

A proposal for an special issue of the journal :

FOCAAL. European Journal of Anthropology

Towards an Anthropology of Europe: The Research Dimension

Contents:

(a provisional list of papers offered)

- 0.- *Introduction and Presentation*, by Peter Skalník and Andrés Barrera.
- 1.- *Towards an Anthropology of Europe: Outline for a collaborative research agenda*, by Andrés Barrera, Universidad Complutense, Madrid.
- 2.- *The Anthropology of European Institutions*, by Marc Abélès, CNRS-LAIOS, Paris.
- 3.- *A Question of Translation? Anthropology and the European Union*, by Cris Shore, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- 4.- *Interdependent Diversities: 'Historical Regions' in Europe*, by Christian Giordano, University of Fribourg, Switzerland.
- 5.- *Social Ferment in the New Europe: Environmentalism at the Grass Roots*, by Jeremy Boissevain, University of Amsterdam.
- 6.- *Nations and States in the Grand Europe. An Historical and Comparative Analysis, 1789-2004*, by Josep R. Llobera, University College, London.
- 7.- *Anthropology and the Study of Circum-Alpine Societies*, by P. Paolo Viazzo, University of Torino.
- 8.- *Social Anthropology and Archival Research. On excavating The Harvard Irish Mission, 1931-1936*, by Anne Byrne, National University of Ireland.
- 9.- *Together in the Field: Anthropology of Transition and the Local Interpretative Traditions*, by Ines Prica, Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb.
- 10.- *Urban Studies and Migration in the European Context*, by Zdenek Uherek, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- 11.- *Equality, Integrity and Reciprocity: On Swedish Values and the Problem of Charity*, by Gudrun Dahl, Stockholm University.
- 12.- *Political Cultures in Central-Eastern Europe*, by Peter Skalník, University of Pardubice.

- 13.- *Eastern Europe after Communism According to Neo-Liberals*, by Michal Buchowski, University of Poznan.
- 14.- *Variables of Macedonian Identity in the European Context: Towards the Construction of a Contested Identity*, by Magdalena Elchinova, New Bulgarian University, Sofia.
- 15.- *Slovakia's Regional Cultures and Identities in the Europe of the Regions*, by Alexandra Bitusikova, Matej Bel University, Banska Bystrica, Slovakia.
- 16.- *Different Regions, Common Themes: The Handling of Folk Customs. From Folklore to the Anthropology of Local Politics*, by Fabio Mugnaini, University of Siena.
- 17.- *On the Road: Individual, Society and the State in the Appropriation of Public Space*, by Ana I. Afonso, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- 18.- *Public Understanding of Genetics: A Cross-cultural and Ethnographic Study of the 'New Genetics' and Social Identity*, by Joan Bestard, University of Barcelona.
- 19.- *Comparative and Interdisciplinary Approaches in Research. Some reflections on the KASS project*, by Patrick Heady, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle.
- 20.- *Digital Integration in Europe*, by Dorle Dracklé, University of Bremen.,
- 21.- *Towards an Anthropology of Eurasia*, by Chris Hann, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle.

Abstracts :

Introduction and Presentation

by Peter Skalník and Andrés Barrera.

Foreword: This is a kind of foreword which introduces the project and its history. It argues for a joint effort by various schools and individuals which until now have worked in isolation or little knowledge of each other. Parallel to the gradual economic and political unification of Europe also anthropologists and ethnologists look at Europe as one possible field of study. They do so critically because Europe as a concept might differ from realities of life. Like Africanists or Oceanists, those working on Europe and in Europe should now work together for a better understanding of “the old continent”. The specific character of this task stems from the specificity of anthropology as a comparative social discipline which at present sheds away the taint of exoticism and embarks upon examination of ourselves in unity and diversity.

