

Introduction

Disciplinary cartographies and connectors

Francisco MARTÍNEZ

University of Leicester

ABSTRACT: This special section explores and problematises the disciplinary boundaries of European anthropology by studying the shifting conditions of our work and changing centres of gravity in the field. The contributors have been invited to think about what the concept of “European anthropology” brings actually to the fore, while working in a context of changing epistemic relations, labour conditions, institutional assessment and claims to disciplinary validity. This set of papers and commentaries proposes to approach European anthropology as a specific kind of relation between localities and practitioners, not an essence. Polemically, we argue that European anthropology does not exist as a single, easy to define entity precisely because it exceeds its conditions of possibility and goes beyond geographic relations and separations. Additionally, we pose as problematic not only the conjunction of the adjective *European* and the noun *anthropology*, but also the separate standing of each of them and what kinds of relations are established as a result (possession, placing, aspiration, rejection and so on). We conclude that a key feature characterising European anthropology is its transnational character – multiplying the relations with what has been traditionally considered non-anthropological and non-European, and troubling of the boundaries of the discipline.

KEYWORDS: WORLD ANTHROPOLOGIES, RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURES, DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES, CONNECTORS, EUROPE.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons © Francisco Martínez

Introduction: Disciplinary cartographies and connectors

2019 | ANUAC. VOL. 8, N° 2, DICEMBRE 2019: 125-142.

ISSN: 2239-625X - DOI: 10.7340/anuac2239-625X-3630



European relocations and changing centres of gravity

It seems to us important to engage with a tension that it is directly affecting our work: how the community of practitioners defines what counts as anthropological knowledge within a political and financial context of which anthropologists may not be responsible for. Also, discussions on what is actually considered to belong to the European anthropological traditions and about our relations with what has typically been considered to reside outside the discipline are more relevant than ever¹. This special section aims to understand the distinctive shape of European anthropology in the present, our objects of study, relations and connections, and also the existing inter-generational discontinuities. In a rather autoethnographic manner, we pay attention to changing centres of gravity and relations in our field of practice, given the fact that almost none of the conditions that traditionally led to the development of the discipline exist anymore. Hence, this means that Europe has to be positioned as a problematic object for an anthropology of the contemporary too.

Assuming that if nothing else, European anthropology is diverse, we want to investigate what is meant by diversity, including how Europe itself is imagined (Macdonald 2015), whether we should search for singularity or diversity on the continent (Nic Craith 2015), and whether a loss of distinctiveness should be considered negative *per se* (Kockel 2010). In this respect, our research provides a nuanced account of European anthropology at a number of levels and locations, positing Europe not simply as a nexus of political concern but also as a problem (Dzenovska 2014). Likewise, we question the very territorial narrative of European anthropology; this line of thinking is meant to open up the scale of the transnational field to encompass a global anthropology, exploring whether European anthropology still exists at the edges (or shadows) of the anglophone world (Rapport 2002), if those at the core are losing influence on anthropologies done in the disciplinary periphery, and also if European anthropology might become a distinctive branch or sub-system of “world anthropologies” (Restrepo, Escobar 2005; Lins Ribeiro 2006).

1. I want to express my special thanks for Damián Omar Martínez, who crucially contributed to improve the whole issue even if he prefers not to be credited as author or editor. Also, my gratitude to Tomás Sánchez Criado, Adolfo Estalella, Sarah Green, Thomas H. Eriksen and Čarna Brković for their generous feedback during the editing process, and to the anonymous reviewers arranged by the journal.

We start by proposing that neither Europe nor anthropology should be regarded as fully integrated coherent wholes, but rather as part of numerous connections and relations at multiple scales – from small regional branches to broader world anthropologies². Yet even if inspired by the world anthropologies project of Lins Ribeiro, Restrepo and Escobar, and despite these matters being related, we do not seek to study issues of systems of power and hegemony, but rather intend to problematise the disciplinary boundaries of European anthropology and put the analytic focus on the actual destabilization of historically constituted traditions. Our specific contributions to ongoing disciplinary discussions will thus be to address the emergence of a transnational field of study, which is shaped by national traditions but not constrained by local practices and institutions. These increasingly contested epistemic contours and intersections show how problematic the traditional disciplinary and political boundaries have become.

