Conference as well as in his Afterword to the forthcoming publication) rings the alarm bells: when the forms of commodification destroy the very ground upon which alternative political movements can be built, global Fascism is imminent.
Financialisation (2015–)

Progress Report by Don Kalb (Central European University, University of Bergen)

Group Leaders: Chris Hann, Don Kalb


This research group began its work in the Winter Semester 2015–2016 and its members are currently (Winter 2016–2017) conducting field research. Six postdoc researchers in different stages of their careers were selected in the summer of 2015, after an exceptionally competitive recruitment process (more than 120 applicants).

Financialisation investigates the rise of finance in the social reproduction of societies and people, including 1) the consequences for peoples’ householding, calculation and planning; and 2) the multi-scalar contestations around and contradictions of these processes. The project extends economic anthropologists’ traditional focus on money and markets toward topical questions surrounding financialised capitalism in the contemporary globalised context. Debt, austerity, deflation, and expanding social inequalities are central features of the ongoing crises of capitalism. In all of them the logics of finance play a central part. Institutional disruptions and accelerating social, cultural and political changes, both locally and globally, are intrinsic to these processes. But current patterns and developments are not entirely novel; and they are certainly not the same everywhere. Different locations in relation to the history of capital accumulation display systematic differences as to the role they play within global financialisation. I myself have a long standing interest in historical capitalism, crisis and the role of finance in these crises and I will continue to pursue this interest in the context of the financialisation project.¹

The relevance of this project is underlined by the now increasingly accepted similarities between aspects of the current predicament and the calamitous crises of the interbellum. Indeed, finance, oligopoly, inequality, deflation, and global shifts of power are mutually correlated and mutually reinforcing developments: correlations that were the key drivers of the collapses of the 1930s. They are re-appearing today. As expected of anthropological research, our project will generate fresh ethnographic insights on lower levels of aggregation, but we are keenly aware of the salience of this wider context for our individual projects. We shall reflect systematically about

how our micro-insights can be made to speak not just to the larger national societies we are looking at but also to the world historical predicament as such.

Anthropologists have carried out illuminating studies of bankers and stock exchanges. This project shifts the focus toward social and relational dynamics of financialisation outside the finance sector proper. The group studies trajectories of finance in particular societies, practices and sectors, and among particular social groups, together with the moral backgrounds and the shifting social and political relations and contestations in which credit and debt are embedded. The states included in this project are Spain, Greece, Croatia, Germany, Azerbaijan, and China. Our agenda also includes formal or informal contestations around the rise of finance, inequality, class formation, social reproduction, and indebtedness. We thereby extend classical economic anthropology in the direction of a closer alignment with political economy approaches, both inside and outside anthropology, without losing interest in how individuals calculate and reason in relation to markets. The methods include ethnographic fieldwork, expert interviews, and archival research. All projects will apply multi-scalar perspectives as well as historically informed comparisons. We consider explicit theorising essential for this endeavor and, as in other economic anthropology projects in the department, we are seeking cross-fertilisation between Polanyian, Maussian, Marxian, and other relational and institutionalist approaches.

While earlier economic anthropology projects at the MPI (Economy and Ritual, 2009–2012; Industry and Inequality, 2012–2015) could draw on long-established research traditions and focus on well-defined territorial research sites for their ethnography, this project inevitably unfolds on more experimental terrain. The topic is still relatively new for all disciplines, including anthropology, and few of the junior researchers who applied to our call had worked on financialisation issues before (Hadas Weiss, trained at the University of Chicago, being the exception). Also, finance is not just an empirically delineable and territorially locatable sector such as industry or services, but embeds itself in the full panoply of social life. Even those researchers who continued to work in their country of expertise (Barrett, Bruckermann and Buier) had to shift their interests and questions to new fields and issues related to finance, credit and debt.

Natalia Buier, who had earlier been working on high-speed rail in Spain, and Tristam Barrett, who had studied trajectories of state making and class restructuring in Baku, had no difficulty in organically extending their interests in the direction of financialisation. The former chose the financialisation of infrastructure development, i.e. high speed rail, and the social contestations that were arising around it in various local settings. These settings included Ciudad Valdeluz, a dormitory town outside Madrid planned around a high speed rail station, as well as the Basque country, a historically decentralised urban landscape inimical to the inevitable hierarchisation of urban systems that comes with high speed rail. Spain, of course, has been one of the countries where international financial excess was channelled into local infrastructure and housing on a mass scale. Tristam Barrett shifted his focus toward
finance, class, debt, and the life course in the Azerbaijani petro-state, a site that had been flush with speculative capital. This state and its financial sector and households had fallen into crisis and had just been signed up for the IMF ward. For these two young postdocs, who had defended their doctoral dissertations shortly before coming to the MPI, the current projects are designed to generate fresh material that will help extend, revise and enrich existing manuscripts before these are submitted to an academic press in 2018.

Having previously conducted two major projects in Bulgaria, Dimitra Kofti is now investigating indebtedness in Thessaloniki, Greece, a city with 35% unemployment. There is a predictable deep popular divide in social sympathy and in political and moral discourse about wealthy middle class debtors and the poor. In a society that is drained of cash, as money disappears upward toward international sovereign creditors, even professionals such as lawyers often do not get paid, which complicates the socio-legal process and indeed the authority of the courts. It also complicates the discourse about the supposedly wealthy middle classes.

Having studied transformations in civil society in Serbia for his doctorate at the London School of Economics, for this group Marek Mikuš is investigating contentious processes around financialisation, credits and indebtedness in Zagreb, Croatia. The Euro crisis has focused a lot of attention on Greece and Spain and other societies that use the Euro, but the Balkans and Eastern Europe have been saturated with credit and debt too. High debts in Croatia, which under crisis circumstances cannot always be rolled over, in combination with falling real estate prices, have led to a boom in the debt-collection and debt-restructuring business.

The flip side of crisis and deep indebtedness in the EU’s South and East, plus stagnation in the wider Eurozone economy, is the decline of interest rates on savings in the North. In the German speaking countries, until now decidedly less financialized than elsewhere in the EU, this has precipitated a gradual transformation in financial life planning away from savings and pensions toward personal finance. Hadas Weiss studies this contentious transformation by observing and analysing financial education initiatives and their reception. She combines these data with financial life histories of both younger and older Germans. Rather than a local site, she carries out field research in seminars in various parts of the country.

Compared to German citizens who are only now being introduced to personal finance in large numbers, citizens, governments and corporations in China are highly aware of financial options, including investments associated with ‘green finance’ and ‘carbon markets’. The government is investing heavily in carbon awareness-raising and Chinese citizens respond positively to the educational tools introduced by the state. There are plans to link up the new ‘social accounts’ to personal carbon accounts. All this has been a key concern of the Chinese government as it seeks ways to channel surplus capital into carbon-offsets to reduce pollution and increase environmental sustainability in the context of intense industrialisation. Charlotte
Bruckermann studies these financial constructions in China, with a special interest in ‘green finance’.

This has been a very busy period for myself as in 2016–2017 I am transiting from Central European University to the University of Bergen and launching new and complementary research projects on value, capital and class (for some indications of this agenda see Kalb 2014bchap, Kalb 2015chap). Nevertheless, I am enjoying the work with the MPI postdocs enormously and have already learned a great deal about the paths and ramifications of financialisation in these varied settings. I have also made several field visits, which have been rich occasions for accelerated learning and brainstorming about methods as well as about the particularities of the paths of financialisation in these very differently situated societies.

Following the pre-fieldwork Workshop in July 2016, members of the Financialisation Group relax with their guests in Chris Hann’s garden. (Photo: M. G. Cammelli)
III

URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY
The Global Political Economy of Cultural Heritage (2011–2016)

**Final Report by Christoph Brumann**

**Head of Research Group: Christoph Brumann**

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

Between 2011 and 2016, this group investigated the political and economic conditions and consequences of a prominent global institution, the UNESCO World Heritage Convention of 1972. From humble beginnings, this international treaty has evolved into the globally most important catalyst and clearinghouse for heritage discourses and policies. The intergovernmental committee overseeing the convention, with the support of a secretariat (the World Heritage Centre) and three advisory bodies, has come to focus on the World Heritage List, both on monitoring the state of conservation of the currently 1052 cultural and natural properties in 165 countries and on adding further sites deemed to have “outstanding universal value” (OUV). The World Heritage title is a major global brand now and an important asset for promoting tourism, boosting national and local pride, attracting investments and development funds, and sometimes also improving conservation. Correspondingly, the hopes and aspirations pegged on World Heritage bids are often considerable, not least in Halle where the Francke Foundation was a much-touted but ultimately unsuccessful candidate in 2016. World Heritage fame can even transform sites into targets of violence, as demonstrated by Islamist radicals’ destructive acts in Timbuktu, Mali, in 2012 that ultimately occupied the International Criminal Court. As around eighty percent of the World Heritage List consists of cultural properties, this is also one of the most prominent arenas for the public discussion of culture; how exactly the “universal value” of cultural achievements is constructed is an interesting question for post-Boasian social anthropology.

In approaching this global institutional assemblage and its tacit premises, we followed a two-pronged strategy: I continued my earlier multi-sited field research of the central institutions and their statutory meetings while Cheung, De Giosa and Marquart conducted more conventional year-long field studies of World Heritage sites, all of them cities in Eurasian “transition countries”. The expectation was that the observations at one end of the World Heritage apparatus would shed light on the other end.

For the global end, I was admitted as an academic observer to five of the annual eleven-day World Heritage Committee sessions (2009–2012 and 2015), two of the biannual three-day World Heritage General Assemblies (2011 and 2013), and a number of other official meetings, conducted formal interviews in five languages with a large number of participants from all contributing organisations, often on
separate occasions, and scrutinised the vast documentary record. The observed period proved to be fortunate, as it spanned the tumultuous transition from largely expert-driven proceedings to a new regime where the self-interests of the 21 Committee member states and other national delegations determine the outcomes. The treaty states insist on their right not to be disappointed, career diplomats are firmly in command now (Brumann 2014TH, 2015chap), celebrating their own community, and the system has lost whatever teeth it once had.

This state of affairs, in large part, is the result of “culture chaos”, unresolved North-South tensions, and the inbuilt growth dynamic of the World Heritage system. “Culture chaos” results from the co-existence of an elite notion of culture with a broader, explicitly anthropological idea, without awareness of the inherent contradictions. Reacting to charges of bias when the European countries were filling the World Heritage List with their palaces, cathedrals, and historical town centres during the 1990s, the World Heritage institutions expanded conceptions of cultural heritage to include testimonies of everyday life, the vernacular, and the subaltern, thus paving the way for cultural landscapes, industrial sites, routes and canals, sites of voluntary and forced migration, and the like. The experts of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), however, remained in place and what is familiar to their art historical and architectural backgrounds, such as Baroque parks, still has an easier path onto the World Heritage List than, for example, traditional settlements in Africa.

The persistence of such bias is encouraged by the way North-South tensions play out in the World Heritage Committee. Even with the new policies, Northern countries were not barred from nominating conventional sites and using the new categories for their own candidates. Thus the most common case of World Heritage cultural landscapes was the European wine region. Southern countries, by contrast, often failed to meet the rising standards and since the unfunded World Heritage title is the only substantial reward, frustration mounted. In the 2010 session, large Southern countries in the Committee banded together for amending many of the proposed decisions according to their own interests, overriding the advice of the advisory bodies with their largely Northern personnel and the few Northern countries that supported the experts. This set the tone also for the subsequent sessions. Yet while postcolonial
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2 In times of increasing political and economic multipolarity, a division of the world into a rich and powerful “North” – or “West”, or “advanced countries”, often but not always implying North America and (Western) Europe – dominating the “South” is of course an oversimplification that does little justice to the actual global role of quite a few countries (such as postsocialist Eastern Europe, NATO member Turkey, China, India, South Korea, G7 member Japan, or Australia). Nonetheless, it remains an important structuring principle for, and convenient shorthand within, discourses and alliances in the international arena. Of course, the division belies the actual historical continuities and connections within the Eurasian land mass.
rhetoric and laments about global imbalances are often heard in the plenaries, little Southern solidarity has arisen. Instead, Japan and the more World Heritage-hungry states of the South such as China, India, Iran, Mexico and Turkey team up with the Northern list leaders to fight anything that might inhibit their nomination thirsts, thus preventing a more even spread of attention and resources. There are close parallels to what political economist Robert Wade has observed for reforms in the G20, the World Bank and the IMF around 2010 where it was also the weightier Southern countries’ pursuit of national interests that worked against collective gains for the Global South, resulting in “multipolarity without multilateralism”.3

Yet without the underlying expectation of growth, national interests in further World Heritage titles could not dominate the dynamics to the degree they do. Nobody proposes to close the World Heritage List and new designations make for happy news, even as the resources of the system fall behind. Were List access regulated by numerical limits or were there to be an overall cap, coordination might be easier. But as OUV is construed as absolute, the temptation for nation states to push their own candidates and help one another in talking OUV into existence is irresistible. Even so, almost all participants believe in the inherent qualities of at least some World Heritage properties – the really deserving ones – and this keeps the machinery afloat and the internal critics committed.

In a one-day MPI workshop in January 2014, historian Aurélie Elisa Gfeller (The Graduate Institute, Geneva) and I convened the historians, geographers and folklorists who have conducted comparable ethnographic or archival studies in the World Heritage arena and on the sister UNESCO convention for intangible cultural heritage (adopted in 2003). Debates centred on methodological questions, particularly the challenges of maintaining a researcher position when participating as state representative or consultant (“collaborative dilemmas”, as participant Chiara Bortolotto
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phrased it). Cooperation with Gfeller for a joint article on the history and present application of the “cultural route” category is ongoing.

For the local studies of World Heritage cities, we chose the historical capitals of three rapidly developing countries, Istanbul in Turkey, Melaka in Malaysia, and Xi’an in China. All these cities are former centres of imperial and colonial rule, the most celebrated strongholds of history and heritage of their nations (a distinction that Xi’an shares with Beijing), erstwhile meeting places of peoples and religions, and present-day magnets for cultural tourism, including foreign visitors. All three have experienced massive transformations in recent years, with major infrastructural and commercial construction projects changing the urban landscape and affecting the perception of the built heritage. With my own earlier field study of Kyoto⁴ – another heritage stronghold and tourist attraction – as a model, Cheung (Xi’an in 2013/14), De Giosa (Melaka in 2012/13) and Marquart (Istanbul in 2012/13) set out to approach the role of cultural heritage broadly, giving attention not just to the heritage experts and institutions but also to other bureaucrats, builders, planners, landowners, residents, businesspeople, citizen activists, heritage aficionados, and ordinary residents, taking into account the full range of positions and views. The place of World Heritage and other historical legacies in these people’s social lives and imaginations was to be charted and put into the context of larger forces.

What we observed was very much a transition-country model of dealing with cultural heritage. There is little readiness to give state-backed conservation apparatuses the autonomy they tend to enjoy in the more resourceful Euroamerican countries where, for example, the demolition or alteration of listed buildings is often severely constrained, backed by a largely unquestioned belief in the intrinsic value of heritage conservation and related concepts such as authenticity. But neither is there a widespread disinterest in and neglect of heritage and the past (as one sometimes finds in societies where the struggle for basic public safety and livelihood needs is more acute). Rather, in these three countries, cultural heritage is harnessed to larger political and commercial projects. It is expected to pay its way, in a sense, but is still sought after because of its symbolic weight that is not entirely reducible to vested interests. This tendency is more pronounced in the two multi-million metropolises Istanbul and Xi’an. Yet in Melaka as well, heritage anchors a whole range of projects and aspirations, and global recognition through the World Heritage framework amplifies the effect.

Instrumentalisation is most obvious in those projects that tie heritage to nationalist agendas. Xi’an stands as a symbol for past – and indirectly, also present and future – Chinese greatness. Reference to ancient times is heavily influenced by the government’s attempt to glorify specific dynasties, the Qin (creators of the Terracotta Army found next to the city), Han (first unifiers of the Chinese empire), and Tang (rulers

over China’s greatest expansion with the capital Xi’an/Chang’an as the world’s largest city). Monuments and sites connected with these periods are boosted while others receive less attention. This imperial optic also played out in a multi-national World Heritage nomination of Silk Roads sites in 2014 where the final, much contested selection of Chinese component parts included imperial palaces and Buddhist sites but left out all Islamic ones, such as the Great Mosque of Xi’an. Although the latter derive from the Silk Road, they would have complicated the Sinocentric narrative. In Istanbul, the elite Ottoman heritage has enjoyed increased attention in recent years, again as testimony to Turkish imperial greatness and at the cost of contenders such as Byzantine monuments or ordinary wooden houses from the Ottoman period that remain neglected, even within the World Heritage zones. And in Melaka too, empire is celebrated, with the Malay sultan’s palace reconstructed right next to the colonial structures of the subsequent Portuguese, Dutch, and British overlords. The present-day official politics of multiculturalism also leaves its mark on heritage, such as when particular historical streets are branded as exclusively Chinese, Indian, or Malay (the three nationally dominant groups, each with its own political party). In actual fact, there was much more ethnic differentiation in Melaka’s past and little segregation.

The nationalist deployment of heritage was less surprising for us than the scope of commercial appropriation. Xi’an stood out most in this regard: heritage including the World Heritage sites is often the nucleus for real-estate development, with a shopping and entertainment area around the historical site and rings of high-rise luxury condominiums further back, making for a trademark pattern that has been imitated across China. Tourism dictates the development of traditional neighbourhoods where both the building substance and the residents have been largely replaced, except in the Muslim Quarter, whose residents have used the politically delicate status of their religion in China to some advantage. The entire Silk Roads World Heritage bid with Xi’an as a cornerstone was part of Xi Jinping’s geopolitical initiative of the “Silk Road Economic Belt”, aiming to reconnect China with Europe via the Central Asian countries. In Istanbul, vintage facades grace the brandnew upper-middle class condominiums in historical neighbourhoods, and tellingly, president Erdogan’s controversial reconstruction plan for the former army barracks on Taksim Square would have housed a shopping centre. In Melaka, the entire historical core, with many of its former shop houses converted into boutique hotels, cafes and restaurants, is now ringed by high-rise developments, often on reclaimed land that ironically removes the famous harbour ever further from the waterfront. The poshest condominium, catering to rich Singaporeans and overseas investors, recreates the landmarks of historical Melaka in an indoor mall. Connections with and references to a glorified past, even in the skimpiest form, are good for marketing in all three cities. It does not have to be heritage in the strict sense. Reconstructions can stand in readily for the real thing: in the aforementioned examples, the modern-day shop house built for Melaka’s “Hard Rock Café”, or the “neo-Tang” facades lining downtown boulevards
in Xi’an. Demands of authenticity are often restricted to specialist circles such as architects and planners or conservation NGOs. Ordinary citizens tend to remain passive, even when they doubt the veracity of the historical relics (as quite a few domestic visitors of the Terracotta Army do).

