

Call for Papers

“The Global as Method: Ethnographic Scales in the 21st century”

November 8-9, 2019

Graduate Institute, Geneva, Switzerland

The Swiss Anthropological Association (SSE-SEG-SAA) convenes once a year a major conference around thematic panels. This year, the annual meeting of the SSE-SEG-SAA will address the topic of “The Global as Method: Ethnographic Scales in the 21st century.”

The global has become a truism permeating most of current anthropological research: ‘it’ denotes a spatial dimension – the global South or North; it can serve to gauge the pulse of the world – global crisis and inequalities; and has increasingly come to define the terms of our own epistemic engagements – global health, global capitalism, global governance, etc. Despite its self-evident facticity, how exactly does one critically approach the global? Or, more to the point, how does one research the global as method and across scales, temporalities, from the local to the planetary? How do we grapple with the global as contingent, ever changing processes that are continually reimagined, contested, differently appropriated and reconfigured? As an object of study, it poses challenges for anthropologists always attentive to how people narrate and experience in everyday life their membership in or exclusion from global connections. If globalisation is traceable across multiple phenomena and movements – people, objects, ideas, texts, images, labour regimes, ecologies, technologies or emergent social, political and economic forms – we propose to think through how the global is mobilised and challenged in the practice of ethnography. Whether at home or abroad, inside or outside, in the center or its periphery, we seek to examine the making of scales – spatial and temporal – as an analytic, methodological and epistemological endeavour.



Mitglied der Schweizerischen Akademie
der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
www.sagw.ch



Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association



Membre de l'Académie suisse
des sciences humaines et sociales
www.assh.ch

The *Global as Method* conference invites us to engage the promises and challenges of researching and bridging conventional North/South, local/global and disciplinary divides. Through the formulation of original research agendas and methodologies, the conference aims to take stock of the momentous transformations that became manifest in the final decades of the 20th century; simultaneously, it looks ahead to imagine how the global as method may chart new directions for anthropology in the opening decades of the 21st century.

Format: Except for the CAV and Student Panels, only one time slot of 105 minutes will be assigned per panel (roughly 10-15 minutes per paper).

The deadline for paper proposals is 30 June 2019. Please submit your proposal to the contact person(s) listed for each panel.

Panel 1

Frontiers of Humanitarianism

Conveners:

Julie Billaud (Graduate Institute, Geneva / CEHRA, Geneva)

Till Mostowlansky (Graduate Institute, Geneva)

Ideologues of humanitarianism as well as humanitarian practitioners have long addressed humanity at large (Feldman and Ticktin 2010) to promote their ideas and materialize their visions. This has been the case throughout the different “ages” of humanitarianism (Barnett 2011), from imperialism to cold war settings to (neo-)liberal globalization. In doing so, they have made claims on a planetary scale whilst also fragmenting the global by establishing the limits of humanity. Paradoxically, actions carried out in the name of ‘humanity’ have produced contrasting modes of intervention. These include military humanitarianism (De Lauri 2018), vernacular humanitarianisms (Brkovic 2017), philanthrocapitalism (McGoey 2012), and religious humanitarianism (Redfield & Bornstein 2010) each of which strive to remake the world according to specific moral paradigms (Calhoun 2008). In this sense, humanitarians have – consciously or not – worked towards a fragmented, compartmentalized and increasingly unequal planet.

This panel aims to examine the gaps and frictions (Tsing 2005), changing power relations, violent encounters and emerging inequalities that result from the fragmentation that humanitarianism has brought forth over the course of time. It thereby seeks to bring together anthropologists working on a range of different contexts around the globe to investigate the in-between spaces that arise at the limits of humanitarianism. The panel conceptualizes such spaces as “frontiers” – zones of contact in the margins – in which concepts, ideologies, social formations and individuals encounter difference, transformation and reconfiguration under unequal power relations. The current period of globalization has propelled the production of such “frontiers” in terms of speed, scalar distribution and observability. Yet, this panel also seeks to acknowledge the historically far-reaching existence of humanitarian frontiers and encourages papers to discuss their emergence across time and space.

Against the backdrop of the violence deriving from the fragmentation of care and the reconfiguration of welfare at the margins of the state, the panel is particularly invested in exploring zones of awkward engagement that destabilize the ideological foundations of mainstream humanitarianism. It thereby focuses on forms of solidarity, philanthropic endeavours, social enterprises and other projects that are explicitly designed to alleviate the suffering of ‘others’, mobilize universalizing forces (capitalism, human rights, humanitarianism, religion, science), transcend localities and produce unexpected biopolitical assemblages (Ong and Collier 2005).

In light of the mentioned themes, the panel invites contributions that discuss one or several of the following questions:

- Where and when do frontiers of humanitarianism develop?
- What sort of actors are present at these frontiers?

- What 'politics of life' and forms of subjectivities do the frontiers of humanitarianism foster?
- Which are the concepts, ideologies and organizations at stake?
- How can we theorize the relationship between humanitarianism and globalization in past and present?
- What are the methodological challenges of studying humanitarian frontiers and how do they affect our research?

Contact person: Till Mostowlansky, till.mostowlansky@graduateinstitute.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 2

The dancing body's scales

Dance Ethnographies in the Era of Globalization

Conveners:

Alice Aterianus-Owanga (ISSR, University of Lausanne)

Ana Rodriguez (ISSR, University of Lausanne)

While for a long time, dance anthropology has been committed to highlighting the way in which dances and cultures shape each other (Kaeppler 2000; Grau 2006), in the present, it is clear that they also carry on each other (Neveu et Skinner 2012). The “time-space compression” (Harvey 1989) resulting from globalization has led to several transformations in local fields of dance: international migration helped to spread so called “traditional” dance repertoires in new spaces where they have become a means of identity reconfigurations; several dances, such as salsa, kathakali, tango or lindy-hop, have been removed from their original territory, to be commercialized and distributed in global industries; international festivals and new tourism locations have arisen, leading to new forms of mobility as well as to the spectacularization of some dance practices that were previously rooted in religious or familial celebrations. As a consequence, dance experience often intersects with different scales (domestic, urban, national, local, regional, global) between which individuals, dance movements, ideologies or images navigate.