We, therefore, introduce “the connector” as a very productive space for rethinking the relational space of possibilities that opens between such combinations (Viveiros de Castro 2003). The connector is itself a form of intersection, a space in-between, coming to operate between different worlds, relating and separating simultaneously. In this sense, we aim to study connectors as channels and also as a materialisation of relations existing at different scales and through diverse orientations. The connections that come to mind can include, for instance, doors, bridges, viaducts, avenues, passages, tunnels, hyphens, trains, languages, maps, disciplines or even methods. Connectors produce new configurations, establishing possibilities of crossing, sharing, interacting, seeing and communicating that in turn affect the parts that they have come into contact with (see Serres 2006). Connectors are also responsible for the translation of different positions, enabling in some cases those different parts to find common ground. Additionally, playing with such conjunctions as “and”, “in”, “of”, “over” or “upon” might also open up a space to think about how “anthropology” is related to “Europe” 1) by summing different elements up towards a transnational project, 2) by locating varied research practices and devices in order to extend the boundaries of what is possible in the social sciences, and 3) by establishing relations of belonging that problematise the very notion of Europe and the role of anthropology while analysing it.

2. We also question the extent to which European anthropology can be considered a completely integrated whole, or rather, an open system partially overlapping with other disciplines and regions.

Our concern about the kinds of connectors that anthropologists establish at different scales is both epistemological and empirical in nature, querying the ways in which we can still make use of an anthropological and European “we” once the ethnocentric “we” is no longer an authority on any “them”. Quite the opposite, the “them” has been found in “us”, and we have already started to actively study ourselves (Parman 1998; Chua, Mathur 2018), correcting previously set anthropological agendas, as for instance where and how the “other” is located (Fabian 1983). This is, thus, a double critique exercise: that of practices of authority *over* and *within* European anthropology in relation to how valid knowledge in the discipline is defined, who and where is our public, and what the concept of “European anthropology” brings actually to the fore.

Our ideas, collaborations and trajectories might be transnational and interdisciplinary, but our practices do not necessarily appear as post-national, post-ethnic or post-tradition. Overall, global processes of re-identification and re-attachment have made more complex the one-to-one relationship between place and cultural production (Eriksen 2003). Yet, anthropology – in itself a field internally fragmented and unfinished – is being affected not only by global re-articulations, but also – when practiced in Europe – by the multiple crises reshaping “Europe” as a political project and as field of study. As pointed out by Laviolette, Green and Martínez in their commentary, once anthropologists began studying Europeans (the “provincialising Europe” moment), this generated a big shift in how anthropology was regarded overall – a transformation not simply due to global whatsits. Retreating back to the *old good times* where the subject and location of study was clear and singular is no alternative, however, neither to cement the boundaries between the disciplines once the crack appeared. Hence, Laviolette, Green and Martínez propose to relate the locating endeavour of European anthropology with novel forms of academic collaboration and belonging to places.

When the centre cannot hold...

While this special section aims to be an answer to the aforementioned disciplinary changes and challenges – offering an analysis of the current situation of anthropology as it is practiced in different European localities – some of the reactions that the project is already generating can be seen as symptoms of a crisis or disagreement in what can be said about anthropology. For instance, anonymous reviewers labelled us as “Young Turks”, and our research as “discouraging”. Such a reaction makes evident

that the project pokes at the “sciatic nerve” of the discipline, and also a sense of leaving behind a disciplinary regime without having a clear idea of how the new one is looking like. Interestingly, European anthropology mirrors many similar tensions between unity and disunity affecting the very concept of Europe itself. Likewise, we can observe empirically how the current debates on the conditions of European anthropology are in many ways no different than the traditional anthropological discussions over issues of language, inequality, hegemony, otherness, liminality, and so forth, or the very uncertainties of the European Union as a political project.

Our research has a strong focus on the contemporary, reflecting on the European condition of our practice in the present rather than discussing how anthropology took Europe as its object of enquiry, or the historical relationship between anthropological theory and its practice in Europe³. The three forums dealing with the concept *Euro-Anthropology* (Green, Laviolette 2015a, 2015b; Martínez 2016) have been a refreshing attempt to tackle these questions in connection with those of the politics of representation and the conditions of the diverse anthropologies actually being done within European academia. We aim, however, to further problematise many aspects of what has been commented upon and debated in three discussion forums published by the journal *Social Anthropology*. The intensity of the debates reflects what Alessandro Testa (2016) calls “a state of unrest”, a sense of urgency that needs to be examined and discussed in depth. Drawing on the momentum generated by the forums, and given the need to develop the brief accounts into more refined arguments with detailed evidence, we propose an analysis of the practical supports and conditions of possibility for the discipline (Green 2014; Strathern 2018), in relation to mobility, locality, collaborations, epistemic validity and the commodification of knowledge production.