What ordinary residents and citizen activists want has, in any event, a weaker influence than in Kyoto where local action kicked off a dynamic that ultimately led to a new heritage-oriented planning regime. Across the three cities, decision-making circles remain opaque to both ordinary citizens and activists. The heritage and planning bureaucracy is often inaccessible and powerless against political impositions. Citizen mobilisation for heritage causes is weak compared to Kyoto and often restricted to educational elites. Successful cases of resistance do occur but tend to be based on local ties, rather than mass media mobilisation and public debate. In most cases, the authorities have their way. The Gezi Park protests that Marquart observed over a couple of dramatic summer months in 2013 were a big exception: resistance against the destruction of the park for the aforementioned army barracks developed into a huge popular movement occupying the park and challenging the AKP government. Marquart observed disenchantment but also a reinvigoration of citizen engagement in the months following the repression of this protest (all largely obliterated in the aftermath of the 2016 coup).
The ordinary person’s involvement with heritage and history tends to take other, sometimes unexpected forms. All three studies found in-depth engagements with localities, relics, houses, and streetscapes that often do not speak the language of heritage “monumental time”, but rather that of lived experience, or “social time”. Many Xi’an old-timers remember digging for ancient relics in their childhood, and history and its heroes are surprisingly common conversation topics among large parts of the population. The neighbours of the Byzantine churches in Istanbul value these as the mosques they frequent and do not object to functional instead of historically grounded restorations. In Melaka, the Chetti – the descendants of the earliest Indian traders who intermarried with the local Malay – see maintaining their rich ritual life as a heritage in its own right, despairing of the fact that this does not suffice to protect their neighbourhood – just outside the World Heritage zone – from high-rise incursions.

UNESCO World Heritage, in all three cities, is in any case a distant presence. It is most momentous in Melaka, which since its designation together with George Town/Penang in 2008 has experienced a tourist boom and where respect for the World Heritage institutions is still strongest. There are few gross violations of buildings rules within the World Heritage property, even when, outside the designated zone, development continues apace. By contrast and partly because of longer experience (Istanbul was listed in 1985), the Turkish authorities have not been too concerned with recurrent Committee admonitions to put a stop to the destruction of timber houses in the traditional neighbourhoods. The construction of the new Metro Bridge over the Golden Horn – a perceived threat to famous vistas – developed into a major standoff where the World Heritage Committee threatened to declare Istanbul a “World Heritage Site in Danger.” The Turkish government averted this by making some minor concessions and lobbying Committee member states for support. Ultimately, the bridge was built, to local opponents’ deep disappointment about perceived UNESCO inaction. While the Mausoleum of the First Qing Emperor (with the Terracotta Army) just outside Xi’an has been on the List since 1987, the first World Heritage sites within the city were only designated as part of the Silk Roads series in 2014, during Cheung’s fieldwork. The World Heritage title was a strong motivation, such as when one of the archaeological candidate sites was cleared by relocating tens of thousands of people. But the contradiction between packaging the sites as remnants of cross-continental connection and their completely nation-centred selection escaped the attention of the World Heritage bodies.

The different approaches of the three countries mirror their styles of participation in the World Heritage Committee, where all served as members during my fieldwork (China in 2007–2011, Malaysia in 2011–2015 and Turkey in 2013–2017). China and Turkey have been among the most eager nominators of World Heritage candidates in
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recent years, clearly aware of the advantages for domestic and international tourism (China is about to wrest the numerical pole position from Italy). Corresponding to their world-political weight, the two delegations played an active role in the sessions. China was matched only by Russia in the blunt way in which it pursued self-interest and rejected criticism. By contrast, Malaysia struck a much more cautious pose; delegation experts told De Giosa that they were attending in order to learn. Chinese and Turkish participants were more aware that there is much to be gained from this diplomatic arena but only little to fear, given their geopolitical clout.

The growing role of national self-assertion was confirmed by the outcomes of a two-day Max Planck workshop that I co-convened with David Berliner (Université libre de Bruxelles) in October 2012. It resulted in *World heritage on the ground* (Brumann and Berliner 2016), the first book to bring together a dozen in-depth ethnographic investigations of World Heritage sites. In my conclusion I explain why the actual sites are often such as distant presence in the Committee sessions (Brumann 2016a). The case studies of the volume focus on World Heritage cities, cultural landscapes, and archaeological sites, mainly in Africa and Asia, comprising world-famous highlights such as Angkor, Chichén Itzá, and Borobudur, together with lesser-known locations. Just as in the studied cities, the national level is shown to have a greater influence on transformations at the sites than the distant World Heritage bodies. In many cases it is not so much the established national bureaucracy but new organisations specifically set up for the purpose that take control. Local communities, by contrast, typically see their rights curtailed. New benefits such as those brought by tourism often bypass them. Once again, heritage conservation is a prescription for accelerating social change (Brumann 2015c).
Over more than 2600 years, Buddhism has been a key civilisational force across large parts of Asia; the countries where it used to be, or still is, the dominant religious tradition house the majority of the world’s population. And among the “world religions”, none gives monasticism a more central role than Buddhism where the sangha – the community of monks and, where recognised, nuns – is one of the “three jewels” together with the founder (buddha) and his teachings (dhamma). This is not fully reflected, however, in the scholarly attention paid to Buddhist monasteries and their personnel. Due to textual and doctrinal bias, Buddhist studies have tended to neglect the economic questions every ongoing social institution must face and to address them from a normative rather than realist point of view. Indeed, ideally and originally, the sangha consists of world renouncers who live off the laity’s offerings and, in their pursuit of enlightenment and salvation, try to supersede their attachment to worldly riches. Theravada Buddhist monks, for example, often refuse to touch money, and both their finances and those of the temples are placed in the hands of trusted lay believers.

When such reticence is taken to be the essence of Buddhism, economic matters and adaptation to lay demands become secondary concerns, if not signs of degeneration. Adherents themselves share this view: most Buddhist priests in Japan, for example, are convinced that their specific variety of family-run temple specialising in commercial cemeteries, funerals, and memorial services – at the cost of meditation, study, or teaching – is inferior to the “true Buddhism” of the past. Money is a distraction rather than a legitimate concern, and research on Buddhism mirrors this otherworldly orientation. Based on ethnographic research, the anthropology of Buddhism has tried to complicate the overly philosophical picture, highlighting the articulation of high religion with laypeople’s ritual needs and their local, communal, and instrumental cults. With a few notable exceptions, however, monastic life and organisation have become more prominent only in the 2000s, and studies of how individual Buddhist monasteries/temples as economic, social, and political institutions perpetuate themselves and the sangha are still few in number.

---

The idealist bias culminated in Max Weber’s assertion that Buddhism, while obliging the laity to sustain the monks through alms-giving, does not provide it with guidelines for the rational conduct of everyday life so that – different from Protestantism – a capitalist ethos could not arise. Such a view, however, stands in stark contrast with the wealth and power accrued by Buddhist temples in a wide range of places and historical times, often provoking censure and even prosecution. The practical challenge of running monasteries with hundreds or even thousands of monks presupposes careful economic planning and stewardship. It thus appears timely to address Buddhist temple economies anthropologically, based on a solid empirical grounding. We were aware of historical studies on “managing monks”. But the topic is also catching on in anthropology and religious studies, notably in a collaborative research project at the University of Copenhagen.

Rather than the business of Buddhism in general, this Group focuses on contemporary temple economies in the strict sense. We chart the flow of money, goods and services that involve members of the sangha and connect them with lay believers. Precisely because renunciation is an ideal rather than a reality, we also cover the dogmatic justification of such flows, their conceptualisation as gifts and donations rather than as commodities or payments, their instrumentalisation by laypeople and political actors, and their moral assessment by all involved parties. Where Buddhist societies took up socialism, two competing soteriologies with similar reservations about amassing private riches had to come to terms with each other. The educational and welfare functions of Buddhist temples have their own economic aspects, and the judicial framework, starting from the taxation of temple property and services, often plays a crucial role. A focus on temple economies thus encourages a closer look at how the temple is embedded in wider networks and structures. We aim for a comprehensive analysis of Buddhist temples on the ground and in their social, economic, and political contexts. The question to what degree these organisations deserve to be labelled “Buddhist” concerns us only to the extent that it is controversial among our informants.

We pursue this research agenda in Asian cities. The historical Buddha appealed strongly to urbanites. Although temples may attempt to provide refuge from the world, the most important ones and the denominational headquarters are often found in cities. They thus face an environment in which the larger challenges of modernisation, secularisation, consumerism, and globalisation are acute and where, due to

---

4 In October 2016 this Group organised a conference titled “Buddhism, Business and Believers”. Four members of this Research Group presented papers.
the generally lower level of social integration, temple survival must rely much more on believers’ conscious choices than inherited obligations. All chosen locations are sites of Mahayana Buddhism, which has seen less anthropological scrutiny than the Theravada tradition. They imply a comparative axis: the field studies in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia (Abrahms-Kavunenko), Ulan-Ude in the Russian federal republic of Buryatia, just north of the Mongolian border (Jonutytė), and Shangri-La/Zhongdian in the largely Tibetan west of Yunnan province, China (Klepeis), all address varieties of Mahayana Buddhism with Vajrayana elements originally derived from – and in many ways still looking towards – Tibet and Tibetan Buddhists in exile. After a period of severe oppression under socialism, all of these countries have been experiencing a Buddhist revival, with an abundance of new temples and followers but much uncertainty as to the details of practices and the legitimacy of practitioners. In the Japanese capital Tokyo (Świtek) and the capital of Japanese Buddhism, Kyoto (myself), by contrast, capitalism has always ruled, and Buddhism, while much more settled and securely established than further west, is widely regarded as having passed its prime. It is perceived as an unlikely source for the spiritual renewal of society. The basic requirement to make ends meet, however, is shared by temples at all our locations. They all have to stand their ground and retain credibility in the face of secular modernity, competing religious institutions and specialists, and a capitalist consumer society with ever-increasing disparities of wealth.

The four year-long field studies and my own two-month pilot study in Kyoto took place in 2015/16. We are currently writing up the results of what in all cases
were very rich and fruitful stays. Since Abrahms-Kavunenko could build on earlier fieldwork in Ulanbataar (Abrahms-Kavunenko 2015aTH, 2015bTH, 2016TH), she has already completed a monograph (tentatively entitled *Enlightenment and the gasping city: Mongolian religion and purification at the vanguard of environmental disarray*; currently under review with Cornell University Press). Initial comparison has yielded a number of topics that are pertinent to most or even all field sites. The first is the complex conceptualisation of Buddhist exchanges, the economic topic that has been discussed most widely in the anthropological and religious-studies literature on Buddhism. This concerns the question what kinds of transfer occur when lay believers share their resources with monks, nuns and priests – with emic views diverging – and how this connects to larger social and moral systems. Can there be such a thing as a pure, disinterested gift to Buddhist practitioners, as the standard prescription for *dāna* – lay prestations to the *sangha* – would require, or are donations for ritual services best seen as reimbursements? Is wealth passed on to the *sangha* purified from spiritual pollution in the act? And aren’t gifts the very stuff that holds Buddhist societies together, given that they require the *sangha* to make themselves available to lay demands for merit-making rather than completely withdraw from the world? It felt almost like a comment on our preparatory discussion when, in my Kyoto fieldwork, the priest who delivered the annual *jizôbon* ritual to the festival neighbourhood I had studied earlier ended his performance with an impassioned sermon on how the cash donations delivered to him after the rite were donations (*o-fuse*), not payments, and how utterly misguided it was to confuse the two. Residents nodded politely but were unimpressed, telling me afterwards how the amounts given are customary and very much perceived as obligatory fees. Similar tensions and discrepancies were present across all our field sites and even in Japan – at the commercial end of the Buddhist spectrum – priests felt driven to justify their position on money matters all the time.

Connected to contested views about exchange and equally present across our field sites is the more general expectation, both among clergy and laypeople, that Buddhist organisations and practitioners should be less self-interested and more charitable than the societal average, a yardstick applied in both self- and lay evaluation. While Weber’s assumptions appear exaggerated, a Buddhist morality still works as a constraint on utility maximisation that cannot be ignored, even in the midst of rapid capitalist transformations. Buddhist representatives simply cannot get away with everything in terms of money matters. This applies even in highly commercialised settings such as in Mongolia, where cash registers and price lists for rituals in the temples suggest the contrary (Abrahms-Kavunenko 2015aTH). On
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occasion, the flow of resources is reversed, such as when temples in Buryatia fund charity projects for the poor.

The economic structure of Buddhist temples is more complex than might be expected when thinking of Christian monastic economies, where there is often only one collective economic unit. Buddhism has been less militant against riches as such than against attachment to them. The Buddhist monastery ceased to be a single encompassing economic unit in the early Indian times, when monks had their private purses and were allowed to engage in money-lending. In our cases, the fact that priests (except in Shangri-La) marry and have families yields at least two economic units, the temple and the priestly household, with payments and services flowing back and forth. As has been described for other Tibetan and Ladakhi cases, the main monastery in Shangri-La contains numerous overlapping units, including the general monastic account, the separate colleges (to one of which all the monks belong), and the outside households that retain ownership of houses within the precincts, in which their monastic family members reside. In Japan, the temples are the property of religious corporations yet the priestly family lives on site, half stewards and half de facto owners, an uneasy situation that gives rise to all kinds of subtle tensions. Understanding complex financial and property arrangements and their consequences, including the ambivalences and grey areas, is an important task across the Group.
Prominent among these ambivalences are family and kin relations. Officially, the Buddhist monk/priest is a world renouncer who, together with all other attachments, cuts his prior social bonds (or her bonds, in the much rarer case of nuns and female priests). Yet when priests marry, this cannot strictly apply. Considerable vagueness arises, as in the case of the Japanese temple wives who, more than a century after the abandonment of celibacy, still struggle for full recognition by sect headquarters. When temple sons become priests by virtue of descent, this raises doubts about the quality of their calling. Even in Shangri-La, where celibacy is taken seriously, there is controversy when the usual flow of support from households to their kin within the clergy (an old and meritorious pattern) is reversed. This is possible when monks succeed in accumulating donations and business profits, but it is not what most laypeople, and even some monks, consider appropriate.

Reflection on the role of the urban environment is a final cross-cutting concern. Ulaanbaatar and Shangri-La formed around, or next to, monasteries in societies where these were long the largest settlements. When Mongolians, Buryats and Tibetans conceive of themselves as quintessentially pastoralist and nomadic – ever less true though this may be – their religion, too, becomes something that has its true place in the countryside, remote from urban turmoil. Urban temples have spread considerably in all these societies. This is perceived as a special challenge to Buddhist practice, starting from the fact that believer attachment to temples is less stable than in the countryside. Common regional and ethnic affiliations play a role both in determining lay adherence to specific urban temples and in organisng the college sub-units of the larger establishments, thus mitigating the challenge that cities present to rural novices. An urban location is less of a concern in Japanese Buddhism but here, too, the highly localised parish communities and patterns of support of rural temples have no equivalent in metropolises such as Tokyo or Kyoto. When parishioners are dispersed all over the city and many of them have ceased to attend temple rituals, community pressure cannot help to sustain allegiances, and priests have to come up with other solutions.

These topics will be further pursued and subjected to comparative analysis in a two-day Max Planck workshop “Sangha Economies: Temple Organisation and Exchanges in Contemporary Buddhism” that Abrahms-Kavunenko, Świtek and I will organise in September 2017. The call encouraged ethnographic forays into all the above-mentioned topics, focusing on interactions that directly involve monks, priests, and nuns, rather than just the laity. Most papers will address Tibet/Ladakh, Mongolia/Buryatia, and Japan but several will deal with Theravada Buddhism in Sri Lanka, Nepal, China and Thailand, opening up a further comparative dimension. In addition, Group members also plan to present their results in a panel at the AAA meeting in Washington, DC, in late 2017 that I am preparing together with Elizabeth Williams-Ørberg (University of Copenhagen).
IV

HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOLOGY
Figure 1: The spatial distribution of the Patriarchy Index (Mosaic/NAPP combined).
(Source: Mosaic/NAPP. Map design: Sebastian Kluesener)
Note. The map is based on a standard deviation categorization centered on the mean of 15.3. 59 percent of data after 1850, 41 percent before 1850.
NAPP = North Atlantic Population Project. www.nappdata.org
(Mosaic: see www.censusmosaic.org)
I came to Halle in 2013 from the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (MPIDR) in Rostock on the premise that my pursuit of the comparative historical regional demography of Europe and beyond would enrich the department’s major agenda of exploring Eurasian unity and variation. One of two crucial assets that I brought with me was my *in statu nascendi* Habilitation monograph. The project was started in Rostock, but it was completed, formally defended with a *veniam legendi* and, finally, published in 2015 during my stay in Halle. “Rethinking East Central Europe: Family Systems and Co-residence in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth” (Szołtysek 2015) reexamines, with the help of a substantial database, the way in which the family-research pioneers formulated European regional pattern differences, how they and later scholars used the proposed regionalization models, and how the initial formulations now appear in light of this project’s findings from household listings and other archival population sources from eighteenth century Poland, Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine. The gravamen of this massive project was that, at the turn of the nineteenth century, there was no such single territory as “eastern Europe”. The general view of the European continent that was being consolidated as empirical research on European families unfolded during the 1970s was already on the wrong track with paradigms that used terms such as “dual Europe,” employed the “dividing line” metaphor, and speculated about the existence of an “undifferentiated Slavic eastern Europe”.