The globalization of dance fields has resulted in a reconfiguration of dance ethnography and in new methodological reflexions on the examination of dance. Thereby, some researchers highlight how the global perspective on “traditions” and identities that are shaped by dance increases the importance of long-term fieldwork immersion and participation in practices observed (Dankworth et David 2014). Others, such as Jonathan Skinner, use the notion of translocation to point out that the idea of clear divisions between scales of practices and experiences, between local spaces and translocal networks, is refuted by the observation of practices, which are embedded in a continuum and a flow that anthropologists should follow (Neveu Kringelbach and Skinner 2012).

Echoing these examples, our panel proposes to shed light on the methodological tools and approaches that appear in the anthropology of dance in response to the “global turn”. Our purpose is to reveal the contributions of dance ethnography to the broader anthropological discipline. Presently, multi-sited ethnography (Marcus 1995) is being reformed by various critics (Hage 2005; Falzon 2009), the couple local/global has revealed its shortcomings, and the deconstruction of the methodological nationalism led by theorists of transnationalism hasn't yet resulted in the emergence of new theories which would allow us to think the metamorphoses of national, ethnic and transnational belongings in the complex scales of globalization. In this context, we assume that the specificities of the subject dance lead anthropologists to develop original tools, in order to understand the tension between the local involvement of the dancing body and the translocal or transnational networks in which it circulates. We believe that these original studies contribute to debates in the anthropology of globalisation and notably discussions regarding ethnographic and multi-scalar approaches.

How do anthropologists combine the unavoidable anchorage and sensitive involvement in local situations of practices with the understanding of translocal scales in which actors and practices circulate? Which specific methodological challenges stem from these circulations, and how do researchers respond to it? How does the rise of new digital technologies transform the regimes of circulation and experience between different scales, and how is it possible for anthropologists to address it? In this panel, we propose to gather dance and globalization anthropologists in order to discuss the scales of observation and investigation explored in the study of the dancing body. Based on case studies about dance in migration, transnational tourism of dance, international dance festivals, artistic tours or dance creations in circulation, the contributions will focus on the ethnographic methods mobilized to think the complex and interconnected scales that intersect in dance practices. We encourage contributors to build on these case studies to establish a dialogue with the theoretical and epistemological turns emerged these last years as part of the anthropology of globalization.

References

- Dankworth Linda et David Ann. 2014. *Dance Ethnography and Global Perspectives: Identity, Embodiment and Culture*. Springer.
- Falzon Mark-Anthony (Ed.). 2009. *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*. Ashgate.
- Grau Andrée. 2006. *Anthropologie de la Danse : Genèse et construction d'une discipline*. Centre National de la Danse.
- Hage Ghassan. 2005. « A not so multi-sited ethnography of a not so imagined community ». *Anthropological Theory* 5(4): 463-475.
- Kaeppler Adrienne L. 2000. « Dance Ethnology and the Anthropology of Dance ». *Dance Research Journal* 32 (1): 116-125.
- Marcus George E. 1995. « Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography ». *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.
- Neveu Kringelbach Hélène et Skinner Jonathan (Eds). 2012. *Dancing Cultures: Globalization, Tourism and Identity in the Anthropology of Dance*. Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books.

Contact person: Alice Aterianus-Owanga: alice.aterianus-owanga@unil.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 3

Jumping scales and embedded archives: interrogating the 'global' in everyday histories

Convener:

Aditya Kiran Kakati (Graduate Institute, Geneva)

This panel will engage the issue of scale, particularly in its global manifestation from the methodological vantage point of historical inquiry, while interrogating the same from the 'various degrees' of ethnography as an empirical basis. We seek to converge parallel and divergent debates on scale, and method in historical studies with similar concerns in the anthropology of globalisation and reflect upon the two key themes: a. the 'global' as a method and b. ethnographic scales; from the disciplinary platform of history in order to enrich the conversation across disciplinary boundaries.

The 'global' as a scale of enquiry has been part of extensive historical debates and methodological interventions. The result of these historiographical approaches have also produced related scalar cousins such as 'transnational', 'international', 'regional' forms of history. Whether explicitly stated or not, historians have heuristically engaged the issue of scale, allowing scope to compare and converse about these approaches with the field of anthropology. This is also arguably linked to the methodological approaches and nature of sources and access to the latter that have determined research approaches. Much like in the unique form of 'globalisation' that we witness in the 21st century, historians have treated the production of fragmentary worlds, through connections to global phenomenon such as empires, colonialism and warfare across a variety of scales. A long tradition of debates within anthropology of globalization has examined how 'global' processes continue to fragment and 'localise' worlds. While some boundaries and institutions were thought to be 'eroded' by global flows, we largely witness that sovereignty, power and agency are further disjointed and operate more rhizomatically. Nations and nation-states dominated historical-writing, and even in their apparent de-centring as loci of history-making, these institutions along with new epicentres of power are only re-entrenched. While these issues have been widely discussed, there is a need to broaden the scope of conversation across these disciplines fruitfully, not the least because historians have a. differently navigated scales without a binary global/local distinction b. have grappled with components of 'ethnography' in its broadest sense, (which may include interviews, oral histories or alternative readings of ethnographic archives), informed by the 'reflexive' turn in anthropological inquiry c. deal with 'time' differently than anthropologists. This selection of approaches may add to charting avenues for debates in anthropology, including greater recognition of shifting, unclear and unstable nature of centre-periphery, North-South, Global-Local binaries. Additional possibilities to interrogate and expand the scope of what is 'ethnography', and how 'archives' may be identified and interpreted across locales will emerge from this interdisciplinary discussion.