This section appears, thus, in a moment where disciplinary relations and boundaries are being reshaped, redefined and repurposed. For instance, we observe that European anthropology is being affected by the destabilisation of what has been historically taken as core and periphery in the discipline, blurring this separation; in some cases, this influences working conditions negatively, yet also we see how edges are drawn into the re-arrangement of

3. In the sense of explaining why and how this has happened over time and through different historical conjunctures. On this matter, see Boissevain 1975; Goddard, Llobera, Shore 1994; Kockel, Nic Craith, Frykman 2012; Kuper 2015; D.O. Martínez forthcoming. Moreover, until recently there has not been a European tradition as such, but rather different schools, such as the British, the French or (arguably) the German schools of thought.

the existing canon of anthropological thinking. Participating in these discussions, Estalella and Sánchez Criado question, in their contribution, the role of traditions in the current making of European anthropology, providing a provocative answer: we find ourselves “in the void of tradition”, practicing anthropology “not as a disciplinary field, but as a field of experimental collaborations”.

When analysing the trajectory of this changing (evolving, mutating, in flux) body of knowledge, we also have to engage with the related criteria of validity and transmission. Hence, the different contributions explain what it means to do anthropology nowadays in a European context, foregrounding the conditions of production for our modes of inquiry, its institutional backing, questioned or fraught status, and the role that new modes of management are playing in enabling – or impeding – forms of relevant anthropological inquiry. Yet, the research also designates a double relational problem: what is the mutual and recursive relationship between Europe and anthropology? And how should we reflect upon the connections between the multiple anthropologies being done in Europe? Rather than offering accounts of different anthropological “areas” and “national traditions”, we interrogate the very notions of Europe and anthropology, their connections at different scales and their changing notions of belonging and what should be of concern.

In this vein, Kockel and McFadyen propose to enter into levels below Europe to show how geographical fields and categories are not definitive, but moving targets in a constant process of transformation. In their contribution, they question the very location of centre, particularly in the aftermath of some events like Brexit, the German reunification, and even Trump’s presidency, arguing that a “Europeanist anthropology” would be a suitable response to the emerging tensions and ambivalences (see also Kockel *et al.* 2012). “It was not meant to be this way”, stresses philosopher Tom Frost (2017) in an article about Brexit, criticising myths of exceptionalism and also wrong technocratic decisions by the EU, such as prioritising the single market, instead of favouring a deeper political and fiscal union.

Emerging centrifugal forces do also challenge disciplinary ideas about methods and epistemic evidence, changing, in turn, the centres of gravity of how anthropology is practiced within European scholarship. The notion of European anthropology might help us, practitioners, to recover a sense of purpose and to see ourselves not as flying Dutchmen, moving throughout Europe without ever integrating ourselves into one particular national tradition, but as contributing to an epistemologically plural, transnational discipline able to question its role and its boundaries. Additionally,

reflecting on European anthropology is for us a way to enable alternative disciplinary descriptions and epistemic relations to respond to the impact of the neoliberalisation of academia on our anthropological undertakings. Hence, this special section not merely accounts for new combinations of the discipline and the alternative research paradigms being practiced by scholars based in European institutions, but also tries to formulate resources of hope and ways of dealing with the present tensions stressing our work. The selection of articles will eventually demonstrate viable ways to look ahead under the present conditions, pointing at the directions that will make our discipline relevant and having an impact beyond academia too.

Biographies and academic trajectories

Besides studying the actual conditions of knowledge production under neoliberal educational policies, we intend to illustrate the personal and professional landscapes of the authors. We will do this by tracking the new circuits of mobility and transfer of knowledge, contrasting their potential for generating further transformations within the different localities where the discipline is practiced. Based on what we found in our practice – an anthropology that refuses to be pinned down and rather aims at a transnational horizon – we do not try to isolate our subject of study, but rather to air it out in order to understand the new conjunctures that lead to shifting connections and dynamics among anthropological practices. The changes in the field of practice and in the institution that the discipline has been undergoing in recent decades have but accelerated (Martínez 2016) with respect to the methodologies used, the themes being addressed, the labour conditions of the practitioners (i.e. the emergence of rapid assessment techniques and short-term ethnography), and the crystallisation of new kinds of location and networks of collaboration, characterised, to a great extent, by the need to defend our time to settle and also to think (di Puppò 2016; Jiménez Sedano 2016).