My second asset was the Mosaic Project, which I built jointly with colleagues at the MPIDR in Rostock for the purpose of recovering and analyzing surviving census and census-like records from historic western Eurasia and beyond (see Figure 2). Since its beginning in 2011, the project has established itself as one of the most important players in the ongoing Big Data revolution in historical demography. It currently covers 123 regions of western Eurasia with almost a million individual records spanning the 15th to the early 20th centuries which can be used to develop a wide range of comparable demographic indicators. The project has been successfully communicated to the research community through publications (e.g. Szołtysek and Gruber 2016) and conference presentations (e.g., at the “Big Questions, Big Data” workshop held at the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, in 2015).
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1 Western Eurasia refers here to European continent as commonly defined.
Figure 2: An example of the Mosaic historical census microdata; the parish of Przyłęć, Poland, 1791. (Source: State Archive in Kraków, Poland)

Note: the household list describes individuals in a settlement grouped into households (co-resident domestic groups), providing the interrelationships between co-resident persons, as well as an individual’s age, sex, and marital status.
Further research expanded towards the central and eastern parts of Eurasia would be necessary to address questions as to whether it is possible to brand macro-regions of the landmass as having a particular type of family system; and whether there was a familial “boundary” separating eastern from the western parts within this macro-region. Since the funding to pursue such an ambitious program is currently unavailable, my comparative agenda focused on western Eurasia, i.e. on the currently available data (or data obtainable at a low cost). In particular, I continued exploring the composite measure of family variation called the Patriarchy Index (PI) (Gruber and Szoltysek 2016). The 2015–2016 years witnessed a substantial enhancement of its analytic potential, enabling its interpretation in terms of varying degrees of sex- and age-related social inequality across different family settings (Gruber and Szoltysek 2016). Further research on patriarchy (in collaboration with Siegfried Gruber, and more recently with Radosław Poniat, Poland, and Sebastian Kluesener, MPIDR) has garnered considerable attention from leading scholars in various disciplines - economic history (e.g. Joerg Baten), sociology (Göran Therborn), and lately from the Director of Research at the World Values Survey Association, Christian Welzel, with whom further cooperation will unfold during 2017.

In order to apply the Index to the widest possible historical datasets, Mosaic was linked to the North Atlantic Population Project (NAPP), which allowed adding Great Britain and the whole of Scandinavia to the existing data hub. All these data were combined into one dataset with a full overlap in the set of variables, altogether for 274 regional populations from the Atlantic coast of Eurasia to the Urals, comprising 14 million individuals living in 3.3 million family households, in the years 1700–1918 (Figure 1 above). The combined database has been further enriched by historical and contemporary contextual information gathered from multiple sources. Using Geographic Information System tools, rich geo-covariates were linked with Mosaic/NAPP samples, including localized information about land use (the share of cropland/grazing/pasture in 1800), terrain ruggedness, soil quality (suitability for agriculture), as well as data for population density and population potential. Furthermore, information on rules of descent (i.e., how kin were reckoned) was derived by matching a composite variable provided in Murdock’s Ethnographic Atlas with information provided in other ethnographic syntheses to Mosaic/NAPP populations.

Along with these technical refinements, I have expanded my research conceptually. First, I have put forward a broad conceptual framework to explain family system variations across Eurasia, and specifically patriarchy (Szoltysek 2014). Variations are seen as stemming from the combined effect of (1) demographic constraints; (2) structural-functional, ecological, or institutional (coercive) adaptations, (3) inheritance patterns and kinship organization, and (4) other residual factors (e.g.
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2 100-percent-samples have been obtained for Iceland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and a 10-percent-sample for England (mostly 19th century).

religion, language, or ethnicity). I have laid out how various elements of this open-ended framework could be operationalised in future research to organize empirical evidence on family and household systems in the wide variety of regional patterns across Eurasia.

Simultaneously, I delved into the problematic of how the exploration of the variation in family patterns in western Eurasia might be conducive to better understanding of inter-regional inequalities, past and present. The major intellectual premise in this regard was the argument that family may represent the grassroots of economic development, as an example of a key informal institution, affecting how societies develop over time. The hypothesis that family systems can have an impact on wider societal outcomes represents a reversal of the more usual argument, which posits that economic development produces changes in dominant family patterns. Max Weber alluded to this when he argued that strong family values do not allow for the development of individual forms of entrepreneurship fundamental to the formation of capitalist societies.\(^4\) More recently, Alberto Alesina and Paola Giuliano have been using a measure of “family ties” derived from the World Values Surveys (1981–2010) to show that strong family ties are correlated with particular societal, economic and political outcomes.\(^5\) If confirmed through empirical historical research, the family-inequality nexus would suggest that many institutional barriers to social policies may be related to inherited family structures, i.e. to persistent cultural differences stemming from the way in which divergent family forms have shaped elementary interpersonal relations.

To take stock and better promote an acceleration of interest in various neighbouring disciplines in the long-term historical development and implications of human family organization, together with Patrick Heady (MPI Halle) in 2015 I organized an international workshop in Halle, “Murdock and Goody Re-visited: (Pre)history and evolution of Eurasian and African family systems”. Five disciplines were represented: historical demography, social anthropology, evolutionary anthropology, archaeology, and cross-cultural research. The workshop resulted in two special issues of the journal Cross-Cultural Research.\(^6\)

For this meeting, I used the Mosaic/NAPP dataset to show how 274 historical populations scored on the patriarchy scale. This is the first comparative research on historical patriarchy across such a diverse set of societies in western Eurasia, and the first that reach as far as to the Urals (see Figure 1 above). PI values in western Eurasia ranged strikingly, from 8 to 35 points. While all the regional populations had at least some patriarchal features, as defined above, none could be characterized
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as fully patriarchal (maximum PI: 40 points). At the most general level, the ranking of the regions is broadly consistent with previous findings from the sociological literature, and seems to confirm the well-known east-west pattern, whereby the westernmost parts of Eurasia appear to be much less patriarchal than other territories.

This generalization is, however, subject to major qualifications. While it is indeed the case that the areas around the North Sea Basin had relatively low patriarchy levels, similarly low levels were also found in parts of Germany and areas of Scandinavia near the Baltic Sea. Especially in the cities of today’s eastern Germany, the levels of patriarchy appear to have been low. In fact, patriarchy levels were low in regions spread across a vast area of western Eurasia, ranging from Iceland and Great Britain, through northern France, the Low Countries, and parts of Germany and Scandinavia, into Poland and Austria. Equally interesting is the long spread of medium patriarchy levels linking Catalonia and southwestern France with various culturally and geographically disparate areas of Westphalia and Tyrol, and with a long vertical axis stretching from Lithuania to Wallachia (Romania) in southeastern Europe. Areas with elevated PI values also existed in northwestern Europe, such as in the “Bible Belt” of southwestern part of Norway, in northwestern Germany, and on the Shetland Islands. Finally, the real “hot spots” with the highest patriarchy levels were dispersed over a large and discontinuous territory, including modern-day southern Belarus, southern Romania, the central Urals, and Albania. The territories between the Baltic, the Adriatic, and the Black Sea seem to have been particularly diverse, encompassing areas with low levels of patriarchy (like the western and northern parts of historical Poland) as well as areas with moderate to high levels of patriarchy (like many parts of Hungary, Slovakia, and Romania).

This internal variation within the complex societies of western Eurasia can be better envisioned by looking at one of the Index’s components, the proportion of people aged 65+ years living with at least one married daughter in the same household (among those elderly people who live with at least one married child in the same households) (Figure 3). This variable, capturing what Jack Goody referred to as the epicerate (the institution of “inheriting daughter”), is the best proxy for the “woman’s property complex” (or “diverging devolution”) considered by Goody foundational to the plough-based agricultural societies of Eurasia.7
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Figure 3 basically shows that, although the preference in inheritance given to close women before more distant males varies in intensity across the landmass, it was nowhere completely absent, not even among otherwise highly patriarchal and patrilocal societies (as in the Balkans). What this variation would amount to if put in the wider Eurasian context, and whether or not some “patriarchal” commonalities across the landmass would emerge from that comparison, must be left for future meticulous investigation. However, following in the footsteps of Goody’s perceptive critique of an undifferentiated “other”, we should expect to find as much regional variation in marriage and family organisation in China, Japan, or Central Asia and Siberia as in Europe. We may also reasonably expect that the two major types of family systems identified in that area – the partlineal/patriarchal joint- and stem-family systems of East Asia and the northern tier of South Asia, and the bilateral, more egalitarian and conjugally oriented systems found in South-East Asia and the southern tier of South Asia, will have a similar bearing on patriarchy to what we
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find in the west, thus uniting western and eastern parts of the landmass in both difference and similarities.

Based on the results of my patriarchy research, I have put forward another agenda which mobilizes the patriarchy data by linking them explicitly to economic history debates about developmental disparities in western Eurasia. In particular, I have focused on the channels through which family variation can produce developmental disparities by inspecting the relationships between family-generated inequalities as captured by the Patriarchy Index and divergences in human capital formation in the past. In order to approximate historical human capital levels, I followed an established practice of relying on techniques developed around the phenomenon of age-heaping. Baten and his collaborators have long argued that the tendency of people to round off their ages to a number ending with a five or a zero can serve as a proxy for the degree to which people could count and calculate (basic numeracy), and can be treated as a measure of human capital in historic periods. The Mosaic database allowed scrutinising the numeracy patterns of 500,000 men and women, between 1680–1918.

In a series of conference contributions from 2016 (leading to publication of the final results in 2017) I have established a strong negative association between the PI and regional numeracy patterns across the Mosaic populations that remains significant even after controlling for a broad range of other important factors, such as the variation in socioeconomic, institutional, and environmental conditions across the societies covered by our data. This outcome suggests that the greater the “patriarchal bias” in the patterning of family organisation at the regional level in western Eurasia, the lower were the respective levels of numeracy – and, hence, the levels of human capital. The observation that family-driven age- and gender-related inequalities, as captured by the index, are relevant for understanding variation in basic numeracy patterns in the past suggests that there are indeed important links between family organisation and human capital accumulation that merit further investigation, and extension to other Eurasian populations in the future.

In yet another approach to patriarchy I have engaged with a flourishing strand of research that argues that a large number of contemporary structural features of societies may have historical roots and that the broad “cultural heritage” of a society leaves an imprint on values that endures through time. Starting from these premises,
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9 Tollnek, Franziska and Joerg Baten. 2016. Age-heaping-based human capital estimates. In: Claude Diebolt and Michael Haupert (eds.). *Handbook of cliometrics*: Springer, p. 1–20, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-40406-1_24. Numeracy is the basic competency of quantitative reasoning; namely, the ability to count, to keep records of one’s counting, and to make calculations. Some scholars have claimed that evidence regarding age-heaping not only provides an additional indicator of human capital, but that given the strong correlations observed between age-heaping and literacy, it has the potential to extend our knowledge of human capital as such to times and places for which data on literacy are entirely absent or extremely scarce.

10 Including NAPP in this agenda is a task for the future.
I have explored the extent to which variation in the combination of various historical family-related institutions and societal mechanisms that the PI captures can be related to present-day spatial variation in the indicators of gender inequality and divergences in value orientations across western Eurasia. The correlations between the historical variety in PI levels and today’s spatial variation in gender and value disparities were made by referring to well-established measures from inequality research.\textsuperscript{11} In addition, two indexes based on the World Value Survey data were also checked for their relationship with historical patriarchy, namely Alesina’s measure of the strength of ‘family ties’, and Welzel’s “Emancipative Values Index” (EVI).\textsuperscript{12}

A comparison of the contemporary indicators with the historical PI values should be interpreted with caution, as the PI data for contemporary states are not representative in a strict statistical sense. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that there are rather strong relationships between historical patriarchy levels and contemporary inequality levels. Of course, the mere establishment of such associations does not allow us to posit the existence of direct causal links between the past and the present. If historical patriarchy levels influenced contemporary gender and value disparities, they probably did so in a path-dependent manner. Nevertheless, these findings provide provisional support for the argument that variation in the characteristics of historical family organization can be relevant to understanding contemporary spatial disparities in the contours of gender inequalities and disparities in value orientations, at least as far as western Eurasia is concerned.


\textsuperscript{12} Welzel, Christian. 2013. Freedom rising: human empowerment and the quest for emancipation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. The EVI is a 12-item index measuring Protective-vs.-Emancipative Values”, i.e. a national culture’s emphasis on universal freedoms in the domains of (1) reproductive choice (acceptance of divorce, abortion, homosexuality), (2) gender equality (support of women’s equal access to education, jobs and power), (3) people’s voice (priorities for freedom of speech and people’s say in national, local and job affairs), and (4) personal autonomy (independence, imagination and non-obedience as desired child qualities).
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Accomplishments

The period under review saw the completion of various projects from earlier group members and some changes in the research structure. Oliver Tappe and Patrice Ladwig finalised their projects. By spring 2014 both had left the focus group “Ethnic Minorities and the State in Eurasia: relations and transformations” which explored the forms, practices, and structures of interdependencies, dominance, and resistance in various parts of Southeast Asia, China, and Russia. Oliver Tappe (project: ‘Reconfigurations of the past in an ambiguous present: memory discourses, social change and inter-ethnic relations in Houaphan, Lao PDR’) joined the prestigious new excellence cluster at the Global South Studies Centre of the University of Cologne, completing his habilitation project which he had started in Halle. Patrice Ladwig (project: ‘Buddhist statecraft and the civilizing power of the dhamma in Laos: the Buddhification of ethnic minorities in historical and anthropological perspective’), was offered visiting professorships in anthropology at the universities of Zürich and Hamburg, and then joined the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity in Göttingen.

Two other projects in which I was directly involved have also been coming to a close and have resulted in a number of publications and further achievements. One major endeavour was the project ‘Dealing with nationalities in Eurasia: how Russian and Chinese agencies managed ethnic diversity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries’, a complex comparative research project by Dorothea Heuschert-Laage, Chia Ning, and myself on governmental agencies in Qing China and Tsarist Russia; key themes included colonial continuities, institutional structures, cross-epochal habitus, and transformed ideologies. Developing her analysis on patronage-clientele relationships and the incorporation of the Mongols into the Qing Chinese legal system, her final contribution to this cooperative project (‘Restricting pastoral mobility: the territorial integration of Mongols into the Qing Empire’) examined Qing attempts to restrict and regulate pastoral mobility by designing internal boundaries and the enclosure of Mongol pastureland. In mid-2014 Heuschert-Laage left the group and joined a research cluster initiated by Karenina Kollmar-Paulenz at the Institute for the Science of Religion and Central Asian Studies at Bern University. Chia Ning,
who is now teaching at Central College (Pella, Iowa), also widened her first project (*Lifanyuan and the management of population diversity in Early Qing, 1636–1795*) on the Lifanyuan’s differentiated procedures of indirect rule by comparing this agency with the two other institutions that managed ethnic diversity in the Qing Empire namely, the Libu (Board of Rites) and the Six Boards. Her research not only corroborated the thesis that colonial forms changed over time, but also enlarged our analytical framework by including the Libu in a comparison of institutions in charge of Qing colonial affairs.

My own investigations contrasted the Chinese case with similar developments in the Russian Empire, thus adding a broader continental perspective to the comparison. Results of this research have been continuously developed and published in various formats. In addition, all key studies found a prominent place in the Lifanyuan book project edited by Chia Ning and myself, which is based on an earlier conference at the Max Planck Institute on administrative and colonial practices in Qing-ruled China. In *Managing frontiers in Qing China*, historians and anthropologists explore China’s imperial expansion in Inner Asia, focusing on early Qing empire-building in Mongolia, Xinjiang, Tibet, and beyond; also included are Central Asian perspectives and comparisons to Russia’s Asian empire. Taking an institutional-historical and a historical-anthropological approach, the book engages with two Qing agencies (*Lifanyuan* and *Libu*), that were involved in the governance of non-Han groups. It offers a comprehensive overview of these to some degree cognate agencies, and revises and assesses the state of affairs in this under-researched field.¹ This “first comprehensive study of a key institution of the Qing dynasty: the Lifanyuan”, Nicola Di Cosmo writes in his preface, “destabilizes the centrality of Western imperial narratives more radically than approaches that simply assert differences between Asian and European empires”, making it a study that “forces theorists to grapple with a practice of empire-building that cannot be confined to the Chinese political tradition”. Using a contrastive approach that compares the Lifanyuan with the Libu, the northern with the southern frontiers, and the early stages with later developments, the book also benefits from the interdisciplinary cross-fertilisation of various historical, anthropological, and philological methods.

The Lifanyuan (Court of Colonial Affairs) was remarkable among Qing governmental institutions. Its main function was to deal with the affairs of incorporated nations and to communicate imperial policies and decisions to the imperial peripheries of Inner Asia. This included legislation, taxation, trade, diplomacy, and social welfare, and encompassed civil, military, and cultural matters. By maintaining forms of indirect rule and separate administration in Inner Asia, the Lifanyuan offered a

¹ The contributors to the volume are: Uradyn Bulag, Chia Ning, Pamela Crossley, Nicola Di Cosmo, Dorothea Heuschert-Laage, Laura Hostetler, Fabienne Jagou, Mei-hua Lan, Dittmar Schorkowitz, Song Tong, Michael Weiers, Ye Baichuan, Yuan Jian, and Zhang Yongjiang; publication date: November 2016; year of publication 2017; see http://www.brill.com/products/book/managing-frontiers-qing-china.
model of integration by difference that existed as an alternative to the Qing’s assimilatory policy (integration by sameness, or *gaitu guiliu*, “replacing the locals with residents”) pursued in the colonisation process in many parts of China’s southern frontier.

Lifanyuan and Libu responsibilities significantly overlapped; both had important duties in non-Chinese affairs on which other ministries did not concentrate. Since Ming times internal relations with indigenous peoples were generally managed through the Chinese prefectural structures according to the traditional “*Tusi* system” (*Native Chieftain System*) and external relations with tribute-paying countries were managed through the Libu. The Libu was also in charge of imperial examinations and of implementing Chinese political tradition and Confucian moral order. As institutions that fall at the junction of Ming and Qing world views and integration strategies, the Libu and Lifanyuan have always been of considerable interest not only for historians of China studying socio-cultural processes and the institutional expression of Qing policies but also to historically minded anthropologists studying the changing practices and habitus of imperial governance. Against this background the book explores the imperial policies towards and the shifting classifications of minority groups.

While integration strategies in multi-national empires may vary across time and space, they are all attempts to address essentially the same challenge: to maintain cross-epochal cohesiveness and to guarantee certain rights of national self-determination. In the case of Russia, 18th-century Enlightenment scholars from Western Europe responded to the urge to take stock of the empire’s riches, peoples, and languages and undertook assiduous counting and classification which paved the way for a *mission civilisatrice* and the modern nationalities question. In Ming-Qing China, on the other hand, there was remarkably less interest in creating a detailed ethnic typology of the empire’s peoples. Instead, a tradition prevailed of subsuming non-Han Chinese under collective names formed into ethnocentric stereotypes (*Fan, Meng, Hui*, etc.) using a dichotomous distinction between “inner” (*nei*) and “outer” (*wai*) domains, accompanied by the messianic belief that Confucianism is instrumental in promoting the “barbarians” from a lower “raw”(*sheng*) to a higher “cooked” (*shu*) status. Western concepts of “ethnicity” and “race” did not reach China until the
late 19th century. However, independently of each other, though with some degree of mutual influence that continued into socialist times, both empires – China and Russia – invented and developed central institutions, needed even today, to control and influence ethnic-cultural diversity, to govern the civilisational frontier, to design appropriate keystones for their nationalities policies, and to implement strategies of integration for the sake of imperial cohesion.