The panel invites and proposes papers that interrogate global processes and fragmentation of space, community and time and 'culture' in its peculiar manifestations in the 20th-21st century. The panel seeks to further the conversation between historians and anthropologists by illustrating alternative and complimentary possibilities to

traverse scale may emerge. This may be coupled with the adoption of methodological flexibility, in being able to utilise components of 'ethnography', and read the historical 'archive' in forms that are dispersed and embedded in everyday life or in seemingly banal situations. These approaches broaden the scope of 'ethnography' and 'archive', beyond its usual sense. The panel will simultaneously engage advantages and limitations of these approaches, while offering methodological possibilities for re-ordering time and scale, as concepts that may contribute to and are very much part of concerns for anthropologists and ethnographic theory. Knowledge and scale as methodological frameworks can thus be useful for interpreting the past and de-constructing the present. The panel papers will draw upon various thematic and regional studies, and contribute towards better understandings of memory, history, knowledge, representation and meaning making processes.

Contact person: Aditya Kiran Kakati, aditya.kakati@graduateinstitute.ch
Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 4

Ethnographies from Global Margins

Questioning Current Makings of Knowledge in Anthropology

Conveners:

Denisse Sepulveda (University of Applied Sciences and Arts Geneva; SNF Project *Im/mobile Others in Chile*)

Céline Heini (University of Applied Sciences and Arts Geneva + University Fribourg; SNF Project *Im/mobile Others in Chile*)

Anne Lavanchy (University of Applied Sciences and Arts Geneva, SNF Project *Im/mobile Others in Chile*).

Initially exotic “objects” of anthropology, many of the very “others” of the discipline have reclaimed their full place as active subjects in the discipline. Subaltern voices (Spivak, 1988) proposed indigenous methodologies (Smith, 1999), feminist and queer epistemologies (Abu-Lughod, 1991, Hekma, 2000), drawing on post/decolonial (Anzaldúa, 2004 (1998), Hall, 2006, Said, 1979) cultural sciences and literature theories. Along with anthropologists from formerly colonized settings (Ntarangwi, 2010), scholars from these global margins have created new regimes of academic truth and legitimacy through activism and commitment. Their reflections on situated and on mechanism of authority in monographies have dismissed pretensions to neutrality and objectivity and highlighted the Western and heterosexist biases of anthropological knowledge.

Still, one can reasonably question their success to reform in profound and lasting ways the making of anthropological knowledge. Let us name three recent examples amongst other ones: the concern of EASA’s Anthropology on Race Network about the burning necessity to decolonize anthropological curricula across Europe¹; the “prominent anthropologists” laudatory praises of a recent publication, apparently unaware these her-stories, pleading for anthropologists to get out of their ivory tower²; and, finally, voices from academic margins that denounce precarious working conditions of non-tenured scholars, whose innovative, but largely unrecognized, scientific contributions to anthropology departments paradoxically reproduce established hierarchies³.

The panel aims to be a forum to exchange on the possibilities to develop different ethnographies from these global margins, in such a way those would broadly *matter* for anthropology. Drawing on Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s groundbreaking program for decolonizing methodologies (Smith, 1999) to produce new epistemologies, it addresses the old question of power relationships in knowledge production in a time of increased academic competition, which leads to a greater uniformity of anthropological thinking. Panelists should also actively engage with the idea of “margins”, in particular when it rests on binary categorizations (TallBear, 2017): What means for instance “global South”/“global North” (Bacigalupo, 2016)? Which are the relevance and the limits of this, and similar, distinction? Does belonging to academically marginalized spaces become a DNA thing (Kowal, 2013)? How could indigenous, feminist and other critical methodologies and epistemologies really matter for the whole discipline?

Notes

¹ <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/news/2019/03/call-for-papers-decolonizing-european-anthropology>; also see Tsantsa's latest issue on "Decolonial Processes in Swiss Academia and Cultural Institutions: Empirical and Theoretical Approaches" (2019), ed. by Fiona Siegenthaler and Marie-Laure Allain Bonilla.

² <https://books.publicanthropology.org/an-anthropology-of-anthropology.pdf>

³ <http://allegralaboratory.net/towards-a-transnational-anthropology-union-universitycrisis/>

References

- ABU-LUGHOD, L. 1991. Writing against culture. In: FOX, R. (ed.) *Recapturing anthropology*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- ANZALDUA, G. 2004 (1998). Borderland/La Frontera. In: RIVKIN, J. & RYAN, M. (eds.) *Literary Theory. An Antology*. Blackwell.
- BACIGALUPO, A. M. 2016. *Thunder Shamans. Making History with Mapuche Spirits in Chile and Patagonia*, University of Texas Press.
- HALL, S. 2006. What is this 'black' in black popular culture? *Stuart Hall*. Routledge.
- HEKMA, G. 2000. Queering anthropology.
- KOWAL, E. 2013. Orphan DNA: Indigenous samples, ethical biovalue and postcolonial science. *Social Studies of Science*, 43, 577–597.
- NTARANGWI, M. 2010. *Reversed Gaze. An African Ethnography of American Anthropology*, University of Illinois Press.
- SAID, E. W. 1979. *Orientalism*, Vintage.
- SMITH, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Otago, Otago University Press
- SPIVAK, G. C. 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In: NELSON, C. & GROSSBERG, L. (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*
- TALLBEAR, K. 2017. Beyond the Life/Not Life Binary: A Feminist-Indigenous Reading of Cryopreservation, Interspecies Thinking and the New Materialisms. In: RADIN, J. & KOWAL, E. (eds.) *Cryopolitics*. MIT Press.

Contact person: Anne Lavanchy, anne.lavanchy@hesge.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 5

Scaling Spatial Capital

Conveners:

Christina Mittmasser (University of Neuchâtel, nccr – on the move, Geography Institute)

Laure Sandoz (University of Neuchâtel, nccr – on the move, Geography Institute)

Katrin Sontag (University of Basel, nccr – on the move, Institute of Cultural Anthropology and European Ethnology)

The term “spatial capital” has been discussed and put forward by different scholars to analyze the ability of individuals to use the opportunity structure of places in a strategic way. The concept relates to Bourdieu’s theory of capitals by assuming that certain abilities and the accumulation of specific resources allow the individual to gain social advantages (Bourdieu, 1986). For some authors, the concept of “spatial capital” captures the engagement with place and space, the knowledge about specific environments, and the ability to convert the resources related to a specific locality into economic, social, cultural or symbolic capital (e.g. Lévy, 2013; Rérat, 2018). For other authors, the concept also includes the ability to move (or “motility”), defined as, the access to specific possibilities to be mobile, the competence to use these possibilities and the appropriation of strategies to accumulate resources and life chances through mobility (Kaufmann, Bergman, & Joye, 2004). Thereby scholars also refer to the ability to control one’s (im)mobility (e.g. Franquesa, 2011; Moret, 2017) and the embeddedness of capacities and experiences related to mobility and place within a specific habitus (e.g. Fournier, 2008).