Introductory Study: The texts included in this proposal for a special issue of FOCAAL were first read (and later revised) as papers at the European Science Foundation ‘exploratory workshop’: *Towards an Anthropology of Europe*, held at Litomyšl in the Czech Republic, 1-5 September 2004. They address various aspects of Europe as an object of anthropological research. They are written by both senior scholars of international reputation and younger researchers whose fieldwork took place in a European setting. Whereas the texts examine their topics against the question of Europe as a socio-cultural field, they at the same time are anchored in concrete field data or comparative research on such data from regions with the European continent, parts of a country or localities. Emphasis is laid upon current social processes, but social change from a more traditional past towards a more globalised present is also examined. Thus transformation in East-Central Europe receives attention along with migration processes or environmentalism, charity or road accidents in other parts of Europe. A more theoretical question of the extent of Europe as a field of study is posed in papers on identity, ethnicity or national states. One paper even questions the very legitimacy of Europe as a field of study. Finally, on one hand there is a text on politics of folk customs, on the other an attempt of anthropological analysis of European institutions. What follows are brief abstracts of each text to be included in the special issue.

Towards an Anthropology of Europe: Outline for a collaborative research agenda
by [Andrés Barrera-González](#), Universidad Complutense, Madrid

In pursuing an Anthropology of Europe, it is argued in the paper, we ought to start by making a critical appraisal of Anthropology's scholarly legacy in its relatively short history as an academic discipline. A legacy constituted by some impressive assets, but also a number of controversial features. A number of precedents in the history of the discipline that are relevant in construing an Anthropology of Europe are examined. The most circumstantial examination of Anthropology's history shows that the scope of the discipline has been progressively narrowed, sidetracking traditions that did not fit the established canon of the time. Contrary to these developments, the author argues in favor of reclaiming Anthropology's ambition as the Science of Man, a truly interdisciplinary and multidimensional pursuit, narrowed neither in time nor in space. Consequently, a greater effort is required to integrate different schools, traditions and areas of Anthropology that have become mutually estranged. The author also argues for Europe as a legitimate object of anthropological enquiry, for the near as well as the distant ought to be within the scope of the discipline. Moreover, anthropologists should not shy from broaching (surely from the unique perspectives in theory and method that are our trademark) all contemporary and socially relevant issues that fall within its range of knowledge. Along the lines stated, the last part of the paper consists of a number of proposals and suggestions for research in and on Europe. Thus it is drawn an agenda for anthropological research that might be pursued in collaboration between a wide network of departments and research institutes around Europe and elsewhere.

The Anthropology of European Institutions
by [Marc Abélès](#), CNRS-LAIOS, Paris

A Question of Translation? Anthropology and the European Union,
by [Cris Shore](#), University of Auckland, New Zealand.

The expansion of the European Union both as an idea and geo-political entity has generated a plethora of arguments and debates around the dynamics of European integration and its implications, yet despite the volume of literature and academic research, one question remains curiously unanswered: what exactly *is* the European Union, and what is it *for*? Donald Puchala's parable of three blind men attempting to describe an elephant by touch alone remains a useful allegory for the problems we face trying to understand the EU: what is the best approach for grasping the 'reality' and complexity of a phenomena so large and unfamiliar? This chapter sets out to explore these questions from a political/anthropological perspective. In part, that entails a critical look at some of the new language and concepts used to theorize the EU as a distinctive form of 'multi-level governance'. But it also entails recognition that the EU holds different meanings for its different actors. That the EU itself is a

polysemic symbol: a floating signifier or 'blank canvass' onto which peoples and governments project their hopes, fears and fantasies. In short, whatever the EU *is* from an objectivist perspective, its meanings are invariably a question of interpretation and translation. I argue that anthropological debates around 'cultural translation' provide a useful lens for thinking about the EU. In developing this theme, I focus in particular on views of the EU from 'within', i.e. what the EU represents for its own civil servants in Brussels and beyond.