These studies benefited from the doctoral research of Simon Schlegel, together with that of Elzyata Kuberlinova of the IMPRS ANARCHIE (see Part VIII). All investigated the historical situation of ethnic minorities in multi-national states. Simon Schlegel (thesis: The making of ethnicity in Southern Bessarabia: tracing the histories of an ambiguous concept in a contested land) corroborates the idea that the social construction of ethnic boundaries in the Russian Empire underwent historical changes from ‘religion’, being the main identity marker in the early 19th century, to ‘ethnicity’ as a modern category of classification. Taking the case of the Kalmyks, a Western Mongol people in-migrating from Inner Asia in the early 17th century, Elzyata Kuberlinova also addresses the connection between religion and social cohesion (project: Religion and empire: Kalmyk Buddhism in late tsarist Russia). She illustrates how the imperial administration governed minorities through religious institutions and how the Kalmyk clergy responded to these governmental schemes.

**Outreach & Conferences**

As the above projects drew to a close, efforts were made to disseminate the research results and raise awareness regarding the impact of the ‘legacies of the past’ on contemporary developments. Two events from 2014 are particularly worth noting: the international conference on “Nation-building and the Integration of Migrants” convened by Valerii Tishkov and his “Network of Anthropological Monitoring and Early Conflict Warning” in Göttingen, and the international workshop “Ukraine – a multiregional state under pressure” at the MPI in Halle organised by myself and Stefan Troebst from the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO) in Leipzig.

Lectures on “Imperial Formations and Ethnic Diversity in Russia and China” based on the projects “Lifanyuan” and “Dealing with Nationalities in Eurasia” were given on various occasions to anthropological, historical, and area-studies audiences at home and abroad. The focus was on imperial practices and institutions, habitus, classifications, and cross-epochal legacies. In 2015 I gave talks at the University of Bonn’s Department for Mongol and Tibetan Studies, at Harvard University for the Inner Asian and Altaic Studies Lecture Series, at Brock University’s Faculty of Humanities in St. Catherine’s, Ontario, at Roosevelt University’s College of Arts and Sciences in Chicago, at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Denver, and at the 2016 Association for Asian Studies Conference at Doshisha University in Kyoto, Japan. There was also an increase in outreach
activities at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in particular and the German research networks in general, various presentations at Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, as well as the AAA meeting in Denver, including a “Research in Germany” Science Lunch hosted by the German Research Foundation.

Finally, two new research agendas that build on previous projects were explored in workshops and conferences. The first topic is “Buddhist reform thinking under early Soviet rule” as discussed in a workshop on “Sino-Tibetan relations and Tibetan self-perception in historical perspective” organised together with Leonard van der Kuijp from Harvard University and during a round table on “Buddhist Temple Economies in Urban Asia” organised jointly with Christoph Brumann from our institute and Karenina Kollmar-Paulenz from the University of Bern. The second topic, “Continental Colonialism”, was presented and developed during an international conference on “Forms of Continental Colonialism: the ‘other’ colonialism” at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in July 2016.

Emphasising continental colonialism and its diverse forms, this workshop built on earlier scholarly contributions to the study of internal colonialism, understood as structural inequalities installed by political agency or invented economically in Russia, China, and Europe, for instance. Other sources of inspiration included studies of internal colonialism based on prior overseas and settler colonialism in North America and Canada, Hispanic America, India, and South Africa. The focus was placed on the subaltern conditions of the “other within” – including both the “ethnic other” and the “social other” – in imperial formations that have fostered lasting strategies for managing ethnic and social diversity. The workshop brought together anthropologists/sociologists and historians aiming to expand the range of places and topics addressed in the anthropology of colonialism. They examined colonial agency and practices as well as forms of resistance and resilience among the colonised from historical and contemporary perspectives in order to identify shifting forms of colonialism with a focus on the differences between continental and overseas colonialism in terms of both their original contexts and their legacies. Discussing the varying trajectories from indirect to direct rule, the homogenisation of ethnic diversity (as opposed to marginalisation or apartheid), the persistence of “colonial” agencies, and contradictions between profit-making and geopolitical gains, the conference challenged widely held assumptions about colonial patterns that result from the predominance of overseas rather than continental colonialism as a topic of study.

**Outlook**

Discussions and first reviews of conference papers were quite encouraging. We are thus planning to publish the proceedings under the preliminary title *Between empire and nation: the shifting forms of continental colonialism* edited by a cross-disciplinary board consisting of myself, John Chavez, and Ingo Schröder with Pal-
grave Macmillan. Given the wide range of regions and continents under discussion it was indeed tempting to structure the book geographically. However, a thematic structure, seems preferable, as this would help place the focus more closely on the phenomenon of colonialism itself. The global, comparative perspective is another strength of *Shifting forms of continental colonialism* and provides cross-fertilisation of an interdisciplinary approach. While comparing these forms and analysing the different modes of hegemony and interdependencies, we attempt to question the concept of and find new ways to re-conceptualise colonialism while avoiding monothetic classifications.

Finally, another book project will soon reach its final stage. Based on intensive continued research carried out over many years in Russian archives in Ulan-Ude (Buryatia), Elista (Kalmykia), St Petersburg, and Moscow, the intended book with the title “(...) *Because nobody will save the allogeneous people unless they save themselves (…)*” will make a significant contribution to the historical anthropology of the Buryats and Kalmyks, the only Mongol-speaking Buddhist peoples living within the confines of the Russian state since the early seventeenth century. Profiting much from recent research at the Russian State Historical Archive (St Petersburg) and the State Archive of the Russian Federation (Moscow) in summer 2014, this project presents and comments on archival materials (including sections on “Buddhist Reform Thinking”) related to the *Inorodtsy* (*ἄλλογενῆς*) as an ethnicity-based category referring to non-Russian minorities in Tsarist and early Soviet Russia.
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This Focus Group was launched in 2006, making it our longest-running Group ever.1 Over eleven years, in fourteen distinct projects, researchers carried out lengthy periods of fieldwork in two large Asian countries which have experienced radical social change during the last four decades. China and Vietnam have become increasingly accessible to foreign anthropologists, but their developmental trajectories continue to puzzle most observers, who detect a contradiction between market-oriented decentralization and the persistence of one-party rule. The implications of high growth rates and tremendous geographical as well as social mobility for local communities, families and personhood are not well understood. This is where we aimed to make a contribution.

Our projects were diverse. This Focus Group did not apply a common questionnaire, unlike earlier work on similar themes in Europe led by Patrick Heady, which was one of our sources of inspiration.2 Individual researchers (all but four of them postdocs) followed up their particular interests, often in locations which they knew already from previous work. The themes we broached ranged widely, from popular religion among ethnic minorities to the role of jokes and irony in political commentary, and from memories of the early socialist decades to contemporary mobilities (between city and village, but also internationally). In spite of this variety and changes in personnel as the years went by, the Group was able to consolidate its core themes of social support and kinship. In doing so, we leaned considerably on the
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1 For more detailed information, including individual reports on the fourteen projects of this Group, see Endres, Kirsten W. and Chris Hann (eds.). 2017. Socialism with neoliberal characteristics. Halle: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology. www.eth.mpg.de

Throughout the existence of this Group we have been greatly assisted by numerous cooperation partners, especially Professor Shengmin Yang at the Minzu University in Beijing.

2 Heady, Patrick et al. (eds.). 2010. Kinship and social security in Europe. 3 volumes. Frankfurt/M: Campus.
broad approach advocated by legal anthropologists Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann. In this perspective, provision by state institutions is but one dimension of social security, often the least important. It is everywhere supplemented by other institutions, which may be public (e.g. in the field of religion) as well as private (the household and wider networks of kin).

This general approach is as pertinent to China and Vietnam as it is elsewhere. Many of the questions addressed by our researchers are found in comparable forms all over the world, if not universally. How do increasingly fragmented sibling groups arrange for the care of infirm parents? What factors influence the age of first marriage and choice of partner? In China and Vietnam it is clear that long-term histories of patriarchal ideology continue to influence local answers to these questions, in both town and countryside. More recent history, namely the experience of repressive forms of socialism under Mao Zedong and Ho Chi Minh, has also had a huge impact. In the decades of central planning, before the state commanded the resources to provide comprehensive welfare services, it intervened in all fields at every level of society. With the shift to “market socialism”, the state has partially withdrawn from the everyday life of its citizens. Yet it has remained faithful to earlier socialist ideals by continuing to extend public provision in key fields such as health care, in the countryside as well as the town. During the lifetime of this Focus Group, significant steps have been taken in the provision of social insurance and old age pensions on a universal basis. This can be interpreted as prima facie evidence for a convergence of welfare models in Eurasia: while many European states are increasing the role of the market in welfare provision, China and Vietnam are, in certain contexts at least, moving in the opposite direction.

A fundamental commitment to the availability of affordable care can be taken as a sign of inclusive social values that have deep roots in Eurasian societies. Of course, the principle of market exchange also has very deep roots. In this respect, China and Vietnam present fascinating cases from the perspective of the theorizing of Eurasia in the longue durée (see Introduction). In the wake of decades during which the market was uniquely repressed, it is not surprising that its revival has been characterised by certain forms of excess and widening social inequalities. But there are plentiful signs that these East Asian societies are aware of the limitations of the market and of the necessity to consolidate effective mechanisms to promote the welfare of all, weaker members including society’s. In short, the swing of the pendulum between market and redistribution may differ substantially between East Asia and Western Europe. But, when compared with the United States, where support for far-reaching redistribution is either lacking in the population, or present but impossible to mobilise politically, it is still possible to speak of a common Eurasian pendulum.
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The Projects

This Focus Group, like its predecessors, sought to specify the balance of transformation and resilience in contemporary social change. For example, although Confucian patriarchal traditions remain powerful in shaping gender relations, more and more households find themselves obliged to modify these norms in practice. Alongside male-female relations, generational difference figured prominently in most projects. The physical hardships and emotional scars experienced by those old enough to recall the production-oriented ideological campaigns of the early socialist decades contrast sharply with contemporary aspirations. Those who are young today are generally much more interested in consumption and finding a comfortable place in the rapidly expanding ranks of the middle classes. In addition to the resilience of patriarchy, however, patterns of social differentiation are marked by persisting sociological continuities, notably the rural-urban divide. Several researchers (notably Meixuan Chen, Minh Nguyen, and Roberta Zavoretti) paid close attention to migrants, whose cheap labour power has made a major contribution to economic growth. Although implementation in recent years has relaxed, both China and Vietnam still have laws that make it difficult for “peasant workers” to settle permanently in the cities (Fang 2016chap).

Two of the China projects were based in large cities. Having previously worked for her doctorate in the capital Beijing, for this Focus Group Friederike Fleischer investigated the southern metropolis of Guangzhou. Roberta Zavoretti chose to continue her research in the historic capital of Nanjing. Both postdocs were struck by processes of class formation and the myriad ways in which material inequalities create uncertainties and undermine commitments based on relatedness. Fleischer contrasted the new urban middle classes with the traditional category of ‘common people’ and showed how a Protestant congregation defining itself in terms of ‘love’ offers its members an alternative to neoliberal consumerism.4 Zavoretti focused on the institution of marriage, noting how the New Marriage Law of 1950, which ushered in an era ostensibly based on free choice and ‘romance’, is nowadays consolidated through practices that bear a resemblance (at least on the surface) to the property-based strategies of the feudal era. Marriage remains virtually universal and a prerequisite for legitimate sexual relations and social status; it is central not only to class formation but to citizenship and national identity.5

Among our rural projects, the links between the domestic domain and patriotic identity were noted by Gonçalo Santos in connection with the state’s role in regulating procreation. Drawing on his many years of fieldwork in rural Guangdong Province, where nowadays grandparents commonly provide childcare on behalf of
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parents who are working as migrant labourers, Santos argues that diagnoses of a
global convergence (often glossed as individualization) are simplistic. Patriarchy
in China has been transformed but welfare remains “familialistic”. His “intimate
choices” approach (Santos 2016TH) offers a corrective to excessive emphasis on
neoliberal individual agents. In addition to Santos, two other researchers also paid
close attention to the moral (or ethical) dimensions of contemporary social change
in rural townships in southern China. Meixuan Chen concentrated on the social im-
pace of the emigrants of earlier generations. Overseas Chinese who have prospered
outside China are now encouraged by the reform socialist authorities to return and
invest in the community of their ancestors. This leads to novel forms of cooperation
and support, but also to tensions (e.g. concerning burial practices). The returnees
provide a role model for local youth – who stand little chance of emulating them.
Hans Steinmüller’s postdoctoral research continued his earlier work on ethical
dimensions of everyday life. Adapting Michael Herzfeld’s concept of “cultural
intimacy”, he paid particular attention to the ways in which subtle forms of irony
disguise cynicism and political complicity.6

In the northern village of Cheer, some 200 kilometres from Beijing, Xiujie Wu
found that the boundaries of solidarity were drawn more narrowly than before.
Although the family remained a “resilient institution” and the state encouraged lo-
cal networks of support, legal disputes were increasingly common, even between
siblings. Such rampant individualism was less evident in the community study of
Helena Obendiek, whose doctoral project in a remote region of Gansu Province
focused on education as a path to prosperity and social mobility. She found that
the hallowed belief that one’s fate can be changed through hard study and success
through examinations has been vigorously revived in recent decades. It shapes fam-
ily support strategies among poor Han villagers, where girls no longer suffer the
discrimination they experienced in the past (Obendiek 2016TH).

In our joint project on social support in Qumul in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autono-
mous Region, where the indigenous population is predominantly Muslim, I con-
centrated on socio-economic and religious dimensions (e.g. Hann 2014chap), while
Ildikó Bellér-Hann paid close attention to the ways in which constructions of the
pre-socialist past are shaped by the legitimation concerns of the present, e.g. Bellér-
Hann 2014chap, 2016a, 2016b. Sawut Pawan practised a quite different form
of historical anthropology, focusing in his doctoral thesis on how the enforcement
of class identities transformed the rural social structure of the Uyghurs during the
first three decades of socialism. Although hardships were experienced by all, the
beneficiaries of this revolution may still experience nostalgia for the decades under
Mao. In her work in a rural township near Kashgar famed for its trading economy,
Ayxem Eli noted that loans without interest were a significant source of help for

Berghahn. See also Steinmüller and Brandtstädter (eds.). 2016.
the deserving and trustworthy poor. Islamic charity, considered by the state to be a cultural practice rather than a form of religious activity, was a more significant form of redistribution here than Bellér-Hann and I were able to observe in Qumul. In both locations, however, state support has become increasingly significant: not only public assistance for those with special needs, but the payment of a modest pension to everyone over the age of sixty.

The nationwide trends of individualization can be observed in the border province of Xinjiang as everywhere else. They were most vivid in the doctoral project of Heila Sha, who studied support and care in a new urban settlement of the unique frontier institution known as the Production and Construction Corps (Bingtuan). Focusing on the elderly, Sha emphasized the new ways in which old people themselves exercise agency (e.g. in adopting healthy living strategies and in practices such as widow(er) remarriage). Like several other researchers, she also noted the enhanced role played by daughters, especially in the provision of emotional support.7

In a complementary doctoral project focused on infants and young children of the Akha minority in a remote region of Yunnan close to the Myanmar border (also successfully defended in the present reporting period), Ruijing Wang’s research demonstrated the importance of the traditional cosmology in providing spiritual as well as emotional support. Ethnic traditions have not been displaced by the expansion
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of state institutions and modern biomedicine, but rather persist in complementary fashion.

Kirsten Endres was initially recruited to work in this Focus Group, but she left it prematurely in order to establish her own Minerva Research Group to work on trade and markets in Vietnam (see Part V below). In addition, two Vietnam specialists worked as integral members of this Focus Group: Markus Schlecker and Minh Nguyen helped us to draw out comparative implications of the Chinese case studies and to formulate more general theoretical conclusions. Schlecker’s initial research in 2006 concentrated on rotating credit associations. This led him to draw a distinction between *purposive* acts of support and those resulting from a pervasive “mutuality” that persisted in spite of all economic changes. Even in a very poor commune in North Vietnam, lavish outlays on ritual become intelligible when one appreciates the uncertainty of support itself. By probing discourses and historical connections beyond the empirical detail of who is giving (or selling) support to whom through which combinations of practices in the present moment, Schlecker echoed the conclusions of his colleagues working in China. The study of social support and kinship has to be a holistic, composite undertaking. Care and support deserve to be centre-stage in new theoretical approaches to social reproduction as well as comparative empirical investigations of the consequences of neoliberal political economy.8

In her research with migrants to Hanoi specializing in the trading of waste products between 2011 and 2016, Minh Nguyen distinguished between the levels of everyday practice, ideological discourses, and institutional relationships between different providers of support. She explored how gendered caring roles were continually renegotiated inside the household as both men and women moved between city and countryside. Thanks to the profits earned in this informal, low-status activity, the local social structure has changed considerably. Cultural ideals of patriarchy remain powerful, however.

In July 2014 Minh Nguyen and Roberta Zavoretti organized a multidisciplinary conference *Beyond the Global Care Chain: boundaries, institutions and ethics of care*. The convenors reached out beyond their own regional specialisations (Vietnam and China respectively) to engage with globalisation literatures, in particular concerning the migration of women from poorer countries for domestic service, nursing, and sex work in rich countries. Various dimensions and implications of care were discussed during the conference, from technologies and institutions to bodies and ethics. Researchers working in European and North American contexts have too often obscured the causes and consequences of care chains in the Global South. To grasp contemporary forms of manipulation and exploitation, it is crucial to understand local cultural and institutional practices and new forms of personhood, including, for example, adaptations of traditional conceptions of gender which al-
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low men to engage in the provision of care. This meeting extended lines of feminist critique launched at the conference convened by Gonçalo Santos and Steve Harrell (Washington University) at the MPI one year earlier. The proceedings of these conferences (each containing contributions from several members of this Focus Group) will be published in 2017.  