This panel seeks to combine two main theoretical developments. Firstly, it will focus on approaches that discuss space in relation to capital. We do not understand places as fixed entities, but rather in relation to their performative nature (Hannam, Sheller, & Urry, 2006). Referring to concepts such as “place-making” (Baka, 2015), “the pragmatics of space” or “doing with space” (Lussault & Stock, 2010) we propose to focus on social practices and the active mobilization of space by specific actors in specific situations.

Secondly, we connect the discussion on spatial capital with the conference theme of scaling and the question of how individuals deal with spatial capital on different scales. Social practices can be associated to specific scales, such as “the city”, “the region”, “the nation” and “the transnational”. Moreover, they involve different levels of analysis (economic, legal, political, etc.), which intersect with these scales in complex ways. With this panel, we aim to look in particular at the construction, influence and usage of global and geographically distant scales in local contexts. Such approaches can be seen for instance in transnational studies of social fields (e.g. Glick Schiller, Çağlar, & Guldbrandsen, 2006), in studies about resources’ access and appropriation (Taravella & Arnould de Sartre, 2012), in studies about tourism economies (e.g. Neveling & Wergin, 2009) and in multilevel approaches to the study of citizenship. How to move beyond conventional hierarchies and spatial distinctions, such as central vs. peripheral, urban vs. rural, global vs. local or small vs. large, is still a question. In this context, we are particularly interested in analyzing how “ideologies of scale”, defined by cultural claims about locality, regionality and globality, create and shape both understandings of scales and abilities to use space (Tsing, 2000).

We invite papers that address space as a form of capital and that discuss scales empirically, theoretically or methodologically. We welcome in particular contributions that take a reflective stance to ask how, when and why we as ethnographers are constructing scales when analyzing space and spatial capital.

If you want to participate, please send an abstract of max. 250 words to christina.mittmasser@unine.ch, laure.sandoz@unine.ch and katrin.sontag@unibas.ch by June 30 at the latest.

References:

- Baka, V. (2015). Understanding Valuing Devices in Tourism through “Place-making.” *Valuation Studies*, 3(2), 149–180. <https://doi.org/10.3384/VS.2001-5992.1532149>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.
- Fournier, J.-M. (2008). Le capital spatial: une forme de capital, un savoir être mobile socialement inégal. L'exemple de l'élite argentine de Punta del Este (Uruguay). In R. Séchet, I. Garat, & D. Zeneidi (Eds.), *Espaces en transactions* (pp. 67–82). Presses universitaires de Rennes. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pur.430>
- Franquesa, J. (2011). “We’ve Lost Our Bearings”: Place, Tourism, and the Limits of the “Mobility Turn.” *Antipode*, 43(4), 1012–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00789.x>
- Glick Schiller, N., Çağlar, A., & Guldbrandsen, T. C. (2006). Beyond the ethnic lens: Locality, globality, and born-again incorporation. *American Ethnologist*, 33(4), 612–633. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2006.33.4.612>
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100500489189>
- Kaufmann, V., Bergman, M. M., & Joye, D. (2004). Motility: Mobility as Capital. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(4), 745–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00549.x>
- Lévy, J. (2013). ‘Capital spatial.’ In *Dictionnaire de la géographie et de l'espace des sociétés* (pp. 147–149). Paris: Berlin.
- Lussault, M., & Stock, M. (2010). “Doing with space”: towards a pragmatics of space. *Social Geography*, 5, 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.5194/sg-5-11-2010>
- Moret, J. (2017). Mobility capital: Somali migrants’ trajectories of (im)mobilities and the negotiation of social inequalities across borders. *Geoforum*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.12.002>
- Neveling, P., & Wergin, C. (2009). Projects of scale-making: new perspectives for the anthropology of tourism1. *Etnografica*, (vol. 13 (2)), 315–342. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etnografica.1125>
- Rérat, P. (2018). Spatial Capital and Planetary Gentrification: Residential Location, Mobility and Social Inequalities. In L. Less & M. Phillips (Eds.), *Handbook of Gentrification Studies* (pp. 103–118). Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Taravella, R., & Arnauld de Sartre, X. (2012). The symbolic and political appropriation of scales: A critical analysis of the Amazonian ranchers’ narrative. *Geoforum*, 43(3), 645–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.11.009>
- Tsing, A. (2000). The Global Situation. *Cultural Anthropology*, 15(3), 327–360. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.2000.15.3.327>

Panel 6

Student panel: Dealing with ethics, from research design to restitution

Conveners:

Wiebke Wiesigel (University of Neuchâtel)

Tobias Marschall (Graduate Institute, Geneva)

As anthropology students (BA, MA, PhD), we are confronted with research ethics from the moment we plan our first fieldwork, when questions such as access, methodological and theoretical choices and the presence of the researcher in the field become relevant. Later we have to ask ourselves how to use our data, how engaged we want our work to be and how to disseminate our findings. At the same time, we are also subject to the legislation of the country we are conducting our research in, for example in Switzerland the *Federal Act on Research involving Human Beings* (Federal Assembly 2011). In sum, ethical questions are present at every stage of the research, yet we rarely take the time to discuss them.