Interdependent Diversities: 'Historical Regions' in Europe

by [Christian Giordano](#), University of Fribourg

Most concepts of Europe as an 'imagined community' are characterized by a bipolar scheme in which the notion of Europe appears together with contrastive representations of 'Anti-Europe' (Arab-Muslim culture, Asia, Africa, the Orient, etc.). There is a reflective relationship in which the former basic traits are identified through a presumed diametrical opposition with the latter. However, it is misleading to think of Europe as a 'united civilization' or a sum of 'cultural areas'. As suggested by the Hungarian historian Jenő Szűcs, and by the American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein, Europe must be considered as a system of strictly (inter)dependent yet structurally diverse 'historical regions.' The rise of the capitalist 'world-system' and the emergence of a new international division of labour transformed those regions into core, peripheries and marginal external areas.

The article tries therefore to show that Europe consists actually: of one core located mainly in the north west part of the continent; of four peripheries (Mediterranean Europe, Central East Europe, East Europe, South East Europe); and of some marginal external areas (for example the Caucasus). From a social, cultural and economic point of view these core-periphery-external areas divisions are still evident today (for example: North/South, West/East).

Social Ferment in the New Europe: Environmentalism at the Grass Roots

by [Jeremy Boissevain](#), University of Amsterdam

This paper makes a case for including the study of New Social Movements, particularly those concerned with the environment, in the teaching and research agenda of the Anthropology of Europe Programme under discussion. I explore three cases in Malta that illustrate some of the ferment occurring at the local level in the periphery of the new Europe. The cases deal with conflict in Malta between developers, planning authorities and environmentalists related to attempts to extend a leading Hotel, to establish a tourist complex on an undeveloped bay, and to construct a second golf course. They demonstrate that detailed planning procedures do not guarantee protection to the environment. While operating within the legal framework, lease conditions may be altered to benefit developers, government officers can be persuaded to approve destruction of monuments, and expert opinion can be suppressed.

Though NGOs and environmental activists have only won a few contests, they have sensitized elements of civil society to environmental issues and, via campaigns and increasingly sophisticated use of the local media, they have kept these issues before the public. They have helped civil society to become more vocal and are slowly beginning to influence environmental policy. Malta's new membership of the

European Union will provide more political leverage The direct alliance of civil society with European institutions provide "new space for the self-organization of people by providing a space beyond the nation" (Eder 2001: 49).

Nations and States in the Grand Europe. An Historical and Comparative Analysis, 1789-2004 by Josep R. Llobera, University College, London

Nationalism is a modern category that had its roots in the Enlightenment. It was in Western Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century that love of nation came to exist along with love of the state. Over the next two centuries, however, nationalism would have the upper hand, having spread, in different forms, all over the world. Along with liberalism and socialism, nationalism is one of the most powerful ideologies of modernity. I use the word ideology in a minimalist, neutral sense, to mean a system of ideas and values prevalent in a given milieu or social environment. In Durkheimian terms, nationalism as an ideology is a set of collective representations that are typical of modern societies. Two main reasons explain the salience of nationalism in the world in which we live. First, the sacred character of the nation, borrowed from religion; and second, the will of the people to defend their sense of cultural community.

I would insist that nationalism has no predetermined content; as a container of meaning, nationalism can refer to both the good and the evil realities of the nation. There is a liberal and a democratic conception of the nation, as there is one tainted with totalitarianism (of the communist, fascist or religious fundamentalist varieties). "The task of a theory of nationalism, as Tom Nairn reminded us some years ago, must be to embrace both horns of the dilemma. It must be to see the phenomena as a whole, in a way that rises above these 'positive' and 'negative' sides. Only from this fashion can we hope to escape from a moralizing perspective" (1977: 332) and rise to a more scientific one. As social scientists we should "spend less time decrying it -which is a little like cursing the winds. And more in trying to figure out why it takes the forms it does and how it might be prevented from tearing apart even as it creates the societies in which it arises, and beyond that the fabric of modern civilization" (Geertz, 1973: 254).