The final conference of this Focus Group was convened in late September 2016 by Meixuan Chen and Li Zhang (University of California, Davis) under the title *Mobility in Contemporary China: imaginaries, technologies and power*. Contributors explored mobilities of many kinds – of persons as well as of things and ideas, both within the Chinese state and transnationally. In addition to villages which have been transformed by processes of migration and return, attention was paid to diasporas...
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(Hong Kong families established since the 1960s in Scotland). The geopolitical background ranged from “dreams of the new Silk Road” in Xinjiang to “female moral entrepreneurs” in Zambia. Several contributors demonstrated how new technologies pertaining to infrastructure and the media are impacting on the motivations behind rural-urban migration. Upbeat imaginaries of middle-class affluence contrast with highly precarious forms of life in many sectors, such as waste markets. In addition to paper-givers, several distinguished anthropologists of China accepted our invitation to join us as Discussants. This conference provided the perfect opportunity for us to interact once again with Yuhua Guo (Tsinghua University) and Shengmin Yang (Minzu University), the two Beijing scholars who kept an eye on the progress of this Focus Group from its inception. Following the many stimulating exchanges at this final meeting, work is under way towards the publication of a collective book or special issue.
VI
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Introduction

In the current, globalized world, markets no longer seem to be tied to a certain place – they are “nowhere in particular and everywhere at once”. The rise of industrial capitalism and modern market economies has effectively changed the meaning of the term ‘market’ from its original understanding as a particular marketplace into an exceedingly abstract idea. This, however, does not mean that actual physical marketplaces have ceased to exist. Nor does it mean that they are fossilized remnants of a pre-modern era, although governments in many parts of the Global South today, including Vietnam, tend to perceive them as such. The mushrooming of modern department stores and luxury malls that has been taking place in conjunction with the marginalization of small-scale traders is part of a worldwide trend that has been accelerating in the past decades. Concomitantly, the proliferation of an informal sector in market activities has emerged as a phenomenon that not only pertains to economically poor or developing countries grappling with the effects of macro-economic forces and policies (such as globalization, deregulation, and structural adjustment), but also reflects the dramatic shifts that have been occurring in the world economy as a result of neoliberal policies.

Vietnam’s overall socio-economic achievements are without doubt impressive. In the three decades since the launch of the Đổi mới reforms (lit. renovation), Vietnam has transformed from a poor and war-ravaged country to a middle-income country with a dynamic ‘socialist-oriented’ market economy that attracts significant inflows of foreign direct investment (FDI). Notwithstanding the adverse effects of the global financial crisis and domestic volatility, Vietnam’s annual growth rate averaged 6.16 per cent from 2000 until 2016 and is projected to trend around 6.8 per cent at the end of 2016. The rate of people living in poverty has dropped from nearly 60 per cent in the early 1990s to less than 5 per cent in 2015. While 70 per cent of Vietnam’s population of 93.4 million is still living in rural areas, rapid urbanization has
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accelerated the migration of people to cities in search of economic opportunities. Many rural-to-urban migrants engage in small-scale trade for a living, but they are not the only ones for whom local marketplaces continue to fulfill an enduring, vital role in daily lives and livelihoods.

My Minerva Research Group investigated local markets and other sites of small retail trade in different locations across contemporary Vietnam: the capital city Hanoi (Lisa Barthelmes), a peri-urban village in the Red River Delta (Esther Horat), the north-western uplands (Christine Bonnin), and two trading hubs on the Vietnam–China border (Kirsten Endres, Caroline Grillot). By looking at various types and places of small-scale trade, group members examined how Vietnamese traders and market vendors experience, reflect upon, and negotiate current state policies and regulations that affect their lives and trading activities. The projects show how trading experiences shape individuals’ notions of self and personhood, not just as economic actors, but also in terms of gender, region, class, ethnicity, and age, and how these forms of personhood in turn work to challenge or, alternatively, to naturalize aspects of a market economy. The group’s results – outlined below in further detail – highlight how Vietnam’s shifting political economy is constructed through quotidian interactions among traders, suppliers, customers, family members, neighbours, and officials at various levels – in contested spaces, through expanding and contracting circuits of mobility, and across physical and conceptual borders that are fixed, yet porous.

In April 2013, a “workshop in the field” was organized in Hanoi in cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology, Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS). This workshop resulted in the publication of a special issue of the anthropological journal Dân Tộc Học (Anthropology) in Vietnamese. Another fruitful collaborative meeting was hosted in Vienna by Maria Six-Hohenbalken at the Institute of Social Anthropology of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in December 2013. This collaboration lead to the publication of a special section of Cambridge Anthropology, entitled Risks, Ruptures and Uncertainties: Dealing with Crisis in Asia’s Emerging Economies (see Endres and Six-Hohenbalken 2014) The following year, in October 2014, the group organized an international conference titled “Traders in Motion: networks, identities, and contestations in the Vietnamese marketplace” which took place in Halle. With Ann Marie Leshkowich I am currently preparing a co-edited volume for publication with Southeast Asia Program Publications (SEAP) at Cornell University.

Market (Re)development and Privatization

The modernization of marketplaces is high on the Vietnamese government’s agenda of national economic development. Since the central government issued its first detailed decree on the development and management of marketplaces in January 2003, the relevant ministries (the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, the Ministry of Planning and Investment, and the Ministry of Finance) have issued numerous decisions and regulations with regard to distribution network planning; investment into the construction, repair, and upgrading of marketplaces; and general market management. Market development policies are thus part of complex infrastructural planning assemblages aimed at national development. In 2007, the Ministry of Industry and Commerce approved a first master plan towards the year 2020 that targeted over 900 markets throughout the country for ‘development’, including both the upgrading of previously existing marketplaces and the construction of new ones. Regarding the funding required to achieve the plan’s objectives, the ministry called for additional private investment into local market renovation and upgrading. In order to elaborate and implement these central policies, provincial and municipal people’s committees had to formulate their own market development projects (quy hoạch phát triển chợ) as an integral part of their local-level socio-economic development strategies.
The results of these projects paint a highly uneven picture: Whereas many newly built market structures in Vietnam’s upland region have been “left fallow” because planning did not pay sufficient attention to local needs and conditions (Bonnin and Turner 2014bTH), market renewal in urban areas has sparked numerous protests and discontent among vendors. In Lào Cai City on the border to China, where I worked myself, stallholders in the central state-run market were forced to contribute a significant amount of money to the construction costs of a market building, to be set off against the rent for the next ten years.3 In this case, the local state shifted the responsibility for realizing its ambitious urban development plans to the people, at their own risk. In the capital of Hanoi, a number of long-standing public retail markets have been demolished and rebuilt as multi-storey 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 (Endres 2014aTH). In addition, since the mid-1990s, other ‘disorderly’ forms of commercial activity, such as street vending and hawking, have been banned

repeatedly in government efforts to bring order to city streets and discipline citizens into becoming modern urban subjects. In the village of Ninh Hiệp, conversely, the construction of two new privately owned commercial centres offered many families a welcome opportunity to expand their businesses, which subsequently led to intensified competition and greater social inequality among villagers.

*Moral Identities and Tinh Cảm Relations*

As inherently social constructs, markets and marketplace activities are inextricably bound up with issues of morality. The commercial principle of “buying cheap and selling dear” has been debated in moral terms since the days of Aristotle. Moral views about how things should be done, and for what purpose, inform notions of just prices, fair competition, and proper conduct of social relations in marketplaces around the world. The gradual transformation from a subsistence-based to a commercial-based and profit-oriented system of production in Europe had far-reaching effects on the ways in which economic transactions were conducted and regulated. According to E.P. Thompson, the eighteenth century emergence of a ‘new political economy of the free market’ ultimately disrupted the ‘old moral economy of provision’ that sought to protect the common good by imposing limits on the operation of the market. In Vietnam, as in many other societies, commerce has been viewed as a greed-driven occupation based on fraud and deceit. Market traders are vilified as selfish profiteers who tamper with their weighing scales, lie about the origins and quality of their goods, and overcharge their customers in order to increase their gains. Disputes and conflicts naturally arise when social, moral, or religious value systems clash with the realities of life in the marketplace. The Research Group sought to understand how social and moral dilemmas emerge and play out in contemporary Vietnam, where economic actors need to reconcile their ‘moral economies’ with changing market and political economy forces.

While Vietnamese economic organization remains deeply entrenched in prevailing social norms and values emphasizing filial obligations and family cohesion, neoliberal ‘market governmentality’ has become a prime mechanism for producing and organizing self-reliant subjects. Small-scale traders deal with the resulting ambiguities and contradictions through the performance of moral identities that invoke their right to make a viable living. In the streets of Hanoi, itinerant vendors exaggerate their rural origins in order to elicit moral sentiments of compassion for their plight as hard-working peasants. In Lao Cai City’s central market, Confucian notions of fate, fortune, and luck intertwine with moral ideas expressed in economic choices and ethical conduct (Endres 2015a TH). In Vietnamese society, building relationships
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based on *tình cảm* (sentiment) are an essential part of being a moral person.\(^5\) Yet this highly valued and constitutive element of social relationships is perceived by many Vietnamese market traders as lacking in Chinese business relations. At the Vietnam-China border, differences in trading practices therefore tend to contribute to the construction of the cross-border Other as morally aberrant or inferior (Endres 2015\(^\text{art}\), Grillot 2016\(^\text{art}\)). Chinese suppliers often perceive their Vietnamese customers as untrustworthy, especially with regard to their debt repayment practices, whereas Vietnamese traders tend to complain that their Chinese business partners are not putting as much emphasis on *tình cảm* as the Vietnamese. The border thus emerges as a productive site, in providing not just access to economic opportunity but also a boundary through and across which identities are shaped. As complex, multidimensional processes that involve both short-lived interactions and carefully cultivated relationships with the neighborly Other, these identities and alterities are continuously in the making (Endres 2015\(^\text{art}\)).
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Risk and Uncertainty

Two major currents can be identified in socio-cultural studies on risk and uncertainty. One focuses on the ways in which groups and individuals cope with vulnerability and potential loss. The other raises questions of planning and control in dealing with the uncertainties that have emerged from the disjuncture between past and present (Endres and Six-Hohenbalken 2014[3]). The Research Group approached these issues from a micro-level perspective, thus providing insights into the ways in which Vietnamese traders anticipate and deal with risk and uncertainty in the contemporary, ‘market-socialist’ era. Issues of supply and demand, fast changing trends and fashions, fickle regulations, and unpredictable governing practices are among the most common uncertainties in the small-scale trading sector. In her doctoral dissertation, Horat emphasises the productive dimensions of uncertainty in the lives of Ninh Hiệp traders. This dimension becomes most apparent in the creation and cultivation of personal networks and relations of trust with trading partners and informal credit suppliers. These forms of social support contribute not only to the success of Ninh Hiệp family businesses, but also to the social and economic vitality of the village community at large.

Regulatory uncertainty has evolved as an efficient means for the Vietnamese state to exercise power over its citizens. In her doctoral dissertation, Barthelmes found that, for itinerant street vendors in Hanoi, the looming threat of police controls is the most stressful part of their daily routine. The lack of predictability as to when and where a mobile law-enforcement team will chase after them, and what kind of treatment and penalty they can expect if caught, accentuates their precarious economic situation. The tactics and strategies that mobile vendors employ to deal with the risks and uncertainties of itinerant trade in the streets of Hanoi include spatial and temporal avoidance, moral claims to livelihood, and the performance of ‘ruralness’. Moreover, legally ambiguous contexts offer room for extralegal (and illegal) manoeuvring. One way of negotiating legal restrictions and ambiguities is through petty bribery. Small-scale traders commonly justify their resort to such “exchange practices” by declaring them to be an essential means of economic survival (Endres 2014[a][3]). The avenues through which Vietnamese small-scale traders at the Vietnam-China border have seized the economic opportunities are invariably smoothened by “greasing the palms” of local government officials. These arrangements with the authorities, however, also expand the grey zone of risk and uncertainty that lingers between the ‘lightness’ of free trade, economic opportunity, and self-advancement, and the ‘darkness’ of illegality, corruption, and arbitrary exercise of power.
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Conclusion: markets in anthropology

Markets and marketplaces have long captured the interest of economic anthropologists because of the insights they offer into the embeddedness of economic activity within wider societal, cultural, and political contexts. Throughout history and across the world, markets have evolved and grown into complex and adaptive socio-economic institutions through which goods and services flow from suppliers to consumers. Anthropologists generally think of markets as embedded in wider social and political institutions, albeit to differing degrees and in historically and culturally distinct ways. Their perspectives on markets thus challenge views that assume universal traits of human economic behavior. Not only are they sites of economic exchange, they are also thriving social spaces where networks are forged, identities are shaped, and power relations are negotiated. In many regions of the world, economic organization remains deeply entrenched in social norms and values regarding kinship obligations and family responsibilities. Anthropologists therefore need to study how different modes of sociality and relatedness are created, negotiated, and instrumentalized in the context of economic and political changes. They look at how participation in economic life is shaped by gender ideologies concerned with ideals of femininity/masculinity and with men’s and women’s role in family livelihood strategies. Anthropologists have also examined the culturally and politically specific ways in which markets are embedded in state regulation under changing configurations of political economy.

The findings of this research group reveal remarkable similarities between market dynamics in Vietnam and in other world regions, irrespective of the political system in place. ‘Market socialism’ has not prevented neoliberal ideas from penetrating the lives of Vietnamese small-scale traders, be it in Lào Cai City, in Hanoi, or elsewhere in the country. In line with global trends over the past decades, Vietnam’s adoption of neoliberal-informed practices and strategies has proved a key mechanism for producing and organizing self-reliant subjects whose “will to improve”\(^7\) entails a willingness to sacrifice for the common good and national development. And yet, the ‘market economy with socialist characteristics’ that has emerged in Vietnam over the past 30 years since Đổi mới has brought forth unique features that defy a singular notion of ‘the market’ even within one particular country. Its diverse logics and modalities emerge out of complex interlinkages between global challenges and local dynamics of economic transformation that are subject to equally diverse forms of encouragement, regulation, and policing at national and local levels.

Electric Statemaking in the Greater Mekong Subregion

Kirsten W. Endres

Introduction

Electric power has been emblematic of progress and modernity since the late nineteenth century. At a time when global initiatives to achieve universal access to ‘sustainable energy for all’ go hand in hand with efforts aimed at tackling the devastating ecological effects of globally increasing energy consumption, it is pertinent to look more deeply into the networks of power that crisscross the landscapes of the planet. With a focus on electricity in three key areas – generation, transmission, and consumption – the project will investigate how the expansion of electric grids in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) interacts with social, political, and economic forces at various levels of governance. My new project will investigate policies and bureaucratic encounters in the context of electric infrastructure development and inquire into their role in the construction of particular (gendered, neoliberal, moral, political) subjects and subjectivities. Despite calls for increased attention to the relationship between energy systems and socio-political arrangements, empirical research on ‘electric statemaking’ is still at an incipient stage.¹ My new Research Group will fill this gap with a comparative investigation aimed at developing an infrastructural perspective on statemaking processes that will enrich current understandings of government and governance in Southeast Asia and beyond.

Southeast Asia: the regional background

As a starting point for such a perspective, this Research Group will review some of the key ideas and theories on early Southeast Asian statehood.² Common to these works is the idea that, in contrast to the bureaucratized and territorially bounded states of early modern Europe, Southeast Asian states were rather loosely organized political entities whose power radiated out from their dynastic ‘exemplary centers’ to the peripheries. Besides drawing attention to similarities and differences in historical trajectories of state formation, models of the maṇḍala, the galactic polity and the theatre state also highlight the interrelations and interdependencies between the kingdoms and polities within the region.

With the emergence of the modern and modernizing nation-state in Southeast Asia, there has been a gradual shift from power ‘radiation’ to the ‘penetration’ of state power into peripheral regions, most notably through infrastructural development. In this regard, electric development must be seen as part and parcel of statemaking processes. These statemaking processes include, but are not limited to, the appropriation of resources from peripheral regions and the consolidation of territorial control through development projects. They involve new social relations, identity politics, political institutions, and configurations of power and inequality. Electric statemaking is therefore intricately intertwined with the making of subjects and subjectivities. The project sets out to investigate this relationship along the electric power grid in the Greater Mekong Subregion.

The Greater Mekong Subregion

The GMS is a cooperation program of six countries located in the Mekong River Basin: Cambodia, China (Yunnan province and, since 2005, the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region), Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam. Initiated by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in 1992, the program is primarily aimed at enhancing connectivity and economic relations among member countries through major infrastructural projects. In line with global agendas of ensuring universal energy access, affordable electricity is seen as a prerequisite for the region’s economic growth and social wellbeing. The subregion’s energy resources and demands, however, are not evenly distributed among (and within) member countries. GMS energy cooperation therefore focuses on grid interconnection in order to establish a competitive and integrated regional power market. A network of high-voltage transmission lines is planned to link the GMS member countries and deliver energy from a steadily growing number of hydropower plants, predominantly in Myanmar and Laos, to high-demand countries.

The development of hydropower is globally highly controversial due to the hazardous effects of large dams on riverine ecosystems and human populations. In addition to the large-scale displacement of people and the subsequent upheaval of their livelihoods, other issues include changes in the river’s flow and temperature, the disruption of wildlife habitats, the trapping of sediment leading to the erosion of downstream riverbeds and banks, all of which may have negative implications for the food security of vulnerable communities. Meanwhile, the benefits of hydropower are mostly enjoyed by urban and/or industrial centers within and beyond national borders. These unequal power relations at local, national and transnational scales will be a major focus of the research.
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Infrastructure and Statemaking

The Research Group posits that infrastructures contribute to statemaking processes in important and multifarious ways. Conceptualized as material networks that enable movement and connectivity through space and time, they are closely linked with visions of modernity and promises of progress. Anthropological engagements with infrastructural systems such as roads, water supply, sewers and power grids have revealed insight into the material (re)ordering of social life in contexts of global transformations. Infrastructures have also been addressed as technopolitical assemblages forming part of wider ideological projects and policies central to the organization and exercise of state power. Electricity grids are thus not only fundamental to the goals of governmental modernity and development agendas, but also to practices of statecraft as such.

Although the provision and maintenance of essential infrastructure is seen as a central task of the state in many parts of the world, private sector participation and public-private partnerships in infrastructure development have been adopted worldwide as a solution to state budget shortfalls. This also applies to the Greater Mekong Subregion, where hydropower development has emerged as a high-priority sector in national and regional development plans. This sector is increasingly characterized by complex networks of state and non-state actors, including business enterprises, transnational donor organizations, and civil society groups. There is no doubt that this rescaling of power relations in the context of electricity provision has the potential to “reconfigure the way that states are able to spatialize their authority and stake claims to superior generality and universality”. This project hypothesizes that it may also contribute to strengthening state infrastructural power, characterized as the “institutional capacity of a central state, despotic or not, to penetrate its territories and logistically implement decisions”.