In recent years, research ethics have become an increasingly debated topic within the anthropological community, leading researchers, academic institutions and government agencies to position themselves in the wake of legislation by creating ethics committees and other institutional arrangements. The Ethical and Deontological Think Tank (EDTT) of the Swiss Anthropological Association issued a clarifying statement in 2008, addressing questions such as informed consent, confidentiality, anonymization and dissemination of results (Swiss Anthropological Association 2011). More recently, the EDTT published an article differentiating between “procedural” and “processual ethics” (Perrin et al. 2018). While the former refers to institutional requirements, i.e. ethics protocols, the latter means “approaches which refer to a comprehensive, relational and positional understanding of research ethics and which adapt their principles to the specifics of each research site” (Perrin et al. 2018, 139).

How can we deal with such questions in our own work? This panel, conceived as a workshop, will provide young researchers with an opportunity to discuss the ethical concerns specific to their own research with fellow students, sharing experiences, difficulties and ‘best practices’.

References

Federal Assembly. 2011. Federal Act on Research involving Human Beings.

Perrin, Julie, Nolwenn Bühler, Marc-Antoine Berthod, Jérémie Forney, Sabine Kradolfer, and Laurence Ossipow. 2018. "Searching for ethics. Legal requirements and empirical issues for anthropology". *Tsantsa* 23:138-153.

Swiss Anthropological Association. 2011. "An Ethical Charter for Ethnologists? Ethical Position of the Swiss Ethnological Society". http://www.seg-sse.ch/pdf/EDDT_Ethical%20Statement_of_the_SES.pdf

Contact person: Wiebke Wiesigel, wiebke.wiesigel@unine.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 7

Global Sport as Object and Method

Convener:

Raphael Schapira (Graduate Institute, Geneva)

Contemporary sport is not just a product of globalization but instrumental in creating it. Local and concrete sport practices are embedded into global economic, political, and symbolic systems and flows which they influence and by which they are equally shaped. This makes sport a particularly productive object of study to inquire into the relationship between the everyday lives of ordinary people and large-scale processes. Sport and body cultures form a window into what constitutes the “serious life” (Durkheim [1912] 1995) in which the normal and the extraordinarily are negotiated. Through sport, the everyday lives of ordinary people are entangled with the state, the nation, and the world (Besnier, Brownell, and Carter 2018).

Because of the embodied character of sporting practices in sport meaning is generated and expressed through the body. In his pioneering article on body movements, Marcel Mauss ([1936] 1950) laid bare that there is nothing natural about movements. The techniques of the body are the socially learned ways in which individuals do things, making the body simultaneously an object which is formed and a means through which to do things. Western social sciences have ignored the body until the 1970s. But even after the body gained attention it remained rather a static social object instead of being understood as grounded in movement (Farnell 2012, Ingold & Vergunst 2008). The study of sports allows us to investigate how the performance of signifying movements changes over time and depending on the social context in which they are performed.

Scholars generally agree that ‘the global’ and ‘the local’ cannot be thought of as separated entities but must be rather used as ideal types that allow us to think through the problem of globalization. According to Appadurai “the new global cultural economy has to be understood as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models” (1990, 296). Additionally, these models propose certain linearity inadequate for the analysis of today’s disorganized, messy and predatory capitalism of cultural frictions and global interconnections (Tsing 2005).

Despite the contemporary worldwide circulation of athletes forming part of this messy capitalism, e.g. Besnier (2011) on Tongan rugby players working in Japan, today’s global sport complex emerged out of the colonial circulation of sporting practices, and the lessons that can be learned from its analysis remain important for our understanding of the contemporary global condition. Arjun Appadurai’s (1995) analysis of how Indian cricket became an emblem of Indian nationhood is an example of the effective power of cricket demonstrating how the nation got inscribed into the male Indian body giving passion and purpose to the creation of India as a decolonized nation.

Today, sports such as mixed martial arts continue to express and embody central societal concerns, albeit on the local-global nexus. One example is the controversy around the “modern” Chinese mixed martial arts fighter who beat a “traditional” kung-fu

master but was stopped by the Chinese authorities before being able to continue his proclaimed crusade against the, in his opinion fraudulent, kung-fu masters. The state's reaction to the fight sparked a massive controversy about hierarchy and authority in China (Tatlow 2017), exposing the power of sports and martial arts as a means to negotiate tradition and modernity, nationalism and globalization, and the state's role in them.

The polymorphous character of sport allows it to connect to a variety of social phenomena such as globalization, gender, class, ethnicity, religion, tourism, indigeneity, and so on. Often, these phenomena intersect as in the case of male evangelical mixed martial arts fighters who take to the global stage during Ultimate Fighting Championship events broadcasted around the globe. Many evangelicals see aggression and violence, often the most important marker of manhood (Kimmel 2011, 143), not as inherently bad, but as inherently manly. The global reach of evangelical sports exemplifies how corporeal practices shape and are shaped by contemporary social, cultural, and historical processes.

This panel welcomes contributions using ethnographies of sport as a vehicle to think through the global as method. How do people relate to the global in their sporting practices and how are these informed by the global? Which ethnographic practices are best suited to research global sports? These are some of the questions this panel seeks to answer reflecting upon the challenges and possibilities the globalization of sports poses to ethnographic scales.

Contact person: Raphael Schapira, raphael.schapira@graduateinstitute.ch
Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 8

Globalizing peripheries

Mobilities, diversification and reconfiguration of “the local” within territories at the margins.

Conveners:

Andrea Boscoboinik (University of Fribourg, SNF project Devenir local en zone de montagne)

Viviane Cretton (University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Sierre, SNF project Devenir local en zone de montagne)

Andrea Friedli (University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Sierre, SNF Devenir local en zone de montagne)

In which ways is “the global” reimagined and reconfigured across the worldwide process of urbanization and gentrification in peripheral areas, like sea, countryside or mountain sites? Commonly seen as an embodiment of rurality, remoteness and stagnation, non-urban areas are also part of the “metropolitan pulsation”, economic centrality and glocal development. Mobilities and new ways of living out of cities commonly stand for current phenomena, at different scales, that are closely intertwined with economic globalization and neoliberal practices.