Anthropology and the Study of Circum-Alpine Societies by Pier Paolo Viazzo, University of Turin

The first aim of this paper is to outline the basic themes in the anthropological study of the 'Circum-Alpine area', a cultural and geographical zone that includes most of the upland regions of Southern and Central Europe. Special attention is paid to the main phases of the development of Alpine anthropology from the few pioneering studies conducted before the Second World War through its 'expansive moment' between the 1950s and the 1980s up to the present day: an initial and persisting interest in social change, the adoption of cultural-ecological and ecosystemic models in the analysis of the relationships between environment, population and social structure, the study of ethnicity and the formation of identities at regional and local levels.

This paper also shows that the Circum-Alpine area has been the scene of encounters between local scholars steeped in southern or central European traditions

of anthropological or ethnological research and ‘foreign’ anthropologists coming from North-Western Europe and the United States. In some cases, this has generated tensions and misunderstandings; in other cases, once the initial difficulties created by a mutual lack of familiarity with (and respect for) different traditions has been overcome, this has led to collaborative work and an enrichment of the research agenda. An analysis of these encounters offers interesting insights into the history of ‘Europeanist’ anthropology and offers relevant lessons for any attempt to build an Anthropology of Europe.

Social Anthropology and Archival Research. On excavating The Harvard Irish Mission, 1931-1936 by Anne Byrne, National University of Ireland

After the first decades of the twentieth century, the rural communities of Clare were objects of the visiting anthropologists’ gaze and pen, investigating rural anomie and social cohesion in the context of the rapid transformation of European rural societies. Spanning a forty year period, American anthropologists such as Arensberg and Kimball in the 1930s, Cresswell in the mid 1960s, followed by Gallaher in the late 1960s have minutely described the family, community, farm economy and kinship relations in a number of rural areas in North and West Clare. Their legacy is evident in their writings and publications on community studies and anthropological methods, providing a rich resource for teaching anthropology and for contemporary scholars providing baseline data for any future studies of the region.

This paper explores the merits and challenges of re-investigating previous anthropological studies so that more can be learned about the socio-political and intellectual context in which the research took place. Anthropologists of the period in question were spare in describing their methodological approaches and concerns. Thus historical research into the archives of these projects provide clues to the methodological frames and theoretical concerns which informed their work. Archives also reveal how long and for what periods anthropologists remained in the field, their position in households, the range of their contacts, how they gathered and recorded data, who were their informants, about whom did they gather information and crucially how those observed responded. Additional biographical information on the visiting anthropologist themselves, their motivations, training, experience and teachers influences can also be gleaned, all of which inform practices in the field as much as in the texts produced.

In this paper I discuss the Harvard-Irish Survey of Ireland (1931-1936) and in particular the task of accessing, compiling and working with the social anthropological archives of that Survey. The location, range and content of archival material is examined revealing fieldwork approaches and methodology. Through archival research it is possible to speculate on the theoretical, methodological and other external constraints placed on publishing a range of data collected. Questions are raised concerning research relations at the site of the research (at the level of the church, state, community and household for example) as well as the relationship between the Irish study, Irish ethnography and sociology, and American social anthropology.

Together in the Field: Anthropology of Transition and the Local Interpretative Traditions by Ines Prica, Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb

Moved by the hugely symbolical power of world political changes at the end of the 20th century, the anthropology of transition has commenced as an almost spontaneous and slightly forced mobilization of scientific forces in face of the unique challenge of historical novelty. Organized as basically empirical research of the post-socialist transformation of cultural traditions dispersed in vast (and so far unattainable) anthropological terrains, the project counts significantly on the modernist methodological tradition of regional/case-studies, and the interpretative strategies striving for the final goal of global cross-cultural comparativeness. Simultaneously with this venture, and for the first time *truly* together in the same field of cultural experience, the endeavours of various *anthropologies at home* operate in the complex situation in which the radical transformation of local cultures goes hand in hand with a need for radical transformation in the production of professional knowledge. Too often, especially in the proverbial critique of local ethnologies on their way between scientific tradition and innovation, such a transformation has been carelessly reduced to the poor choice of either *being non-pertinent* (conservative, parochial and, predominantly, “nationalistic”) or “*sub-adult*” (false, imitating, sycophantic), in terms of the grandest, and practically “inescapable” anthropological project of our time.