The Group adopts a transnational, multi-level and multi-sited approach to ‘electric statemaking’ in the GMS that entails the study of power technologies in both the literal and the Foucauldian-inspired figurative senses. It does so by focusing on electric power in three key areas. The first one, power generation, investigates the rules and procedures of electricity decision making and investigates the environmental, social and economic impact of electric power generation on the ground. The second area, power transmission, looks at the power interplay among state and non-state actors at local, national and supranational levels in the context of electric power development and energy trade. The third key area, power distribution and consumption, examines
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histories of electrification and variations in access and consumption of electricity across different sectors of society. We ask how ordinary people interact and deal with (adapt to, alter, resist, negotiate) electricity in everyday life.

Key areas of inquiry and main research questions
The project “Realising Eurasia: civilisation and moral economy in the 21st century” (REALEURASIA ERC Grant Agreement no. 340854) is rooted in economic anthropology, but also draws on historical sociology and adjacent fields. Relying primarily on ethnographic methods, it investigates economic attitudes and activities at the level of households and family businesses, paying particular attention to the moral dimension of the economy and the extent to which this is shaped by distinctive religious and “civilizational” traditions. Conceptually, the project takes off from classical work by Max Weber positing a distinctive “economic ethic” in Protestantism. Weber’s Eurocentric limitations can be demonstrated through comparative investigations of the other major “world religions” he identified. In addition to contributing to economic and other sub-divisions of anthropology, this project addresses long-running debates about modernity and European bias in other social sciences and in global history. “Christian Europe” is better grasped not as a continent but as one very important macro-region of the Eurasian landmass. It continues to share many features with the other civilizations of this landmass, as one would expect in view of their common origins dating back to the Bronze Age (for more on Eurasia, see the Introduction to this Report, and Hann 2014a, 2015c, 2016a).
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Locating REALEURASIA in Social, Economic and Moral Anthropology

Since my intellectual background is in “old school” British social anthropology, I have a basic preference for empirical analysis and comparison of the type found in other social sciences, as opposed to the idealist-hermeneutic bent which characterizes North American cultural anthropology; but I also draw freely on the latter and the boundaries are nowadays not as clear as they used to be. Within social anthropology I have specialized in matters pertaining to economy (a consequence of the fact that I studied economics as an undergraduate, switching to anthropology as a graduate student). Whereas some currents in cultural anthropology tend to dissolve the economy into the “culture as a whole”, I prefer the intermediate position of Karl Polanyi’s substantivist school. Economy can be a useful analytic category, but we need to begin by recognizing two distinct senses in modern usage. The universalist sense of utility maximizing or economizing in conditions of scarcity is less interesting than the sense in which the human economy is everywhere a matter of meeting needs in particular environments. This invitation to a relativizing approach is qualified in social anthropology by recourse to Polanyi’s ideal types to serve the purposes of generalization and comparison.
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1 This section is a condensed version of a presentation made by Chris Hann to the EASA Economic Anthropology Network at the Tallinn conference, July-August 2014. Thanks to convenor, Allen W. Batteau.
Karl Polanyi classified economic systems in terms of their “forms of integration”: reciprocity, redistribution and (market) exchange. According to him, the emergence of market society in Great Britain in the 19th century threatened an unprecedented disembedding of the economy from society. This rupture in the real economy was marked by the replacement of the intellectual paradigms of political economy with the neoclassical synthesis that has defined mainstream economics ever since. A sympathetic reconstruction of Polanyi’s substantivism requires extending the concept of embeddedness to include contemporary economies dominated by markets. No matter how global and apparently anonymous, these too are shaped by political, social and cultural constraints and mediated by human agency. Yet the nature of the embeddedness changes with the rise of nominally “self-regulating” markets. According to Polanyi, this “utopia” had to be underwritten by states, it necessarily provoked protective responses in society, some of which were benign, while others were malignant and led eventually to the reintegration of economy and society through Fascism. The renewed pertinence of Karl Polanyi’s framework in the early 21st century has been widely recognized.

For the purposes of REALEURASIA, the work of cultural anthropologists on the embeddedness of family businesses is of particular interest, as exemplified in studies by George Marcus and Sylvia Yanagisako for dynastic families in the US and for more modest scales of entrepreneurship in Italy respectively. Anthropologists have paid close attention to discourses of “family values” and their relationship to household practices. They have gone a long way towards deconstructing the concepts of family and household and questioning their utility for comparative analysis. It is sometimes suggested that terms such as entrepreneurship and “family firm” are Orientalist concepts that obscure recognition of inequalities and actual household dynamics. But anthropologists have not carried out many detailed studies of the importance of religion for the life-style (Lebensführung) and organisation of contemporary family businesses. Many studies of modernisation have shown the inadequacy of Western secularisation assumptions; we know that many successful businessmen even within the modern West are attracted to meditative and devotional practices, some of which transcend particular civilizational traditions. These themes figure in Business School curricula and a new specialization “business anthropology” is now well-established. But we still know rather little about how religious beliefs and practices shape values and affect the “performance” of work in family-controlled businesses and the domestic economy more generally. The same holds true for perceptions of solidarity and exploitation, within the family as well as outside it.

---


In terms of theory, economic sociologists draw on many of the same sources as the anthropologists. In both disciplines, French scholars have led the way in critiquing neoclassical economics, for example by emphasizing the moral pre-eminence of the human worker beyond wage-labour norms. However, relatively little attention has been paid to regions outside North America and Europe. Some political economists who engage with “varieties of capitalism” have recognized the need to refine such models when extending them to other regions, including regions such as Central Europe that have close civilizational ties with the capitalist West. An “Asian model” has been touted, based primarily on the Japanese case, but anthropologists have helped to demonstrate the enormous variety which exists within the “market cultures” of Asia. Comparative institutionalist research has drawn attention to structural factors, timing and sequencing in explaining similarities between countries such as Japan and Germany, but few have attempted to tease out the importance of the civilizational factors.

REALEURASIA brings together the political, the economic and the religious in a civilizational frame. This was in effect the frame of Max Weber himself, though he did not theorise the concept of civilization and relied on such vague terms as Weltkultur. Yet his French contemporaries Émile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss, influenced by German ethnological Kulturgeschichte but going beyond cartographic diffusionism, embraced this concept before the First World War as a complement to their foundational concept of society. Civilisation allowed them to identify “families of societies” and thus move beyond the level of particular bounded cases. This tradition had a limited take-up in North American cultural anthropology. However, it died out almost completely in the second half of the 20th century. Contemporary scholars use terms such as transnational to capture some of these phenomena. The most common term today is globalization, but its application may flatten resilient differences. Christianity and Islam are both global religions, but there may nonetheless be significant differences between them in the way they impact upon economic life; there may also be significant differences internal to the tradition, e.g. between Byzantine and Western traditions of Christianity, or Sunni and Shia forms of Islam.

The links between religion and economy have been the object of countless studies, in non-orthodox branches of economics as well as in anthropology. It is a commonplace that a faith can provide a basis of trust to enable commercial practices. In principle, any creed can play this role (and secular badges of identity such as an old school tie can function equally well). But the question remains: do the major world religions identified by Weber differ as he thought they did with regard to “this-worldly” economic activity? One hundred years after he developed his sociology of

---

religion, in the wake of his earlier celebrated study of *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, can the development of capitalism in the Eurasia of the early 21st century be illuminated by a return to his questions? Weber’s key concept was the *Wirtschaftsethik*. Focusing not on specific theological teachings but rather on the “practical impulses for action”, the job of the historical sociologist was to investigate variation in the world religions (including internal variation). It was clear to Weber that different economic ethics need not necessarily translate into different patterns of economic organisation. REALEURASIA researchers will explore how differences in discourses and organisation affect morals, lifestyle and behaviour a century after Weber’s ruminations, in the light of the large literatures they have generated in the meantime, especially in Germany.

Recognition of the centrality of religion and morals to political legitimation and economic embeddedness potentially opens up vast fields of scholarship. The concept of “moral economy” was not coined by Polanyi or Weber but by the British historian E.P. Thompson. Thompson was interested in tacit social understandings that could not be expressed in economic statistics and calculations but depended rather on “social norms and obligations”, expressed in ideas such as that of “reasonable price”. Many scholars have adapted this concept, originally put forward to explain the behaviour of urban crowds on the eve of the industrial revolution, to analyse behaviour in very different settings (see e.g. Kofti 2016b). Disruption of the established value order has been widely diagnosed in analyses of postsocialist societies and of neoliberalism generally. Drawing on Karl Polanyi, I have put forward the concept of “moral dispossession” to complement the more familiar “material dispossession” and “cultural dispossession”. But I have also warned against romanticization of the concept of the concept of moral economy and shown that “the market” and private property can be a strong positive focus in the value system of rural populations. I shall pursue these lines of research in the course of REALEURASIA.

It is no accident that we owe the concept of moral economy to a remarkable historian of that Protestant island which was prominent in undermining the long-term integument of the moral economy across Eurasia and continues to have a difficult relation to the adjacent European “continent”. Thompson commented wistfully on the irresistible spread of his concept, commending in particular the adaptation of James Scott. He would probably not be surprised by its growing popularity in an epoch of capitalist crisis, from radical political economists for whom capitalism is intrinsically immoral to theologians and philosophers who insist that the market, too, depends on a foundation of shared moral convictions. While liberals continue

---

to stress the paradoxical claim so central to their tradition that the selfish action of individuals can, through the market mechanism, be conducive to the collective good, most recent applications of the concept of moral economy have looked at activities outside the market and outside the economy altogether. With the contexts investigated ranging from humanitarian interventions to Wall Street, there is a danger that the inflation of “moral economy” leads to incoherence.

Didier Fassin has sought to stabilise the concept by emphasising moral subjectivities in the context of a new “anthropology of morality”.9 This is part of a wider current which emphasises actor-focused enquiries into the use of moral terms in “ordinary ethics”. The researchers of REALEURASIA will focus on the economic implications of moral concepts which bind persons not only to their families and employers but also to wider communities of citizens and perhaps even to anonymous remote publics in other countries. The boundaries of the moral economy are broad, but in each case study it will be carefully disaggregated (e.g. investigating the differences between casual labourers (perhaps employed on a seasonal basis) and employees with permanent contracts who have been associated with a family business over decades or even generations. We expect to demonstrate that pressures to rationalise production and distribution have not been accompanied by equivalent convergences in the subjective experience of economic and human social relations, either inside or outside the workplace.

Contemporary small businesses, including retail stores, in Halle as in other former socialist cities, face the challenge of adjusting to competitive capitalist markets in a context in which entrepreneurial values were stigmatized for four decades. Left: Chain stores of large corporations on Halle’s main shopping street. Right: Small shops in a side street near the city centre. (Photos: S. Terpe, 2016)

Although REALEURASIA is a comparative project in the substantivist tradition, we shall be alert to possible contributions from other theoretical perspectives. For example, a “new institutionalist” might argue that, to the extent that religious elements distort entrepreneurial profit-maximizing, this can be adequately explained in terms of a latent function ensuring moral and social order over longer time horizons. A Marxist will prefer to emphasize how religious inflections of the moral economy serve the logic of extracting surplus value and capitalist accumulation. Highly secularized urban labor forces cannot be cast back overnight into the moral economies of the preindustrial era. REALEURASIA researchers will nonetheless explore the possibility that some of the changes underway at present are indicative of a substantive, long-term return of “public religion”, not only in legitimating power holders but as a “social glue” in the embedding of the economy. Our project is constructed in such a way as to emphasize the plurality of civilizational traditions in Eurasia over several millennia. We shall pay close attention to the ways in which each of these traditions constructs and valorizes its own heritage, in opposition to the norms of a globalized “market society” which is increasingly perceived to have wrought great damage to communities (“disembedding” them, in the terms of Polanyi). The deepest hypothesis is nonetheless one which posits commonalities: in their different ways,
all of these civilizations were founded on moral principles opposed to the ethic of short-term market maximization. That is why I maintain that, if the relentless rise (or better “race to the bottom”) of global neoliberalism is to be averted, we can do no better than to look to the civilizations of Eurasia to find ways to keep “the market” in its place (Hann 2014a).°

Progress to Date

The eleven researchers of the project REALEURASIA (seven PhD students and four post-doc/senior researchers, all but two funded by the ERC) have made significant progress since the launch of the project in July 2014. The researchers spent the first year of their project preparing the ground for the empirical anthropological and sociological research. This involved weekly meetings for most of the year for training in theory and research methods, and in ethics. A major task of the senior staff in this initial period has been to assist the students in preparing their survey instruments and in clarifying key concepts. Chris Hann devoted his attention primarily to the central concepts of the project, while also working to disseminate information through the website, especially the innovative blog. An international conference was organized in July 2015 to mark the end of the preparatory year and another workshop in September 2015 to discuss Eurocentrism in global economic history.

The second year (August 2015–September 2016) was dominated by fieldwork. The PhD students and senior researchers worked in eight countries (Denmark, Germany, Hungary, the Russian Federation, Turkey, India, Myanmar and China). All doctoral students have done a full year’s fieldwork in a single location (a norm no longer universally observed in contemporary anthropology departments).

Having set out his concept of Eurasia in a major article in Current Anthropology (Hann 2016a), Chris Hann drafted a Working Paper in which he reevaluates the concept of moral economy (2016misc). The bridging concept of moral economy has been productively deployed in various disciplines but recent inflationary adaptations, in line with the burgeoning anthropology of morality (or ethics), neglect the material economy (the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services). Hann illustrates the moral dimension of economic life with reference to work as a value between the late 19th and early 21st centuries in provincial Hungary. This moral dimension is highly susceptible to politicization. The present right-wing government (in power since 2010) has laid great stress on workfare in its economic and social policies. The paper considers the functioning of these public works schemes in two local settings and shows how discourses of work and fairness are extended into new ethical registers to justify negative attitudes toward immigrants. Investigation of the moral dimension of economy complements the paradigms of classical political

° This section is based on the mid-term Report compiled by Lale Yalçın-Heckmann for the European Research Council in early 2017.
economy and the neoclassical synthesis that dominates in modern mainstream economics. While all three have a role to play in economic anthropology, investigation of the moral dimension through ethnographic methods is the hallmark of a specifically anthropological contribution to the more general programme of renewing a holistic social science. For the project REALEURASIA, this paper provides an example of how ethnographic findings can be combined with historical perspectives in tracing the resilience of moral ideas and their relation to economy.

Other senior staff have also published Working Papers dealing with various dimensions of the project. Matthijs Krul (2016) reflects on “the neoinstitutionalist turn” in the social sciences and its significance for the Polanyian tradition in economic anthropology. Recent trends in economic thought see the debates that engaged Karl Polanyi as obsolete, made redundant by the development of New Institutionalist Economics. Even within economic anthropology this viewpoint has gained some ground. In this paper, Krul argues that this notion is mistaken. After dwelling on the landmark contributions of Karl Polanyi, he scrutinises the “new institutionalist turn” itself. Taking Douglass North’s response to Polanyi as a paradigmatic example, Krul argues that the New Institutionalism suffers from serious conceptual deficiencies. Krul cautions against the view that economic anthropology could or should

become an empirical appendage of the New Institutionalism. Instead, he argues that the New Institutionalism can be useful only when incorporated selectively into economic anthropological research programmes, so that anthropology encompasses institutionalism and is not swallowed by it. Therefore, Krul concludes, “Polanyi’s challenge” remains relevant to economic thought within and outside anthropology. His contribution to the work of REALEURASIA is particularly valuable for emphasizing the continuing relevance of Polanyi’s contribution to understanding the embedded nature of economic institutions. His research explores the limits of the New Institutionalist paradigm, including its models of bounded rationality and institutions as constraints on individual choice. In the spirit of Polanyi, he argues that understanding institutions requires taking seriously the anthropological dimension of beliefs and norms as a core component of different modes of economic integration.

Sylvia Terpe (2016misc) examines the utility of Weber’s idea of value spheres and life orders for micro-sociological and anthropological analysis. In his Intermediate Reflection12 Max Weber famously discusses the idea of different spheres of life, representing their increasing separation and the tensions among them as the predicament of “modern men”. Terpe shows that Weber’s idea of different spheres of life can be a useful heuristic (for sociologists and anthropologists alike) in researching everyday life perceptions of the world people inhabit. Rather than apply the concept to historical phenomena on a macro level, she focuses on how it may guide empirical research on a micro level. In a first step, she outlines what the term “sphere of life” means from a methodological perspective that puts individual actors at its centre. Terpe goes on to argue that – as Weber suggests with reference to “collective entities” – spheres of life exist, in an empirically accessible way, first of all as ideas and beliefs in the minds of individual persons. Against this background, she asks in the second part of the paper how many spheres can be distinguished and how they are best named. The secondary literature on Weber provides no clear answer to these questions. She suggests – with reference to Weber’s concept of ideal types – that they can only be answered empirically from the perspective of the actors themselves. Third, drawing on recent German scholarship, much of what is not yet available in English, Terpe introduces the distinction between value spheres and life-orders as two fundamentally different modes of orientation to spheres of life. While the “inner logic” of value-spheres is caused by the fact that actions which are oriented to values are ends in themselves (and not just means), Terpe also emphasizes that the inner logic of life-orders, to which people relate in a more instrumental manner, can be understood as attributions to these spheres made by the actors. This difference is illustrated using the example of the economic sphere. In the final part of her paper, Terpe outlines the usefulness of Weber’s idea of different spheres of life for analysing various moral dimensions of everyday life. Here Weber’s concept of life-

orders may be helpful in determining the “structure of moral orders” and the idea of separated spheres of life illuminates moral dynamics in everyday life. Finally, Weber’s distinction between value-spheres and life-orders is helpful in disentangling the various ways in which work and morality intersect. This contribution to the work of REALEURASIA is primarily theoretical, but Terpe is herself applying this approach in her empirical research in Halle; it offers many suggestive hints as to how to study the Wirtschaftsethik in economic anthropology.

The creation of value and price formation in economic transactions is the focus of Lale Yalçın-Heckmann’s paper (2016). She investigates rose and rose oil production in the Anatolian province of Isparta with reference to discourses on and procedures of price formation. Farmers have been engaging in rose cultivation for over a century and rose oil production is considered to be a traditional industry. The market actors for rose oil are global functioning cosmetic firms and almost all rose oil from Isparta is exported. Prices and production have been steadily increasing since 2010. Although prices are seen as good, there are concerns about over-production and harsh competition between the rose oil firms for buying the harvest, hence pushing up rose prices and, leading to a crash of rose oil prices on the world market. Through careful observation of payment and price formation procedures, her provisional findings raise issues concerning the “moral economy” of price formation. The discourse on prices suggests that value judgments are embedded in capitalist markets rather than being simply or primarily anti-market. This is a very different context from that in which moral economy has been classically theorized by E.P. Thompson and others.