This panel aims to explore diverse manifestations of this worldwide tendency of living “outside cities”, or “in nature”, through individual experiences and routes, narratives and imaginaries, representations and subjectivities. It invites participants to present their empirical data focusing on non-urban areas – mountain, sea or countryside regions – as idealized places for living, or not, while encouraging the story-telling of individuals or families who have made the choice to settle temporary or permanently in such places and spaces.

The panel wishes to discuss in depth on how “the metropolitan global” interacts with “the rural local” in some particular spots, while considering the anthropologist to be both produced by and producing the fieldwork she or he is in. Further, the panel aspires to talk over new methodological and analytical approaches to studying both global within local and local within global, beyond the classical dichotomy used in social sciences.

Theoretical frames such as lifestyle migration, amenity-led migration or multilocality have emphasized new forms of chosen migration, mobility and dwelling that take into consideration western perceptions and representations of nature and living in nature, like the environmental quality, the climate, the sunlight, the landscapes, the quietness, the safety or the specific conditions to enjoying outdoor activities. This panel proposes to consider other forms of current migrations and mobilities outside cities, in order to analyze how personal choices and imaginaries that constitute life paths are reconfigured at the interface of a global trend and a local way of life, while reshaping simultaneously the power balance between local and global, locality and globality, at an epistemological level. It welcomes ethnographic fieldworks that reflect upon the

(re)making and (re)shaping of locality within a “globalizing” process of urbanization, gentrification and diversification.

All together, the panel wishes to foster stimulating talks, related to the specific aspects of globalization, like touristification, internationalization or migratization, in non-urban areas, as to the methodological and epistemological challenges they raise for the anthropologists. How are the local and the global connected in this specific framework? How or when do they interact ? Is conflict present ? Do they reproduce each other ? How or when are they related to representations and fantasies of non-urban environment ? How or when are they mobilised and challenged in the field, by the research participants and by anthropologists ? Which are the outcomes of the globalization of non-urban areas, for both newcomers and locals, for natural and cultural environment, for local and global development ?

Contact person: Viviane Cretton, viviane.cretton@hevs.ch
Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 9

Panel de la Commission Audiovisuelle (CAV) de la SSE

Arts et politiques de l'écoute:

méthodologies et pratiques du sonore pour l'anthropologie, l'art et le patrimoine

Organisatrices :

Pierrine SAINI et Clotilde WUTHRICH, Docteures en anthropologie culturelle et sociale, membres de la CAV

Le son est omniprésent dans notre environnement quotidien et est devenu un champ d'étude et de création fécond. Comme en témoignent les pratiques contemporaines au sein des *sensory ethnography*, *sound studies*, arts sonores et anthropologie sonore, cet intérêt largement partagé répond certainement à la nécessité d'une approche sensible des pratiques et du monde qui porte son attention sur les sens, les affects, les subjectivités, les perceptions et les expériences.

Champ de recherche large qui floute les frontières entre les disciplines, le sonore impose la nécessité d'une approche pluridisciplinaire, seule capable de questionner véritablement le rôle et l'importance du son dans nos sociétés et de s'en emparer. Pour cette raison, ce panel vise à stimuler l'échange entre des chercheurs, chercheuses et artistes d'horizons divers, voire à imaginer des collaborations et coproductions entre divers·es créateurs et créatrices : cinéastes, musicien·ne·s, artistes sonores, anthropologues, sociologues, historien·ne·s, architectes, urbanistes, conservateurs et conservatrices...

Les intervenant·e·s du panel seront invité·e·s à aborder les aspects multiples des questions sonores à partir d'une approche pragmatique et d'un axe principal, celui des **méthodologies du sonore et de l'écoute qui sont transversales, partagées ou au contraire spécifiques aux pratiques des domaines de l'art, de l'anthropologie et du patrimoine**. C'est donc la question du *comment* qui nous occupera principalement ici : comment aborder le sonore en tant qu'artiste, chercheur·euse, conservateur·trice ? Quelles techniques, quelles ressources et collaborations, quelles politiques sont mises en œuvre dans la production, l'écoute, la captation, la restitution, la reconstruction et l'interprétation du son ? Qu'y a-t-il dans le continuum entre la production et l'écoute d'un son, entre l'oralité (comme production sonore) et l'auralité (comme dispositif d'écoute, l'ouïe) ? Quelles médiations (écoute directe versus écoute médiate ; écoute critique, etc.) opèrent et comment ? Quelles méthodes et quel vocabulaire méthodologique sont spécifiques et/ou partagé·e·s et qu'est-ce que cela implique ? (les pratiques du terrain ; l'interview ; le *field recording* ; les captations ; les recherches-créations ; le

travail sur le long terme ; la dimension participative ou collaborative (avec usagers, habitants, scientifiques, artistes...), la conservation ; la restitution, etc.)?

Pensé comme un laboratoire de recherche et d'expérimentation au croisement de l'art, de l'anthropologie et du patrimoine culturel, ce panel abordera donc la question des productions, performances, enregistrements, dispositifs, processus et autres archives sonores. Le panel mêlera présentations, discussions et expérimentations « live » des invité·e·s. En partant des méthodologies du sonore et de l'écoute, plusieurs axes de recherche seront ainsi abordés, en lien avec les thématiques des intervenant·e·s, tels que :

- **Epistémologies du sonore** : le son comme voie d'accès pour éclairer sous un autre angle des problématiques importantes en sciences humaines et sociales.
- **Le sonore pour se saisir du monde / saisir le monde** : le son comme prise phénoménologique pour saisir les altérités et les voix inaudibles ; pour se réappropriier l'espace et l'histoire ; pour créer une identité sonore partagée.
- **Politiques du sonore** et étude critique des relations entre pratiques sonores, écoute et idéologies, structures du pouvoir ; l'écoute comme *empowerment*, comme moyen d'engagement permettant de considérer la pluralité et la complexité de la réalité et de reconnaître d'autres voix.
- **Esthétiques du son et patrimonialisations** : conventions et catégorisations propres à chaque contexte géographique et historique sur ce qui doit être écouté, peut être écouté, mérite d'être écouté [son / bruit / musicalité] ; ce qui fait le patrimoine sonore des musées et archives ; ce qui précède à la « couleur » des dispositifs sonores artistiques.
- **Plasticités, hybridités et identités multiples du sonore** : le son comme *extraction* d'un continuum sonore multiple et complexe et d'un contexte multisensoriel ; le son comme fiction ; artifice ou artefact ; liaisons entre son et image dans le film ; son et espace/environnement/contexte dans les productions artistiques et scientifiques ; le corps comme objet sonore.
- **Restituer le sonore** : enjeux autour de la restitution/transformation/reconstruction/appropriation des matériaux sonores récoltés-fabriqués. Quelle différence entre création, recherche et restitution (mise en forme, mise en scène) ?