In this set of articles and commentaries, many of the contributions engage with discussions about anthropology's own status as it emerges in different European localities (in some cases outside of academic settings). We also account for new ways of collaboration within and beyond academic disciplines by exploring how new knowledge relations are playing out within, across and beyond anthropology (see Kockcel, McFadyen in this journal). The transformations described indicate a shift in the relations between ethnography and what is considered an anthropological mode of inquiry, an epistemic partnership, and also authority, establishing a more dialogic form of knowledge production (Holmes, Marcus 2005; Estalella, Sánchez Criado

2018). There is likewise a shift – yet of a different kind – between anthropology and its proximity to life, a changing distance characterised by two factors: on the one hand, the amount of time that we dedicate to administrative tasks and to being in front of a laptop; on the other hand, the sense of sacrifice of our personal lives that many of us experience – distancing scholarship from life as a result.

A new generation of anthropologists based in Europe (yet trained in different parts of the world) are showing a more open sensitivity to dialogic forms of research and conceptual tools, bringing with them a new anthropological programme that problematises classical epistemic boundaries. In their contribution to this special section, Estalella and Sánchez Criado put the emphasis on reconsidering the boundaries of anthropology, thereby raising two important questions: Where does anthropological knowledge production take place? And, who is excluded when tracing epistemic frontiers? To answer these questions, we need to pay attention to “the social and cultural located-ness of both knowledge and knowers” (Ferguson 2012: 206). Being part of an inclusive abstraction such as European anthropology might allow us to cross actual disciplinary borders without a visa, troubling anthropology’s boundaries as a response to reactionary efforts to police them (see Clarke 2014; also Estalella, Sánchez Criado in this issue).

All these assumptions rely on increasingly complex forms of relating and on the coexistence of different niches of practice, showing that European anthropology is increasingly being practiced through a transnational network of sites. These different niches of practice interact in multiple ways within the global circulation of ideas, in some cases merging and in other cases not even adding up. Along these lines, we emphasise that European anthropology is not being destroyed, but rather is in the middle of a process of reconfiguration (of concepts, methods and cultural areas, of the divide between us and the other and between objects and subjects), and of dispersion (being currently multiplied through novel relations and connectors, changing along historically constituted traditions and centre-periphery relations). This was also pointed out by James Ferguson in “Novelty and method: Reflections on global fieldwork” (2012: 196). Specifically, he listed four elements that make things different from how our discipline was practiced in the past:

- The fact that social relations are increasingly being stretched across a transnational space;
- The great proliferation of transnational institutions of a new kind;

- The acceleration of many social, political and economic processes;
- The rapidly increasing number of highly educated professionals and amount of information available.

We talk about knowledge territories as a way to problematise them. Overall, space functions as a key organising principle in anthropology, being simultaneously a product of social structures and relations (Gupta, Ferguson 1997). Geopolitical metaphors have also been used to explain and justify the need for different disciplines, with terms such as boundaries, kingdoms or even federations coming into play (see Papataxiarchis 2015). However, the emergence of European anthropology is not simply about the distorting of disciplinary boundaries, and cartographies, but also about producing a change of scale, displacing and dispersing the idea of Europe along with it (see Čapo's commentary); and affecting on European imagination and anthropology's public futures, including discussions about epistemic experimentation, socioeconomic inequalities, and cosmopolitanism (see Eriksen; Estalella, Sánchez Criado; and Rapport in this issue).

Academic capitalism

This special section, originally meant to foster an intergenerational and international debate, also engage with such questions as: What is the relevance of this object called an academic discipline? Where is the public of European anthropology located? And, what is our role as anthropologists in Europe? It is the community of anthropology practitioners who defines what counts as knowledge, and it is that definition which in turn redefines the discipline, argues Marilyn Strathern (2000; 2007). The first auditors of our work are ourselves, the community of practitioners, she insists. As Strathern foregrounds elsewhere, “the value of a discipline is precisely in its ability to account for its conditions of existence and thus [...] how it arrives at its knowledge practices” (2004: 5)⁴. Also, along this line Johannes Fabian points out that the definition of knowledge affects all phases of our work, arguing that “knowing what and how we know is a practical, not just a theoretical, problem” (2012: 439).

However, quantitative indicators have come to signify anthropological quality. Likewise, the discipline has been further integrated into the knowledge economy, influencing the labour conditions and the regimes of value overall, as we are impelled to look at ourselves as a competitive brand

4. Also, Strathern (2006) has noted that disciplinary awareness can be directly linked with the protection of academic autonomy, especially when discourses of interdisciplinarity are used as new procedures for auditing, and in many cases, as a criterion of accountability itself (Barry *et al.* 2008).

since the scientific community is increasingly portrayed through the rhetoric of the market (Brenneis 2009; Pobłocki 2009; Shore, MacLauchlan 2012; Heatherington, Zerilli 2016; Savransky 2016; Shore, Trnka 2013; Shore, Wright 2015). Family life, childcare, social relations and ties to our locations are threatened by actual measurement-addicted strategies in universities. The pressures of working in academia are harder, as the universities are increasingly squeezed; scholars are expected to carry more tasks in less time and more and more involved in short-term projects. To many of us, this makes us reconsider if pursuing an academic career is healthy and worthy, frequently thinking of possible ways out; yet, it also makes the whole scholarly system less sustainable in a long term.