Rose production in Isparta, Turkey, is the start of a complex commodity chain in which moral considerations of what makes for a fair price for roses and rose oil are extremely important for small family-owned enterprises. (Photo: L. Yalçın-Heckmann, 2016)
The doctoral students have observed and participated in the everyday lives of urban residents, households and small firms and are in the process of analysing and writing up their findings. They have all implemented a survey to gather detailed data concerning labour, taxes, corruption, solidarity, thrift, informality, family values and religious commitments. The project is distinctive for its interdisciplinary framework (Sylvia Terpe is a sociologist and Matthijs Krul an economic historian) and for its combination of a quantitative survey with qualitative methods (fieldwork and interviews). The analysis (both individual and comparative) of the data collected in 2015–2016 is still at its initial phase (first results will be presented in the latter half of 2017, in particular at an international conference in Wittenberg, Germany). It can already be stated with confidence that the “moral background” is pertinent in explaining both behaviour and attitudes. In this minimal sense, all human economies are “embedded”. Specifying the links between moral dimensions and different political economic regimes will be the chief task in the next phase of this project.

ERC grant holders are expected to pay close attention to “knowledge transfer”. The first axis of knowledge transfer concerned the doctoral students, some of whom were new to academic anthropology (the subject in which all will obtain their doctorates) and needed to deepen their knowledge of anthropological theory and methods. These students attended University courses in Halle in their first year of the project in order to fulfill formal eligibility criteria for the doctorate. The second, external axis of knowledge dissemination included outreach and scientific talks by Chris Hann, and conference attendance by all senior researchers and some of the doctoral students. Most students engaged in significant outreach activities in the respective countries of research, as well as through the project blog.

All researchers have used this blog to chronicle their research and to disseminate knowledge to the world online, including substantive scholarly contributions as well as ethnographic materials pertaining to field sites. Chris Hann has used it in innovative ways to demonstrate the relevance of his Eurasian perspective to current geopolitical and economic affairs, from crisis in the Ukraine to the election of US President Trump, and from TTIP to Brexit. The trends currently exhibited in the two most populous English-speaking states exemplify one side of a long-term dialectic that can be traced back to the origins of mercantile capitalism and its development in Eurasia over three millennia. In this sense, the US remains within the frame. But if present plans to repeal “Obamacare” are carried through and millions of citizens of the world’s wealthiest country are left without health cover, this would be a significant break with the long-term Eurasian trend. Even with the Affordable Care Act, welfare-oriented redistribution in the United States is modest in comparison with what is accomplished by much poorer states in most regions of Eurasia. These comparisons are explored by US historian Kenneth Pomeranz in an extensive commentary on the Chinese translation of Hann’s paper in *Current Anthropology* (Hann
2016aTH). At a time when many social policy experts are concerned for the future of “social Europe” in the face of neoliberal economic pressures, it is instructive to signal the traditions of “social Eurasia” – and to contrast these aspirations with the market-model propagated by the Republican Party in the United States.

More substantial knowledge transfer in academic fields will take place in the second phase of the project, when researchers have completed data analysis and are ready to publish their results (primarily in the form of Open Access articles and monographs, as required by the ERC). We have been working together to plan further international conferences for disseminating results. Lale Yalçın-Heckmann is organizing a panel at the forthcoming meeting of the German Anthropological Association (Berlin, October 2017). Chris Hann is organizing a panel on “Empire, Exchange and Civilizational Connectivity in Eurasia” at the Fifth European Congress on World and Global History: “Ruptures, Empires, Revolutions” (Budapest, August-September 2017), in which Matthijs Krul will also present. Both Hann and Krul will participate in a meeting in London and Cambridge in June-July 2017 which will explore the contributions of the late Jack Goody to the study of global history. At the end of 2017 the project group is collectively organizing a major interdisciplinary conference in Wittenberg on “Moral Economies: Work, Values and Economic Ethics”, at which the keynote lecture will be given by Hans Joas. Further workshops are planned for 2018, together with the organization of panels at major international conferences, in particular the biannual meeting of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (Stockholm, August 2018).

VIII

THE ANTHROPOLOGY, ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF EURASIA
(International Max Planck Research School, ANARCHIE)
Progress Report

Sascha Roth and Chris Hann

Background

The International Max Planck Research School for the Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Eurasia (IMPRS ANARCHIE) was launched in 2012 as a cooperation with the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg. Our original partners were the Institute of History, the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, and the Institute for Art History and European Archaeology. For the fourth cohort of students, to be admitted in 2017, we shall be joined by the university’s Department of Social Anthropology. All the colleagues in question (see list below, p. 111) are members of Philosophische Fakultät I. Each of our three disciplines is in some sense a daughter of the master discipline, philosophy – provided that philosophy is understood as a rigorous empirically grounded science, and not as the armchair deduction of knowledge from abstract principles.

ANARCHIE receives most of its funding from the Max Planck Society. This is supplemented by two graduate schools of the university: “Society and Culture in Motion” and “Enlightenment – Religion – Knowledge”, in which a few individual members of ANARCHIE participate actively. The Principal Faculty of ANARCHIE consists of senior staff in the participating disciplines, who play the leading role in teaching and in supervising the doctoral projects. The Sprecher and senior representative for anthropology is Chris Hann. In setting up the school, Hann worked closely with historian Michael G. Müller, who remains active in the School but has handed over Sprecher responsibilities for history to Andreas Pečar. François Bertemes is the Sprecher representing archaeology. Following the appointment of the original ANARCHIE coordinator Dr Daria Sambuk to a university post in the Institute of History in 2016, these responsibilities were taken over by Sascha Roth, a member of the first cohort and one of our first Alumni.

IMPRS ANARCHIE was designed for three cohorts of twelve PhD students, each covering all three disciplines. The first cohort, consisting of individual projects connected to the general topic of “collective identifications”, was recruited in 2012. The second cohort began work in 2014 with projects in the general field of “religion and ritual”. The focus of our third cohort, admitted in 2015, is “economic and demographic drivers of social change”.1

Following a successful application to the Max Planck Society, further funding has been secured to enable the recruitment of a fourth cohort in the course of 2017. The core theme will be “representation”. We expect to recruit 12 students (4 in

---

1 On this occasion only nine students were admitted, in order to release resources to permit limited funding of members of earlier cohorts in their fourth year.
each discipline) and, in line with the general trend in the Max Planck Society, to be able henceforth to offer a full fourth year of funding wherever this turns out to be necessary.

ANARCHIE emphasizes interdisciplinarity, which has long been a catchphrase in an increasingly specialized academic world. We agree with Fernand Braudel that “it is essential that each of the participants should not remain buried in his private research, as deaf and blind as before to what the others are saying, writing, or thinking!”2 Work outside established disciplinary boundaries requires an appropriate institutional framework that enables students to step back from their earlier training (usually a Masters programme in one specific subject). The first year programme of ANARCHIE thus features wide-ranging introductory courses covering theories and methods of the social and historical sciences. At the same time, students work intensively on their individual projects with their main supervisor. The projects are discussed collectively at Winter and Summer schools involving international guests. The second year is largely devoted to data collection, usually in the form of field research or in archives and museum collections. This is fully funded by the programme. Resources are also available to support participation in conferences and workshops in every phase of the project. From the beginning of the third year (marked by an Autumn School at which progress reports are presented) the student is expected to prioritise rapid completion of the dissertation. Resources are available to facilitate publication.

Experiencing Interdisciplinarity

The main aim of ANARCHIE is to renew interdisciplinary contacts between anthropology, archaeology and history, which have weakened in the course of each discipline’s cumulative professionalisation. It is sometimes argued that archaeology and anthropology are upstart subjects, “subsidiary” to the classical discipline of history. In modern universities these latecomers are often to be found outside the humanities, the traditional home of Clio. Anthropologists boast proudly that, unlike other social sciences, they alone cover the full range of human societies. They are proud of what they were able to document in colonial conditions, and the study of remote communities living in preindustrial conditions remains a significant strand in anthropological research. But in recent generations, in a world of intensifying globalization, socio-cultural anthropology has successfully reinvented itself. Its longstanding association with the *Naturvölker* has been left behind. Both in terms of empirical range and theoretical innovation, the discipline has been dynamic in the postcolonial era. Anthropologists nowadays are as likely to do their research in large cities as in remote hamlets, and this range is reflected in the Principal Faculty of ANARCHIE. Irrespective of the setting in which they work, oral history and/or

---

archival research can enhance knowledge of local pasts and thereby understanding of contemporary social issues.

The changes in archaeology have perhaps been even greater, not least due to a rapprochement with the natural sciences and the application of ever more sophisticated methods in the analysis of material traces of past societies. These developments are opening up new conversations with geneticists and other neo-Darwinian theoreticians. While the nature of their data limit the possibilities for archaeologists to explore subjective worlds of meaning, symbolic representation and architecture can be studied by archaeologists with the techniques of the humanities. In archaeology too, as in anthropology, older models of unilineal staged evolution have been replaced by more dynamic models which allow for multi-directionality.

Many projects in archaeology overlap explicitly with projects in history in the sense that the analysis of material artifacts can be supplemented by that of written sources. This applies in classical archaeology as it does to the archaeology of the Middle Ages. Both fields are well represented in Halle. The Halle historians most actively involved in ANARCHIE specialize in the early modern and modern periods. Their work, too, reflects more general trends in approaching the past, including the value of comparison, the need to move beyond established nation-state and imperial frameworks, and to consider the voices of actors who were mute in earlier forms of historiography. There is now widespread awareness that historical sources can be approached through posing anthropological questions and applying anthropological techniques.

Because the three disciplines have been going their separate ways for a long time, 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. This is why dialogue between the disciplines is encouraged from the very beginning of the programme, together with an awareness of the big questions underpinning all three. For example, in the era of postcolonial theory, it behoves all European scholars to assess crucially the ways in which they have represented the “others” they have encountered during centuries of imperial expansion. This applies to “continental empires” in Asia just as it does to the maritime empires which until now have had greater salience in postcolonial theory. The stereotypes of “Orientalism” have shaped archaeological scholarship in dealing with the more distant past as well as historical and anthropological accounts. Counter-stereotypes such as “Occidentalism” may play a useful role in unsettling hegemonic narratives and over-simplified notions of the modern West. But in the next step it is usually important to differentiate rather than flatten differences in categories as crude as “East” and “West”. After a generation during which many scholars railed against Western, Eurocentric bias, in recent years some global historians are beginning to push back. Depending on the temporal and spatial frames

---

one wishes to address, recognition of unprecedented progress in European societies may after all be entirely warranted. This is the larger historiographical context in which ANARCHIE projects are pursued.

Whereas our fourth cohort (to start in October 2017) is likely to pay close attention to narrative theory and other humanities approaches in grappling with “representations”, the focus of our third cohort (admitted in 2015) is on the “harder” facts of social and economic history. But how hard are these facts really? Statistics have to be constructed; they are not compiled from the material world free of agency. Whether the data are quantitative or qualitative, almost everyone agrees that comparison is a good thing; like interdisciplinarity, it is a desideratum. But comparisons have to be undertaken with great care if they are to illuminate and not mislead. Irrespective of cohort focus, the same core problems of theory and method are explored in the introductory courses taught in the first year.

Central to our analytic framework are conceptualizations of time and space (in addition, individual researchers usually pay attention to local spatio-temporal perceptions, but that is a different level). ANARCHIE questions established periodization, for example by taking up issues such as how far it is legitimate to apply categories such as “the Middle Ages” outside the European past for which they were devised? What are the limitations of the standard narrative of a decline from Antiquity to feudalism, followed by a “renaissance? Does this suffice to approach the entire macro-region of Europe, let alone the whole of Eurasia? Can a singular phenomenon of “capitalist modernity” be identified and dated, or should we recognize “multiple modernities”, as Shmuel Eisenstadt and others have argued?4

With the notion of multiple geographies, we tackle the construction of historical regions (Geschichtsregionen) on multiple scales, which we seek to connect to each other as appropriate in particular cases. Ultimately, ANARCHIE postulates the Eurasian landmass from Japan to the British Isles as a unity. We thus reject Eurocentric scholarship, which has traditionally insisted on a “continental” divide between Europe and Asia. We encourage constructivist approaches to ethnic and national identities, while recognizing that some nation-states have deeper roots than others. The same is true of socio-cultural traditions: in many cases it is possible to localise purposive acts of creation (“the invention of tradition”), but these innovations often depend for their success on the evocation of sentiments or motifs that have a longer history that is harder to uncover.

ANARCHIE researchers emphasize interaction and movement of many kinds: of people, ideas, goods, and technologies. Some of the theories devised to analyse capitalist globalization may be relevant (albeit on smaller scales) to phenomena of the preindustrial era. World systems theory, for example, has been applied productively by archaeologists to the prehistory of various regions of Eurasia. The current known as diffusionism has long been unfashionable in Anglo-Saxon anthropology
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(ever since anthropology replaced ethnology as the definitive name of the discipline when institutionalization was consolidated at the beginning of the last century). The same is true of Diffusionismus and Kulturgeschichte in the German-language traditions of the discipline. Yet the entanglements in which we are interested, and which nowadays we study with the help of notions such as globalization or connectivity, are not wholly unlike those of previous centuries, and sometimes the approaches of the earlier schools may turn out to be helpful after all. (Although ANARCHIE does not support projects devoted exclusively to disciplinary history, the first-year curriculum is designed to familiarize all students with the main trends in each of the participating disciplines.)

In practice, most scholars recognize complex combinations of diffusion and independent invention. Jack Goody and others point to parallel developments at either end of Eurasia, but stress at the same time the importance of mercantile cultures in transferring knowledge in multiple directions. Such a “bottom up” focus, stressing merchants and markets, needs to be complemented by research into the nature of the polity and the ways in which market exchanges were constrained as well as supported by rulers. Scholars such as the late Bruce Trigger have formulated comparative typologies of “early civilizations” which are thought-provoking for anthropologists, archaeologists and historians alike. ANARCHIE students are encouraged to follow such trails irrespective of the author’s disciplinary label. For example, the work of Max Weber, nominally a sociologist, and Alexander Chayanov, nominally an agrarian economist, has proved useful to numerous ANARCHIE students.

In the course of the curriculum students are acquainted with classical readings deploying key concepts of all three disciplines. The seminar Approaching the Past: Theories, Methods, Conceptualizations covers fundamentals of theory and methodology. Particular attention is devoted to concepts such as “culture”, “acculturation”, “diffusion”, “civilization” and “tradition”, which are used in all three disciplines, though often in divergent ways. This overview is followed in the second term by a seminar which engages with the central topic of the specific cohort. The course Comparative Analysis runs through both terms. It aims to convey how comparative methods are practised in each discipline with a view to maximising synergies and increasing awareness of pitfalls.

From archaeologists, other students typically gain greater awareness of the built environment and the political role of material culture for the construction of civilizational ideologies. For instance, anthropologists interested in the spectacular edifices of the present may realise that in some respects their intentions and effects are not so different from monumental constructions of prehistory. Archaeologists can learn from anthropologists how dangerous it is to assume tight connections

---

between material traces and ethnicity, thus implying delineated and bounded identities that do not do justice to the complexities of identificational processes. More positively they may, if the proper caveats are entered, make good use of anthropological research on modes of communication and production among non-literate, non-industrial groups. Both archaeologists and historians can profit from fresh debates concerning the performative aspects of social action, which have had a big impact on anthropology in recent decades. For historians, one benefit of close cooperation with anthropologists is the refinement of methods of oral history. Anthropologists in turn can benefit from the historians’ advice in how to set about archival work. Several ANARCHIE anthropologists in our first cohorts have combined oral history research with archival work.

Each doctoral project is expected to draw significantly on at least one of the other two disciplines. This is reflected in the composition of the student’s Advisory Committee, which may also be augmented by external experts. At the end of the day, however, students must knuckle down to focus on a particular question (or set of questions) within the scope of their disciplinary tradition. The Martin Luther University does not award joint degrees and therefore the methodology of the primary discipline must dominate. The process of thesis writing is usually highly individualist. It is expected that this takes place in Halle, either at the Max Planck Institute or at one of the university institutions. Most theses are defended at the Martin Luther University, where one formal report is prepared by the main supervisor and one by an independent expert. Cotutelle arrangements are also possible and have been successfully implemented in two cases.

Current Projects: second cohort, “religion and ritual”

An outline of the projects of the first cohort concerning “Collective Identifications” was provided in a previous MPI Report. Most of those projects were successfully completed in the present reporting period (see list of dissertations already defended, inside back cover). The second cohort began work in autumn 2014 within the framework of “Religion and Ritual”. Projects explore links between religion and political legitimation (a focus that will be deepened in the fourth cohort), and the role of cult practice and mythology in the creation of identity.

From the perspective of historical anthropology, Elzyata Kuberlinova explores the Tsarist policies towards a minority religion. She analyses the mechanisms used by the Russian Empire to incorporate Kalmyk Buddhism and to assimilate its adherents. Similar questions are approached by Hoài Trần with regard to ethno-religious minorities and their ritual practices in the highlands of contemporary Vietnam. He is especially interested in showing how the groups and their living spaces are represented and transformed by the community members themselves, but also by

the Vietnamese socialist state in a context in which certain cultural practices are internationally recognized as world heritage. In the multi-religious and multi-ethnic city of L’viv, Diána Vonnák explores how religious sites (Jewish, Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic) have been transformed from sites of Soviet ideological propaganda towards cultural heritage, and also into symbolic spaces for displaying and representing today’s independent Ukrainian identity. The political resonance of religious buildings is also addressed by Giuseppe Tateo who investigates the inflationary construction of sacred buildings in the Romanian capital of Bucharest, and above all the monumental new cathedral. All these anthropological projects are based on extended field research; all demonstrate multifaceted aspects of religion and ritual and their pertinence to understanding political and economic dynamics.