Format: 6 interventions 10+20 : 10 minutes de performance sonore (scientifique et/ou artistique) suivies d'une discussion de 20 min. Le panel pourra se poursuivre avec des performances de plus grands formats le soir-même à la CAVE 12, salle de concert à Genève : <https://www.cave12.org/>. Merci aux intervenant·e·s intéressé·e·s de s'annoncer rapidement en cas d'intérêt.

Contact person: Pierrine Saini, pierrinesaini@hotmail.com
Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 10

A New Terrain in Food Studies: Artisanal Food

Convener:

Atak Ayaz (Graduate Institute, Geneva)

The production, processing, trade, and consumption of food lie at the core of the relationships that societies build with their natural environment. These intricate relationships and their environmental, political, historical, and economic reverberations/echoes/implications have been studied by food scholars (to cite a few, Friedmann 1982, Mintz 1986, Zaman and Barndt 1999, McCann 2001, Pritchard and Burch 2003). These studies highlight the global dimension of the food production and consumption majorly through discussing the mobility of people and commodification of food in global trade and production systems (Phillips 2006). To this end, the companies and institutions having transnational ties and dealing with mass production have been in the focus. However, there is another conceptual and empirical terrain that has gained considerable scholarly attention in the last decades, artisanal production. As opposed to the identical and mass production, this non-industrial, locally-sourced and less-mechanized way of producing develops an holistic approach starting from the cultivation of the main ingredients until the completion of the final product. In chocolate production it is from tree to bar, in wine from vineyard to glass, with the rise in artisanal production, which can be read as the quality turn (Goodman 2003), the cultivation and production became additionally reciprocal more than ever. Heather Paxson argues that artisanal production is part of a greater cultural transition “as key cultural values have been challenged by, or are being adapted in response to, deleterious legacies of twentieth-century industrial agriculture” (2013, 6). Hence, the scholars working on artisanalism, the movement that highlights the necessity of using/producing high quality products that reflect their unique tastes/structures/values, focus on who produces food, how current producers relate to the land, and how they articulate economic, political, and moral bonds via their food production (Terrio 2000, Paxson 2013, Besky 2013, Jung 2016).

In this panel, we will question the role of artisanal production and the effect of artisans in determining the social, economic, and political changes in the cultivation and production spheres. Along with discussing the changes the anthropology of food going through, this panel poses the following questions: What does the increasing tendency/interest towards small-scale, less-mechanized way of production show about the perception of food in the 21st century? What kind of changes does labor go through and how are these artisanal products commodified? Considering that some countries have a long-standing “tradition” of producing specific food (such as chocolate in France—see: Terrio 2000), how is artisanalism perceived in various societies and what are the criteria for evaluating products originating from less recognized localities? Relatedly, given that producing locally and reflecting the essence of the place, *terroir*, is one of the main pillars of artisanal production, how are places constructed around the production of food? While artisanal production collides with the ethos of producing in bigger quantities, which might be seen as the foundational ground of the classic capitalist mode of production, how does artisanal production participate in and express capitalist relations regarding the production of value, accumulation, and market? Lastly, how

should ethnographers reformulate and revise their methodologies in relation to the globally accelerating non/post-industrial production philosophy, artisanalism.

Bibliography

- Besky, Sarah. *The Darjeeling Distinction: Labor and Justice on Fair-trade Tea Plantations in India*. Univ of California Press, 2013.
- Goodman, David. "The Quality 'Turn' and Alternative Food Practices: Reflections and Agenda." *Journal of Rural Studies* 1.19 (2003): 1-7.
- Friedmann, Harriet. "The political economy of food: the rise and fall of the postwar international food order." *American Journal of Sociology* 88 (1982): S248-S286.
- Yuson, Jung. "Re-creating economic and cultural values in Bulgaria's wine industry: From an economy of quantity to an economy of quality?" *Economic Anthropology* 3.2 (2016): 280-292.
- McCann, James. "Maize and grace: history, corn, and Africa's new landscapes, 1500–1999." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43.2 (2001): 246-272.
- Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. Penguin, 1986.
- Paxson, Heather. *The Life of Cheese: Crafting Food and Value in America*. Univ of California Press, 2012.
- Phillips, Lynne. "Food and globalization." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 35 (2006): 37-57.
- Pritchard, Bill, and David Burch. *Agri-food Globalization in Perspective: International Restructuring in the Processing Tomato Industry*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003.
- Terrio, Susan J. *Crafting the Culture and History of French Chocolate*. University of California Press, 2000.
- Zaman, Habiba, and Deborah Barndt. "Women working the NAFTA food chain: women, food & globalization." *Resources for Feminist Research* 27.3/4 (1999): 173.

Contact person: Atak Ayaz, atak.ayaz@graduateinstitute.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 11

Scale-making at stake

The use and meaning of the category ‘global’ in memory and heritage politics and practices

Conveners:

Hervé Munz (University of Geneva)

Patrick Naef (University of Geneva)

Bernard Debarbieux (University of Geneva)

For the last two decades, the polysemous notion of ‘scale’ has drawn an increasing amount of attention among scholars studying memory and heritage politics and practices. Since the beginning of the 1990s, scholarly attention has focused on the growing importance of international bodies (international organizations, INGOs, foundations, etc.) and on the rise of a ‘global’ frame of action.