Universities' priorities have changed and seem to be, by this order, attracting third-party funding, feeding the administrative machinery, cooperating with the marketing department, pleasing the publishing industry, being creative and innovative, and finally, striving for a strong performance in the international market, giving, as a result, no time to engagement in greater society (Eriksen 2006). In an article entitled "I wanted to be an academic, not "a creative": Notes on universities and the new capitalism" (2008), Eeva Berglund criticises how we attribute value to different kinds of work done in the university. As she points out, the institutionally produced environment of rivalry, the fatigue of being burdened by redundant administrative information and the increasing tendency to work according to short-term contracts is producing more difficult working conditions. Additionally, what is put in the hands of this bureaucratic leviathan is the power to reshape the criteria of validity and the regime of value governing anthropological knowledge, increasingly eclipsing traditional scholarly notions of both value and validity (Barth 2002).

What we see, however, is that anthropology has retreated and shrunk away from the public sphere, becoming harmless and unimportant. For our discipline to count politically and influence public debates, it has to reach audiences outside academia. And the best manner we have is to tell stories and write more personally engaged ethnographies. "Stories are the stuff of life; analysis is for specialists" (2006: 35), observes Thomas Hylland Eriksen. Also, the questions of precarity, the consequences of austerity policies and the need to spend increasing proportions of our time in efforts to secure funding have emerged as two of the fundamental topics in the discussions about anthropology in Europe and beyond. The university is increasingly being experienced as a (demanding) institution and less and less as a place (for investigation and knowledge making). One task of European anthropology is thus to contribute to re-imagining universities within the global knowledge economy, to regaining the capacity to define what should be valued and to

designing our own measuring instruments. On this regard, Regina Bendix, Kilian Bizer and Dorothy Noyes note how the demands of the project writing process force qualitative researchers into a position of “translating their idiom, distorting their paradigms, and misrepresenting the logic of their procedures” to align with the requisites of the funding agencies (2017: 7), placing the question of how to measure qualitative outputs at the centre of the discussion.

European research infrastructures

Assuming the importance of recognising the multiple political and economic strategies and scales at play in European anthropology, this special section places itself as part of the new transnational approaches to the study of the epistemic organisational forms and politics of knowledge production (Corsín Jiménez 2008). We aim to discuss the ways the European economic and political project and the field of European anthropology mutually constitute one another, having an impact in Europe making, and in how our work is practised, recognised and legitimated as a relevant discipline. Europe-making and knowledge-making go hand to hand, co-relating politics, research infrastructures and the practice of anthropology. Indeed, the EU has been discursively representing itself through buzzwords that have an impact in our work and considerations of what is knowledge – buzzwords that have been symptomatically changing over the years: from “knowledge society” we have passed to “knowledge economy”, and more recently, we have started to hear terms such as “innovation union” used to characterise Europe (Felt 2016). Europeanisation is more than just a transnational process of mobility and circulation and competing conceptions of integration. Europeanisation also brings to the fore the creation of specific discourses, standards, systems of valuation and research funding and infrastructures.

Ongoing processes of Europeanisation are part of a changing system of relationships between people and institutions, generating new forms of abstraction, valuation, sense of scale and socio-technical arrangements. For instance, one of the most important results has been the ERC programmes, which have become key to the development of scientific research projects in Europe (Miller 2015). Another relevant trans-national institution that has had consequences for European anthropology is the EASA (European Association of Social Anthropologists), serving as it does as a microcosm of Europe and producing a great variety of transnational impulses. As Damián Omar Martínez (2016) has noted, the EASA has helped us to challenge “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer, Glick Schiller 2002) and to craft

European anthropology as a field of practice – one which remains, nonetheless, located in and attached to particular places and in dialogue with different traditions (considered themselves not as something static, but a flowing stream).