If only due to the nature of their sources, mostly restricted to material remains, the archaeological projects were different in character. Tim Grünewald is shedding light on religious and ritual life among South Scandinavian and Central European settlers in the third millennium BCE. His comparison of causeway enclosures promises to reveal new aspects of ritual and religious life and emphasises the simultaneous importance of these monumental structures for spiritual and everyday purposes in Neolithic societies. Jan-Henrik Hartung focuses on special features of the interior architecture of Greek temples before and during classical antiquity. This project presents an elaborate picture of temporal changes and regional variations between sites that, like Grünewald’s causeway enclosures, combine sacral and profane purposes. A quite different object of enquiry is the symbolism of Celtic ritual studied by Anja Lochner-Rechta and its transformation in the early La Tène period. The collective representations expressed in cultic imagery enable a richer understanding of Celtic society, its economy, and its regional differentiation. Ornaments and art artefacts also play a crucial role for Juliane Tomesch whose project is devoted to Egyptian elements in Roman sepulchral culture. The popularity of Egyptian symbols and motives on funeral altars and depictions of the afterlife in the Roman Empire in some ways foreshadowed the Egyptomania of nineteenth and twentieth century Europe.

Among the historians, the project of Simon Bellmann reaches farthest back in time. Taking the books of Esther and their historical translations as exemplary sources, he explores the political theologies of early Judaism, i.e. ideas pertaining to the relationship between divine power and human government. He is especially interested in the attitudes of Jewish communities towards non-Jewish rulers in Hellenistic and early Roman Judaism (330 BCE–100 AD). That not only books but material structures like altars can serve as important sources for reconstructing past relationships between humans and divine powers is demonstrated by Ditte M. D. Hiort. Focusing on the typological and chronological comparison of “horned” altars in the city of Gerasa (today Jerash), Jordan, she aims at deepening our knowledge of the social, religious and historical context that accompanied their making and usage. María Soledad Hernández Nieto draws on the archives of the Inquisition in the Canary Islands to examine the impact of foreign religious ideas, especially
Protestantism, primarily with regard to images and especially the representation of the deity. There are affinities to Tomesch’s investigation of the spread of religious images and artwork in the eastern Mediterranean in an earlier epoch. Hans Goldenbaum’s project challenges the familiar historiography of the Middle East during the Mandate period (especially the 1930s and 1940s), which assumes groups of actors differentiated by religion and ethnicity. Closer inspection of inter- and intra-group relations at the village level as well as between competing nationalist actors leads him to theoretical reflections on concepts of identification and “national indifference”.

We have summarised the projects by discipline, but cross-disciplinary questions have presented themselves continuously in the work of this cohort. For instance, how can the use of religious symbolism to brand exclusive salt plates in Iron Age Europe be compared with the contemporary building of Orthodox churches in Romania to brand a national religiosity? What are the dividends of a comparative analysis of social relations and political loyalties in multi-religious settings such as the interwar period in the Middle East and Kalmykia in the western Tsarist Empire a century earlier? Do the techniques and media deployed by the powerful to create “proper” state-citizen relations resemble each other at some level? And (even though sources may be more scanty here) are there comparable similarities in terms of popular resistance?

Third Cohort: “economic and demographic drivers of social change”

The third cohort of nine students investigates inequality and social change with a particular focus on “economic and demographic drivers of social change”. Projects range from the dynamics of reproduction among prehistoric hunter-fisher-gatherer societies to recent and contemporary processes of migration and resettlement. How is inequality organised and legitimated, e.g. in the domains of family, wider networks of kin, and larger collectivities held together by market exchange? What are the demographic, economic and political impacts of migrants and diaspora communities in past and present urban settings?

Relying on coins as almost the only available source from the Bactrian and Indo-Greek kingdoms of the 3rd and 2nd century BC, Gunnar Dumke’s project focuses on encounters between the Greeks and local indigenous people. Numismatic iconography reveals that changes in the region’s cultural landscape as the Greeks expanded into the Hindu Kush were more complex than hitherto conceptualised by scholars of these Indo-Greek kingdoms. The other historians in this cohort make more use of large quantitative datasets. Based on both public statistics and the private documents of Saxon farmers, Oscar Dube analyses the impact of institutional and technological developments between 1700 and 1900 on the peasant economy. Besides macro-level changes in the political and economic framework, this project also attends to the self-organization of farmers at the local level as a decisive factor in economic and social transformations. Working in the borderland of Belgium, Germany and the
Netherlands, Benjamin Matuzak compares demographic responses to short-term economic stress in 19th-century Europe. Regional variations in mortality, fertility, and marriage systems are all significant. In Eastern Europe in the same era, Maria Kozhevnikova’s project explores social norms among Russian noblemen as reflected in court and police documents. Especially in the first quarter of the 19th century, increasing normative divergence among the Russian cultural elite must be connected to wider changes taking place in society.

The social norms investigated by prehistorian Juana Maria Olives Pons could hardly be more different: she is concerned with demographic developments in foraging societies such as those that can still be found in parts of southern Africa. Combining qualitative ethnohistorical and ethnoarchaeological materials, this project aims to correct one-sided explanations based solely on biological and environmental variables. Nico Schwerdt, in his project on long-term change in Greek Miletus, focuses on ceramic products to investigate socio-economic transformations in the cities of Asia Minor from Roman to early Medieval times. Ruptures and continuities in the production, consumption, and distribution of pottery are interpreted in light of wider economic and demographic trends in the urban economy.

Anthropologist Duygu Topçu also engages with social, economic and urban transformation in western Anatolia: but her focus is on Syrian war refugees in today’s Istanbul and her main methods are ethnographic. Concretely, she analyses the refugees’ loss of economic security and the economic and social strategies through which they cope with the impact of Turkish and international legal regulations. A somewhat different story of profound economic transformation lies behind Daniela Ana’s study of Moldovan wine production, which has been significantly affected by a 2006 Russian ban on the product. How does one of the country’s major economic branches, strongly shaped by the socialist economy, adapt to the different standards and demands of western European markets? While Ana is particularly concerned with changing labour practices in the wine industry, she also addresses wider cultural implications, including wine tourism. Finally, in another former Soviet state with an eastern Christian heritage, Annabel Körner explores the increasing role of assisted reproductive technologies in Georgia. Questions of family planning and the treatment of infertility are analysed with regard to cultural concepts of biological, genetic and social kinship, especially as these are challenged by new reproductive technologies.

As with earlier cohorts, all these projects invite creative thinking, both within and between the three disciplines. Can ethnographic evidence of how contemporary Georgians challenge normative expectations through their use of assisted reproductive technologies illuminate the norms that regulated the reproduction of Paleolithic hunter-gatherers or the norm changes that took place in 19th century Russia? What new impulses do we gain for studying long-term historical developments if we juxtapose historical data on the innovations of entrepreneurial peasants in early modern Saxony with data concerning transformations in the ceramic industry of Roman and Byzantine Milet? Can power inequalities and civilizational encounters
between East and West in Antiquity be compared with the mobility of people, ideas and technologies we observe in contemporary Eurasia?

**Activities**

An Autumn School was organized in November 2014 at which members of the first cohort presented papers drawing on the data they had collected during their second year. The new cohort (focusing on “Religion and Ritual”) was ritually welcomed with a distinguished lecture by Jörg Rüpke (Max Weber Center for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies, Erfurt). The range of this lecture – entitled “Religious privatisation and individualisation in historical perspective” – was as broad as the range of our new projects in this cohort.

The Winter School in Wittenberg in February 2015, at which all members of the new cohort made presentations, was enriched with keynote lectures by Alexander Herda (Humboldt University Berlin), Gábor Vargyas (University of Pécs and Hungarian Academy of Sciences) and Kai Trampedach (University of Heidelberg).

*Winter School of the second cohort in Wittenberg in February 2015. (Photo: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, 2015)*
The same cohort seized the initiative at the end of the Summer semester by organizing a Summer School in Erfurt under the title “Religion and Ritual: A Matter of Power”. This marked the last gathering of this cohort before starting their year of data collection. In addition to presentations by the students themselves and inputs from Principal Faculty, lectures were given by three invited guests: Laurent Berger (Laboratoire d’Anthropologie Sociale, EHESS, Paris), Alexei Lidov (Lomonosov Moscow State University) and José Jaime García Bernal (University of Seville).

Another highlight in terms of interdisciplinary cross-fertilization, was the international conference “Inequality, Scale, and Civilisation”, organised by Chris Hann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology) and David Wengrow (University College London, Centre for Research into the Dynamics of Civilisation). Four members of the Principal Faculty (Bertemes, Fertig, Szołtysek, and Yağcı-Heckmann) presented papers, representing all three ANARCHIE disciplines.8

In October 2015 the third cohort of ANARCHIE was launched with a Distinguished Lecture by László Kürti (University of Miskolc) titled “Ethnography, History and the New Nomadism in Hungary”. Less than one month later we had the pleasure to host another distinguished guest, David Kertzer (Brown University, Providence, USA). Following his talk on “Anthropology, Demography, and History” on 9th November, there was an opportunity to follow up during a roundtable on the following day, organized by Georg Fertig at the Institute of History.

The end of the Winter Semester was marked (as traditionally) in February 2016 by the ANARCHIE Winter School in Wittenberg. Keynote lectures were given by Iliya Iliev (Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski), Dietlind Hüchtker (University of Leipzig) and Jordi Estévez Escalera (Autonomous University of Barcelona). Again following the established pattern whereby the Summer School is organized “from below”, members of the third cohort put together an ambitious programme, “Social and Economic Transformations in Eurasia in the Longue Durée”. Keynote lectures were delivered by Daniel Devolder (Autonomous University of Barcelona), Yuliya Hilevych (Radboud University Nijmegen), Jeroen Poblome (Catholic University of Leuven), Grażyna Liczbińska (Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań), Steven Sampson (Lund University) and Caroline Rusterholz (Birkbeck, University of London). This School was also privileged to welcome Roland Hardenberg, recently appointed Director of the Frobenius Institute (Frankfurt/M).

Having said goodbye to members of the third cohort as they embarked on their year of data collection, in November we welcomed back members of the second cohort to present their preliminary findings at an Autumn School. This was opened with a distinguished lecture by the Danish archaeologist Flemming Kaul (National Museum of Denmark).
Principal Faculty (Cohorts 1-3)

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)

Stefan Pfeiffer (Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, 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)

Mikołaj Szoltysek (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle)

Lale Yalçın-Heckmann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle)
Guest Lecturers, 2014–2016

Jörg Rüpke (Max Weber Center for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies, Erfurt)
Religious Privatisation and Individualisation in Historical Perspective
(Opening Lecture, Autumn School, Halle, 5–7 November 2014)

Alexander Herda (Humboldt University Berlin)
Gábor Vargyas (University of Pécs and Hungarian Academy of Sciences)
Kai Trampedach (University of Heidelberg).
(Winter School, Wittenberg, 9–11 February 2015)

Laurent Berger (Laboratoire d’Anthropologie Sociale, EHESS, Paris)
Alexei Lidov (Lomonosov Moscow State University)
José Jaime García Bernal (University of Seville)

László Kürti (University of Miskolc)
Ethnography, History and the New Nomadism in Hungary
(Opening Lecture, Autumn School, Halle, 12 October 2015)

David Kertzer (Brown University, Providence, USA)
Anthropology, Demography, and History
(Distinguished Lecture, 9 November 2015)

Ilia Iliev (Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski)
Dietlind Hüchtker (University of Leipzig)
Jordi Estévez Escalera (Autonomous University of Barcelona)
(Winter School, Wittenberg, 1–3 February 2016)

Daniel Devolder (Autonomous University of Barcelona)
Yuliya Hilevych (Radboud University Nijmegen)
Jeroen Poblome (Catholic University of Leuven)
Grażyna Liczbińska (Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań)
Steven Sampson (Lund University)
Caroline Rusterholz (Birkbeck, University of London)
(Summer School: Social and Economic Transformations in Eurasia in the Longue Durée, Weimar, 18–20 July 2016)

Flemming Kaul (National Museum of Denmark)
Prehistoric Religion – Bronze Age Religion: A Difficult Topic of Research?
(Opening Lecture, Autumn School, Halle, 9–11 November 2016)
Doctoral Students of the 2nd Cohort: Religion and Ritual

Simon Bellmann (history, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Political Theologies in Early Judaism – A Case Study in the Books of Esther

Hans Goldenbaum (history, Institute of History)
Between Nationalism, Pragmatism and Indifference

Tim Felix Grünewald (archaeology, Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)
Religion and Ritual in Causewayed Enclosures of South Scandinavia and Central Europe (4400–3100 BC)

Jan-Henrik Hartung (archaeology, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Interiors of Greek Temples in Archaic and Classical Times

Maria Soledad Hernández Nieto (history, Institute of History)
Inquisition and Images in Early Modern Spain: Proceedings in the Canary Islands, ca. 1520–1700

Ditte Maria Damsgaard Hiort (history, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Altars in Roman-Period Gerasa and the Region of the Decapolis, 1st–3rd Century C.E.: Local Communication and Expression in the Context of Sacred Markers

Elzyata Kuberlinova (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
Between Buddha and Tsar: Kalmyk Buddhist Clergy in Late Imperial Russia

Anja Lochner-Rechta (archaeology, Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)
“Symbolic Power”–“Symbol Power”: Celtic “Early Style” and its Ritual, Cultic, and Identity-Forming Significance

Giuseppe Tateo (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
City of Crosses: Bucharest’s Re-Consecration after 1990

Juliane Tomesch (archaeology, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)
Egyptian Elements in the Sepulchral Culture of the Roman Empire beyond Egypt

Hoài Trần (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
Mountainous Cultural Space and Socialist National State: Ritual Practices and Cultural Heritage Discourses among Ethnic Minorities in the Central Highlands of Vietnam

Diána Vonnák (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)
Heritage for the Future: Debating Nation and Legacies of the Past in Wartime Ukraine
*Doctoral Students of the 3rd Cohort: Economic and Demographic Drivers of Social Change*

**Daniela Ana** (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)  
Produced and Bottled in Moldova: History and Labour in a Postsocialist Wine Factory

**Oscar Dube** (history, Institute of History)  
Peasants and Lords – Small and Big Farmers: Innovation, Institutions and Productivity in Saxon Agriculture, 1700 to 1900

**Gunnar R. Dumke** (history, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)  
Alexander’s Heirs in India – Graeco-Macedonian Rule in Pakistan and North-Western India after Menander I Soter

**Annabell Körner** (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)  
“Child in every Family!” – Family Planning, Infertility and Assisted Reproductive Technologies in Georgia

**Maria Kozhevnikova** (history, Institute of History)  
Social Norms of Proper and Improper Behaviour of Russian Noblemen as Reflected in Court and Police Documents of 1801–1825

**Benjamin Matuzak** (history, Institute of History)  
Coping and Caring: Institutionalised Vulnerability and Resilience of Families under Economic Pressure during Modernisation

**Juana Maria Olives Pons** (archaeology, Institute for Art History and European Archaeology)  
Social Norms as a Strategy of Regulation of Reproduction among Hunter-Fisher-Gatherer Societies

**Nico Schwerdt** (archaeology, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World)  
Long-Term Urban Change in Miletus from Roman Antiquity to Early Byzantine Times. A Ceramic Perspective

**Sena Duygu Topçu** (anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)  
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JACK GOODY, 1919–2015: IN MEMORIAM
Portrait of Sir Jack Goody by Maggi Hambling
(By permission of the Master and Fellows of St. John's College, Cambridge)
Jack Goody, 1919-2015: In Memoriam

Chris Hann

Jack Goody had only recently been appointed William Wyse Professor of Social Anthropology at Cambridge University when I turned up in the department as a graduate student in 1974. In my first year I chose the area option “Melanesia”. Had it not been for Jack’s advice – and reference letters and signatures on the necessary papers – I would have set off for New Guinea rather than Hungary in the following year. In short, my personal debt to Goody is enormous.

But there is more to this homage than a British variant of filial piety. In the 1980s and 1990s, Jack Goody played an important backstage role as an expert advisor to various committees of the Max Planck Society, the final result of which was the establishment in 1999 of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle. The whole institution is thus indebted to him. Of course, the debt is greatest in this department, which is founded on Goody’s dogged insistence on the similarities to be found across the whole of Eurasia, when viewed from his original perspective as an ethnographer of Africa. Goody came to Halle in December 2001 to deliver the keynote lecture at our very first conference in the permanent buildings. When he visited again in 2004 he delivered a more personal talk about the development of his thinking concerning Europe and Eurasia. A transcription of this talk is in my files and I hope to publish it in due course.

Our concept of Eurasia is not identical to that of Jack Goody. As I noted in the introduction, our efforts to splice Goody’s vision with the vision of Karl Polanyi’s historical economic anthropology go against the grain of Goody’s dismissal of the Central European’s “anti-market” convictions. But this in no way diminishes our intellectual debts.

The tradition of holding an annual Goody Lecture in the Summer Semester, established in 2011, has been continued in the present reporting period. The lectures by Francesca Bray (2014), David Wengrow (2015), and Martine Segalen (2016) have all been published (see overleaf for details). They are also accessible online: www.eth.mpg.de/

Shortly after Wengrow’s lecture, which took up several works of Goody as well as his most important archaeological inspiration, Gordon Childe, Jack Goody died in Cambridge. My obituary was published in American Anthropologist in March 2016 (Hann 2016c). I am currently (early 2017) preparing a more substantial memoir for the British Academy.

2 http://www.britac.ac.uk/biographical-memoirs-fellows-british-academy
Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology

Goody Lectures 2014–2016

2014: Francesca Bray (University of Edinburgh)

2015: David Wengrow (University College London)

2016: Martine Segalen (Université Paris Ouest Nanterre-La Défense)
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Doctoral dissertations defended (* = member of the IMPRS ANARCHIE)

2014
Milena Baghdasaryan: Citizenship at the “historic homeland”: refugees from Azerbaijan in Armenia

2015
Nino Aivazishvili-Gehne: Staatsbürgerschaft an der Grenze. Das Beispiel der georgischsprachigen Ingiloer in Aserbaidschan
Saheira Haliel (Heila Sha): Eldercare in Northwest China: the case of Bingtuan
Vivienne Marquart: Monuments and malls – heritage politics and urban struggles in Istanbul
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Lisa Barthelmes: Peddlers and peasants. Itinerant street vendors in Hanoi, Vietnam
Leah Ah Li Cheung*: De-foreignizing the past. The politics of heritage in Xi’an, Central China
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Pierpaolo De Giosa: Heritage below the winds: the social life of the cityscape and UNESCO World Heritage in Melaka
Esther Horat: Market transformation and trade dynamics in a peri-urban village. Reflections from a Vietnamese marketplace
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Lina Pranaitytė-Wergin: The church, the priest, the living and the dead: exchange practices among Lithuanian rural Catholics
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