Significantly, in many of these works, the understanding of ‘global’ remains highly heterogeneous. When scholars use such a term, it is not obvious whether they are referring to specific scales and, even when that is the case, what the exact nature is of the scales mentioned. Does ‘global’ refer to a large geographical scale, such as the planet, to which UNESCO’s objectives and norms must be addressed and applied? Does it rather refer to a set of general values that lies behind the whole process of heritage-making and connects with other terms such as ‘universality’ or ‘humanity’?

‘Global’ and ‘national’ also happen to constitute a convenient way to refer to state and intergovernmental institutions and to the mutual adjustment of their conception and implementation of memory or heritage policies. Moreover, terms such as ‘global’, ‘national’ and ‘local’ are connected to categories of ‘scale’ or ‘level’ that are taken for granted by the scholars who use them to guide their analysis.

In contrast, this panel promotes a different, constructivist understanding of the notion of scale (Debarbieux and Munz 2019, Debarbieux 2019), inspired by the paradigm of the “Politics of scale” (Taylor 1981 ; Jonas 1994; Smith 1996; Delaney and Leitner 1997 ; Marston 2000 ; Slaughter 2004 ; Swyngedouw 2004; Moore 2008; MacKinnon 2011). Initially framed in critical geography and political economy, this paradigm states that spatial scales are not given but constructed ; they are not natural qualities of space but results of socio-discursive processes through which actors and organizations negotiate recognition, power and visibility, and frames specific issues.

Rather than focusing on spatial scales for themselves, this approach leads to investigating the numerous ways scales associated with cultural practices are elaborated, claimed, contested, transformed and used in different socio-political contexts. There is, therefore, an added value to be found in focusing—without any preconceived or external conception of scale—on the ways in which stakeholders conceive of and mobilize scale throughout the policy-making process or in the development of initiatives based on memory or heritage. Interested panelists are encouraged to propose papers addressing the ways in which scales are defined,

described, elaborated, negotiated and used by various stakeholders in the fields of memory and heritage.

References

- Debarbieux B., 2019. "Théories de la politique des échelles (Politics of scale) et de la fabrique des échelles (scale-making) ", in : Claire Hancock, Géographies anglophones, évolutions récentes, Presses Universitaires de Nanterre.
- Debarbieux B. and Munz H., 2019. "Scaling heritage. The construction of scales in the submission process of alpinism to UNESCO's intangible cultural heritage list", *International Journal of Heritage studies* 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1590445>
- Delanay, D. and H. Leitner 1997. "The political construction of scale", *Political Geography* 16(2), pp. 93–97.
- Jonas A., 1994, "The scale politics of spatiality", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12(3), pp. 257–264.
- MacKinnon, D., 2011. "Reconstructing scale: Towards a new scalar politics", *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(1), pp. 21–36.
- Moore, A., 2008. "Rethinking scale as a geographical category : from analysis to practice." *Progress in Human Geography* 32(2): 203–225.
- Slaughter A.-M., 2004, "Disaggregated Sovereignty: Towards the Public Accountability of Global Government Networks", *Government and Opposition*, 39(2), pp.159–90.
- Smith N., 1996. "Spaces of Vulnerability: the Space of Flows and the Politics of Scale", *Critiques of Anthropology* 16, pp. 63–77.
- Swyngedouw E., 2004, "Globalisation or 'Glocalisation' ? Networks, Territories and Rescaling", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), pp. 25–48.
- Taylor P., 1981. "Geographical scales within the world economy approach", *Review*, 5(1), pp. 3–11.

Contact person: Patrick Naef, patrick.naef@unige.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019

Panel 12

Panel of the Working Group Anthropology and Education

Planetary in transnational research partnerships

Conveners on behalf of the working group Educational Anthropology :

Angela Stienen, University of Teacher Education

Simon Affolter, Centre for Democracy Studies Aarau

Barbara Waldis, University of Applied Sciences, Western Switzerland

This panel will discuss the potential of institutionalised research partnerships in higher education beyond the north-south divide. It will ask the question what research designs we need and which methodological, epistemological and ontological challenges we have to face in collaborative transnational research designs that seek to confront power relations and prevailing paternalisms between research institutions in the global south and north.

Anthropology has a long history of attempts to bridging both the north-south divide and the power gap between researchers and “informants”. At the beginning of the 20th century, Franz Boas encouraged his research assistant George Hunt to co-author some of his writings on Kwakiutl culture while at the end of the 1950s Jean Rouch co-produced one of his movies together with his local cinematic protagonist, Oumarou Ganda, in West Africa. These historical examples show the methodological potential of research partnerships beyond existing power gaps: together with his research partner Boas developed new methods of (photographic) data collection while Rouch developed a new cinematic genre – *ethnofiction* – together with his protagonist. Nevertheless, these innovations were based on individual research partnerships which in the end reproduced existing power relations by fostering the academic careers of the two researchers based at institutions in the global north. How can we build on this legacy in a critical and more radical way?

In critical scholarship on global and planetary learning it has been argued that institutional partnerships between the global south and north, established on equal terms, are key for engaging with a planetary perspective that puts into conversation actors from diverse ontological, epistemic and social locations. Rather than conducting studies *about* such locations, researchers are urged to study *from* and *together with* actors from these locations. The experiences of networking and of partnerships between universities of teacher education in Switzerland and in countries of the global south have contributed to this debate. These experiences have shown that engaging with a planetary perspective by institutionally acknowledging and including silenced ontologies and epistemologies is highly challenging in higher education.

The panel invites contributions that explore and reflect on methodological and theoretical issues in the following areas:

- Research partnerships between institutions in higher education in countries of the global south and global north developed and co-funded on equal terms in order to overcome prevailing paternalisms.
- Research designs that include co-authoring schemes by research partners aiming at confronting the power gap between researchers and “informants”, but also between research institutions in the global south partnering with institutions in the global north. Anthropologists are confronted with the fact that these power gaps are highly politicised.

Contact persons:

Angela Stienen, angela.stienen@phbern.ch

Simon Affolter, simon.affolter@fhnw.ch

Barbara Waldis, Barbara.Waldis@hevs.ch

Deadline proposal: 30 June 2019