In an evolving socio-political construction such as the current Europeanisation process, there are openings and closures. In other words, “some things and ideas travel, while others don’t” (Eriksen 2003: 11). Also, if musing about the specific ways in which anthropological practices underpin or are induced by the making of the EU, and the ways in which notions of European identity have contributed to the establishment of our transnational field of practice, we should critically examine and problematise the way the EU is empirically portrayed in the twenty-first century. For instance, Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida (2003) remark that the EU represents a historical break with the past through the creation of “new, supranational forms of cooperation”. Also, for Juan Diez Medrano (2003), Europeanisation implies the emergence of transnational groups of citizens across borders whose practices transcend their locality or national affiliations. For Andrew Barry (2006), however, Europeanisation refers to the formation of new spaces of government as well as a “technological zone” of common standards. Likewise, John Borneman and Nick Fowler (1997) together with Robert Harmsen and Thomas Wilson (2000) foreground the idea that Europeanisation means new forms of governance and reorganising territoriality, peoplehood and means of power.

Concluding remarks

This special section is not merely an assessment or an overview of the state of anthropology in Europe, but a call to see what sort of transnational (European) anthropological practices exist already and to imagine what sort of transnational, “Euro-anthropology” is worth striving towards. Contributors were selected because of being active in different transnational anthropological communities and/or networks. We do not pretend to represent the state of anthropology in Europe, but rather to offer a reflection about the kind of experiments, formats and relations through which European anthropology is emerging towards the future as an intellectual and political project. Dealing with the topic of European Anthropology is also a problematisation of Europe and anthropology, a mutual and recursive relationship that also brings to the fore the kind of knowledge we represent and the relationship of Europe and our discipline to something that has been named as “world anthropologies”, revealing a larger concern on what is deemed relevant in our anthropological inquiry (see Estalella, Sánchez Criado).

This set of papers and commentaries explores to what extent the shifting conditions of our work and multiple engagements of anthropology with other epistemological paradigms have contributed to the destabilisation of anthropology's disciplinary identity at a broader level. It has to do, therefore, with the configuration and description of the discipline we offer and the future we imagine, making a point about how our knowledge relations are located as a field and the way they reveal something about the character of our discipline and of the (transnational) European project. Against the opinion of some of our reviewers, this does not devalue either Europe or anthropology; rather, it offers new ways of valuing (un updating) them both. Moreover, it was not our intention to engage in a corporatist proselytism of the discipline, providing some kind of advertising brochure to attract new anthropologists, but to question the contemporary conditions of production of anthropological knowledge, and to reflect, critically, on what modes of inquiry our positioning as European anthropologists eventually open up or curtail. The concept of "European anthropology" can be, therefore, approached as an abstraction that connects, a *conceptor*, whereby the emphasis is put on the capacities and possibilities opened up via this epistemic and political location.

One of the things we learnt is that Europe is composed of a variety of peripheries, which in some cases provide strong critiques and creative alternatives in political and disciplinary terms (see Martínez in this issue). Another empirical observation is that, after being historically confronted by differences, the anthropology done in Europe is increasingly turning the disciplinary legacy of a critical ethnographic eye back onto Europe. The space of European anthropology is changing precisely because of the implications that academic precarity has for knowledge production itself; but it is also changing because of the growing importance of the EU for anthropological research – despite appearing as an unfinished and at times dysfunctional political assemblage. Secondly, the relationship of European anthropology to world anthropologies is shifting, becoming more integrative and symmetrical, and making the twentieth century disciplinary cartographies look rather obsolete. Thirdly, as in the case of the European project, anthropology is embedded in global politics and neoliberal knowledge-making dispositions, hence the relevance of the kind of knowledge that we represent in a world dominated by marketisation and standardisation is also changing. Fourthly, based on a collective sense of disciplinary disarray, some colleagues began to approach the idea of European anthropology as a future-oriented project in-the-making (see Čapo, Rapport and Eriksen in this special section), composed of multiple

transnational practices and of a set of humanist values worth striving towards. We conclude that a key feature characterising European anthropology is the very troubling of the boundaries of the discipline – by multiplying the relations with what has been traditionally considered non-anthropological and non-European.

Accordingly, we will engage with such empirical and theoretical questions as: What are the boundaries of European anthropology as a field of practice? What kinds of relationships are established, and what is the role of academic networks within them? How are these connections embodied and articulated? To what degree the emergence of a European field of practice is weakening (or not) national identities and traditions? In what way does engaging with the current disarray of the discipline contribute to rethinking the actual crisis of the EU? What role do the social and material conditions play in the production of anthropological knowledge in that positionality (namely, labour environments, temporal regimes, pressures and reconciliations of work and family life, mechanisms of training, hiring and promotion, canons and notions of relevance)? And finally, how do we know what we are?