Without minimizing the social impact of *national ethnologies*, but, indeed, by changing the usual ideological accent, the aim of the article is to go behind such a dismissive “psychological” comprehension of the otherwise important relationship which is still, as is argued, grounded on the epistemologically pertinent *difference of scientific interests*. There is also examination of whether the detection and legitimization of different types of (social, scientific, authorial) interests can eventually establish a *reciprocal transitional anthropology*, the enterprise now undergoing the collision of two opposed theoretical critiques: the devastating appraisal of “nationalistic” (“eastern”) ethnographic traditions, and the reciprocal identification of the routine and “colonial” (“western”) anthropology of post-socialism. The paradigmatic importance of being *together in the field* is taken as crucial for bridging the gap, as an effort having general repercussions on the shared anthropological knowledge of Europe.

Urban Studies and Migration in the European Context

by Zdeněk Uhrek, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

Urban culture with its universal patterns and regional specificities substantially influences the spirit of contemporary Europe. Consequently, the anthropology of Europe cannot do without the study of urban concepts. Doing so, it is important to consider the ambiguous role of cities in social processes. On the one hand they concentrate diversity and support migration of ideas, technical innovations and persons. On the other hand the stimuli of homogenization from administrative units, nations, and states come into existence just in the cities. Inhabitants of the cities eclectically adopt component parts of culture from elsewhere and re-create them into the new authenticity. Towns and cities create their peripheries, make spheres of influence, and there are also invented concepts of boundaries and ideologies of their maintenance. Nowadays, the European cities approach their social structure of

migration groups that are looking for shelter in Europe. My contribution will give concrete form to the above-mentioned general statements and it will be searching for liaisons among anthropology of Europe, urban anthropology and migration problems.

Equality, Integrity and Reciprocity: On Swedish Values and the Problem of Charity by [Gudrun Dahl](#), Stockholm University

The present paper, emanating from a larger project on buzzwords in development discourse, is concerned with the overarching ways that the aid/assistance/cooperation link is rhetorically dressed up in Swedish. While the larger project is mainly concerned with words that circulate internationally, the present paper deals mainly with terms that specifically are used for convincing Swedish taxpayers and voluntary workers that the whole venture is morally worthwhile by relating to “Swedish” values. These values are in the present context treated more as vehicles for giving accounts, than seen as motivating forces governing human action. That is, for the present purpose I do not want to make any judgements about to what extent development practice is actually motivated by these values, nor whether the activities could in any sense be objectively measured as fulfilling the ideals. The paper is concerned with terms denoting a desirable relation and not so with much the bureaucratic categorization of social identities that has drawn so much attention in writings about bureaucratic discourse.

Political Cultures in Central-Eastern Europe by [Peter Skalník](#), University of Pardubice

The paper is an attempt at comparative political anthropology of the post-communist East-Central Europe which however struggles with the residues of totalitarian ways of thinking and practices in everyday politics on all levels of it, from the state to local social units. It draws from the long-term field research project in the East Bohemian village Dolní Roveň in the Czech Republic, while it considers data from other anthropological research project elsewhere in the region. It also discusses the potential of anthropology to discover processes which escape to political science or political sociology.

Eastern Europe after Communism According to Neo-Liberals by [Michal Buchowski](#), University of Poznan.