REFERENCES

- Barth, Fredrik, 2002, An anthropology of knowledge, *Current Anthropology*, 43, 1: 1-18.
- Barry, Andrew, 2006, Technological zones, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9, 2: 239-253.
- Bendix, Regina, Kilian Bizer, Dorothy Noyes, 2017, *Sustaining Interdisciplinary Collaboration. A Guide for the Academy*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Berglund, Eeva, 2008, I wanted to be an academic, not “a creative”: Notes on universities and the new capitalism, *Ephemera*, 8, 3: 322-330.
- Boissevain, Jeremy, 1975, Introduction: Towards a social anthropology of Europe, in *Beyond the Community: Social Process in Europe*, Jeremy Boissevain, John Friedl, eds, The Hague, Department of Educational Science of the Netherlands, 9-17.
- Borneman, John, Nick Fowler, 1997, Europeanization, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26: 487-514.
- Brenneis, Don, 2009, Anthropology in and of the Academy: Globalization, Assessment and Our Field’s Future, *Social Anthropology*, 17, 3: 261-275.
- Chua, Liana, Nayanika Mathur, eds, 2018, *Who Are “We”? Reimagining Alterity and Affinity in Anthropology*, Oxford, Berghahn.
- Clarke, Jennifer, 2014, Disciplinary boundaries between art and anthropology, *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 13, 3: 178-191.
- Corsín Jiménez, Alberto, 2008, Relations and disproportions: the labor of scholarship in the knowledge-economy, *American Ethnologist*, 35: 229-242.
- Di Puppo, Lili, 2016, Reflecting on knowledge production in contemporary academia. Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part three, *Social Anthropology*, 24, 3: 366-367.
- Diez Medrano, Juan, 2003, *Framing Europe: Attitudes to European Integration I Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Dzenovska, Dace, 2014, Bordering encounters, sociality, and distribution of the ability to live a normal life, *Social Anthropology*, 22, 3: 271-287.
- Eriksen, Thomas H., ed, 2003, *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology*, London, Pluto.
- Eriksen, Thomas H., 2006, *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Estalella, Adolfo, Tomás Sánchez Criado, eds, 2018, *Experimental Collaborations: Ethnography through Fieldwork Devices*, Oxford, Berghahn.
- Fabian, Johannes, 1983, *Time and the Other*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Fabian, Johannes, 2012, Cultural anthropology and the question of knowledge, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 18: 439-453.
- Felt, Ulrike, 2016, Innovations, knowledge ecologies and academic timescapes, in *Designing the Future. Economic, Societal and Political Dimensions of Innovation*, The Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development, ed, Vienna, Echo Medienhaus: 118-136.

- Ferguson, James, 2012, Novelty and methods reflections on global fieldwork, in *Multi-Sited Ethnography*, Simon Coleman, Pauline Von Hellermann, eds, New York, Routledge: 194-207.
- Frost, Tom, 2017, It was not meant to be this way: an unfortunate case of Anglo-Saxon parochialism?, *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 26, 1: 53-74.
- Goddard, Victoria, Cris Shore, Josep Llobera, eds, 1994, *The Anthropology of Europe: Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*, Oxford, Berg.
- Green, Sarah, 2014, Anthropological knots: conditions of possibilities and interventions, *Hau*, 4, 3: 1-21.
- Green, Sarah, Patrick Laviolette, 2015a, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 3: 330-364.
- Green, Sarah, Patrick Laviolette, 2015b, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part two, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 4: 492-509.
- Gupta, Akhil, James Ferguson, eds, 1997, *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen, Jacques Derrida, 2003, February 15, or, what binds Europeans together: plea for a common foreign policy, beginning in core Europe, *Constellations*, 10, 3: 291-297.
- Harmsen, Robert, Thomas M. Wilson, 2000, Introduction: Approaches to Europeanization, *Yearbook of European Studies*, 14: 13-26.
- Heatherington, Tracey, Filippo Zerilli, eds, 2016, Anthropologists in/of the neoliberal academy, *Anuac*, 5, 1: 41-90.
- Holmes, Douglas, George E. Marcus, 2005, Cultures of expertise and the management of globalization: Toward the re-functioning of ethnography, in *Global Assemblages*, Aihwa Ong, Stephen J. Collier, eds, London, Blackwell: 235-252.
- Jiménez Sedano, Livia, 2016, Trapped in the rat race: slow science as a way of resistance for European Anthropology, Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part three, *Social Anthropology*, 24, 3: 362-363.
- Kockel, Ullrich, 2010, *Re-Visioning Europe: Frontiers, Place Identities and Journeys in Debatable Lands*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kockel, Ullrich, Máiréad Nic Craith, Jonas Frykman, eds, 2012, *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kuper, Adam, 2015, *Anthropology and Anthropologists. The British School in the Twentieth Century*, 4th ed., London, Routledge.
- Lins Ribeiro, Gustavo, 2006, World anthropologies: Cosmopolitics for a new global scenario in anthropology, *Critique of Anthropology*, 26, 4: 363-386.
- Macdonald, Sharon, 2015, Moving between anthropologies in and on Europe, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part two, *Social Anthropology* 23, 4: 493-494.
- Martínez, Damián Omar, 2016. EASA and Euro-Anthropology: an ethnographic approach, in Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part three, *Social Anthropology*, 24, 3: 368-369.