Global capitalism implicates a processes in which a restructuring of the perception of social inequalities by the hegemonic neo-liberal ideology takes place. The degree to which various countries and social groups have embraced the free market and democracy has become a yardstick for classifying them as fitting more or less the category of modern West. In the recent past a border between the West and the East was drawn on geographic map, while today, in an orientaling mindset, a mental map has morphed into social space and the spatially exotic other has been resurrected as the socially stigmatized brother. A strategy of blaming the victims has been applied. It has several shortcomings, but above all it is anti-sociological (by fossilizing social actors as passive objects of social change in which

they actually participate) and it is also culture-deterministic (since essentialized 'postsocialist' culture is presented as a burden that conditions people's reactions). Resistance of subalterns hold responsible for failures of the neo-liberal project, merely strengthens their assumed alterity. Intellectuals participating in dominant discourses are reinforced in their views on the mechanism of social change what heartens them in their endeavors to transform people into 'civilized citizens'. Poland is merely an instructive case not only for all postsocialist countries, but for any society in which excluded from the mainstream society are reproached and ostracized.

***Variables of Macedonian Identity in the European Context:
Towards the Construction of a Contested Identity***

by [Magdalena Elchinova](#), New Bulgarian University

The bad fame of the Balkans as the arena of ethnic, religious and national conflicts stretches across three centuries now. If one tries to generalize the nature of these conflicts, among the first definitions to occur is that these are identity conflicts. They have been driven by the striving of different collectivities to define, declare or impose their own identities despite and upon the others, the neighbors. Constructing and expressing identities is often a difficult and painful process, as far as the Balkans are inhabited by communities of contested and vulnerable identities. Macedonians are among them.

On the theoretical premises that identity is constructed in the processes of interaction with the various 'others', Macedonian identity is discussed in regard with various discourses and the rhetoric of its articulation. On the example of a number of life histories, recorded in the last ten years in Bulgaria and the Republic of Macedonia, the article describes various ways of being Macedonian; and presents the regional, ethnic and national dimensions of this identification. The characteristic traits of 'Macedonian-ness' are discussed in a broader European context, drawing comparison with case studies from other European countries. These are viewed in the context of constructing images of the Macedonians, both by communities that share these characteristics and the various 'others' around them. Consequently, some culture modes of setting and lifting boundaries between these counterparts are outlined. The article also comments upon the role of national(ist) projects in the construction and expression of Macedonian identity.

Slovakia's Regional Cultures and Identities in the Europe of the Regions

by [Alexandra Bitušikova](#), Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia.

Slovakia is one of the smallest countries in Europe, but it shows deep regional, ethnic, religious, social, economic and cultural differences. The author discusses the history of the anthropological study of regions in Slovakia and partly in Europe with the main focus on regional diversity, identities and cultures in Slovakia. She analyses reasons of regional differences, as well as the impact of administrative reforms on regionalization from the tenth century up till the latest post-1989 regional reforms. She refers to the establishment of cross-border Euro-regions and the way they develop, and how they influence (or not) peoples' lives and identities.

She stresses the importance of studying these new units within the context of the Europe of regions.

Different Regions, Common Themes: The Handling of Folk Customs. From Folklore to the Anthropology of Local Politics

by [Fabio Mugnaini](#), University of Siena

Several perspectives focusing on local customs coincide in underlining the growth of the organizational aspect of several traditional rituals or festival or other institutions. The increasing awareness in scholarship of the social and constructive nature of traditions invites to re-orient the ethnography and the anthropological interpretation or representation of local or folk customs. Two levels at least seem to be equally relevant, that of the actual events or customary fact (with its historical roots, its load of symbolic sense, its formal peculiarities) and that of the political effects or causes of its contemporary proposal or re-enactment. Such a double level requires the folklorist to open up to themes and tools of a sociology or anthropology of political scenes, and the comparative tradition of folklore studies will help to understand better what is locally embedded in single forms or institutions.

On the Road: Individual, Society and the State in the Appropriation of Public Space

by [Ana Isabel Afonso](#), Universidade Nova de Lisboa

The overall aim of this paper is to draw attention to a potential new domain of research -relevant within European national contexts– generally stated as ‘the impact of motorisation in society’. By *motorisation* I mean the massive phenomena of automobile diffusion and its uses, as an important dimension that accompanied the urbanization process in different world regions.