- Martínez, Damián Omar, forthcoming, Between Boundary-Work and Cosmopolitan Aspirations: An Historical Ethnography of EASA and European Anthropology, *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*.
- Martínez, Francisco, 2016, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part three, *Social Anthropology*, 24, 3: 353-379.
- Miller, Daniel, 2015, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 3: 388-389.
- Nic Craith, Máiréad, 2015, Diversity and singularity in European anthropology, Forum: Rethinking Euro-anthropology part one, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 3: 342-343.
- Papataxiarchis, Evthymios, 2015, For a European Union of anthropological localities, Forum: Rethinking Euro-anthropology. Part one, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 3: 332-334.
- Parman, Susan, ed, 1998, *Europe in the Anthropological Imagination*, Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.
- Rapport, Nigel, ed, 2002, *British Subjects: An Anthropology of Britain*, Oxford, Berg.
- Restrepo, Eduardo, Arturo Escobar, 2005, Other anthropologies and anthropology otherwise: Steps to a world anthropologies framework, *Critique of Anthropology*, 25: 99-129.
- Savransky, Martin, 2016, *The Adventure of Relevance*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Serres, Michel, 2006, *L'art des ponts. Homo pontifex*, Paris, Le Pommier.
- Shore, Cris. Laura McLauchlan, 2012, "Third mission" activities, commercialisation and academic entrepreneurs, *Social Anthropology*, 20, 3: 267-286.
- Shore, Cris, Susanna Trnka, eds, 2013. *Up Close and Personal: On Peripheral Perspectives and the Production of Anthropological Knowledge*, Oxford, Berghahn.
- Shore, Cris, Susan. Wright, 2015, Governing by numbers: audit culture, rankings and the new world order, *Social Anthropology*, 23, 1: 22-28.
- Strathern, Marilyn, ed, 2000, *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, New York, Taylor & Francis.
- Strathern, Marilyn, 2004, *Commons and Borderlands*, Wantage, Sean Kingston.
- Strathern, Marilyn, 2006, A community of critics? Thoughts on new knowledge, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 12, 1: 191-209.
- Strathern, Marilyn, 2007, Interdisciplinarity: some models from the human sciences, *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 32, 2: 123-34.
- Strathern, Marilyn, 2018, Infrastructures in and of ethnography, *Anuac*, 7, 2: 49-69.
- Testa, Alessandro, 2016, Young scholars of an ageing discipline in the old continent, Forum Rethinking Euro-anthropology: part three, *Social Anthropology*, 24, 3: 371-373.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo, 2003, And, *Manchester Papers in Social Anthropology* <https://sites.google.com/a/abaetenet.net/nansi/abaetextos/anthropology-and-science-e-viveiros-de-castro>, accessed on 10/12/2019.
- Wimmer, Andreas, Nina Glick Schiller, 2002, Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences, *Global Networks*, 2, 4: 301-334.

Francisco MARTÍNEZ is a Lecturer in the School of Museum Studies, University of Leicester. In 2018, he was awarded with the Early Career Prize of the European Association of Social Anthropologists. Francisco has been a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Helsinki and Aalto University. Currently, he is the co-editor of the Berghahn book series “Politics of Repair” and member of the editorial board of the *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*. Francisco has edited several books – including *Repair, Brokenness, Breakthrough: Ethnographic Responses* (Berghahn, 2019) and is the author of *Remains of the Soviet Past in Estonia* (UCL Press, 2018).

fm211@leicester.ac.uk

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons © Francisco Martínez

Introduction: Disciplinary cartographies and connectors

2019 | ANUAC. VOL. 8, N° 2, DICEMBRE 2019: 125-142.

ISSN: 2239-625X - DOI: 10.7340/anuac2239-625X-3630