More specifically, the tentative proposal presented here outlines a collective project on the theme of road behaviour in Portugal, in which I collaborate, and that is being carried out by a small research team of anthropologists supervised by M. João Ramos e António Medeiros. In Portugal, it should be emphasized, there is an excessive number and gravity of road accidents – one of the highest rates of road accident fatalities in the EU – which constitutes a worrying epidemic of injury. As this project is in the early stages of development, I won’t be able to give any substantive account on the subject. My purpose is solely to contribute to the debate on the ‘Anthropology of Europe’ by bringing to discussion the key issues involved in our approach to this theme, hoping that this exchange of ideas might fuel the interest of colleagues from other European countries to join this field of studies. Long-term research and comparison between different European contexts will certainly enhance our knowledge on important dimensions of contemporary societies and human behaviour.

Public Understanding of Genetics: A Cross-cultural and Ethnographic Study of the ‘New Genetics’ and Social Identity, by [Joan Bestard](#), University of Barcelona

Recent developments in new reproductive and genetic technologies (NRGT) have led to the assertion that genetics is increasingly being used across Europe to

explain and define significant social identities (for example, of family, race, gender, sexuality and nationality). This project (PUG) aims to investigate such an assertion. Its focus is the ‘public understanding of genetics’ (for example, as lay persons, patients, politicians, professionals, journalists or campaigners). The distinctiveness of the study is in its ethnographic approach. This means that data is qualitative, in depth and holistic, and is collected in the context of everyday life –be it in the clinic, community, organization or mass media.

Comparative and Interdisciplinary Approaches in Research. Some reflections on the KASS project, by [Patrick Heady](#), Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology

The aim of the EU-funded KASS (Kinship and Social Security) project is to compare and explain the practical roles played by family and kinship ties in different parts of Europe. The sponsors hope that the findings will contribute to the future development of family and social security policies within the European Union. While most of the project’s resources will be allocated to the collection and analysis of ethnographic data, substantial efforts will also be devoted to historical research and the analysis of census and social survey data. Theoretically the project will draw on economic and demographic theory, as well as on the traditions of socio-cultural anthropology and family history.

The integration of ethnographic, historical and statistical data raises considerable practical problems. The attempt to integrate the different theoretical approaches also raises a number of philosophical issues –about the role of comparison, the relation between data and theory, and the contribution of research findings to public policy – which have been the subject of much controversy within anthropology and other human sciences. This paper looks at current debates about ‘the European family’ in the light of these controversies, and explains how they are addressed by the KASS research design.

Digital Integration in Europe
by [Dorle Dracklé](#), University of Bremen

Towards an Anthropology of Eurasia
by [Chris Hann](#), Max Planck’s Institute for Social Anthropology

For both short term and long term historical reasons I suggest that Eurasia, defined as the entire landmass between the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian and Arctic Oceans, is a more appropriate entity for comparative anthropological analysis than Europe. Recognition of the unity of Eurasia has been hindered by Eurocentric preoccupations with civilizational differences, and also by the dominant research methods of modern anthropology, which have fetishized the detailed case study and

lost sight of the larger patterns of history. This plea to privilege Eurasia is not an argument to stop doing anthropology in the space we call Europe, nor is it an argument against widening the comparative framework beyond Eurasia whenever this is warranted by the question at hand. Rather, I argue that anthropologists, in the contemporary political setting, have a duty to ensure that their work cannot easily be hijacked by those seeking to instrumentalise 'civilizational' boundaries. It is not enough to critique attempts in Brussels to construct a 'common European culture'. We must be alert to the danger that, merely by uncritically accepting the designation 'Europe' as the framework for 'bread and butter' ethnographic research, we may be interpreted as lending support to such notions. As for the attempt to produce an 'anthropology of Europe' in the same manner that one can attempt an 'anthropology of Melanesia', I argue that this is wrong-headed because Europe does not possess a comparable unity. All the important social, demographic, technological, and religious variables which anthropologists can document in Europe are variants of a repertoire found within the broader unity of Eurasia.