



# The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth

**Office:** Administrator, IT support, and conference  
organiser

**Name:** Rohan Jackson

**Address:** c/o RAI, 50 Fitzroy St, London W1T 5BT

**Email:** [admin@theasa.org](mailto:admin@theasa.org)

**Web:** [www.theasa.org](http://www.theasa.org)

## ASA Committee Meeting, 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006

Venue: 19, Amherst Road, Manchester; Time 14.00 – 17.00 (lunch 13.00-14.00)

### Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of 12.11.05
3. Matters arising
4. Reports
  - a. Chair's report
  - b. Administrator's report
  - c. Treasurer's report
  - d. Ethics report
  - e. Media
  - f. Networks
  - g. Anthropology Matters
  - h. PG Courses
5. Publications
6. Funding for PG-training
7. Welcome pack
8. Profile of Anthropology
9. ASA conferences (conference liaison?)
  - a. 2006
  - b. ASA 2007
  - c. ASA 2008
10. Membership

## **Chair's Report**

### **Internal Affairs**

We have finally shipped out the Annals and Directory, which I copy edited since Iris remained hors de combat, and Ro has completed the purification of our membership database. This means that we are now ready to move forward with strategies for eliminating these problems in the future, which Ro will present in his report for discussion at the meeting. It is, however, apparent from the demographic breakdown that accompanies the directory, and the evidence that will be provided by the ratio of members to non-members at the Keele conference, that the Association's future depends on our capacity to persuade a much larger proportion of the new staff entering the profession to join, and that that in turn depends on our working on our own profile as well as that of the profession as a whole. The revised arrangements for election of members to be put to the ABM will at least remove the existing procedural disincentives to agile recruitment, but I think we will need to consider whether conferences organised on the lines of ASA 2006 – at which ASA members will be in the minority – really serve the Association's long-term interest. I propose that we review ASA 2006 from this point of view at our next committee meeting and be more proactive in shaping ASA 2007 (though since Richard still hasn't handed over any paperwork, I still remain rather hazy on the latter and will need to get in touch with the organisers).

There are also continuing problems with our Publications endeavours, on which Trevor will report more fully, but I will say a little bit about this since I have been involved in some of the discussions with Berg and in more general discussions with publishers on both sides of the Atlantic about the future of anthropology publishing. It is quite clear that the edited book is now an endangered species unless it can be sold as a teaching text to a readership broader than anthropology students. The monographs series seems relatively secure under the present arrangements, although Berg rejected the second volume from the Decennial, offered as part of another series, despite strong representations of support from me and the other series editor. It may well, with the benefit of hindsight, have been a mistake that a previous committee rejected the possibility of attaching a journal to the ASA when that was a possibility (in 2000, if I recall correctly), since the economics of journal publishing under today's consortia deals for on-line access are very different from those of books. But in any event, it does seem clear that ASA conference proceedings will need to be projected more through journals in the future, and that we probably need to start thinking about this more systematically.

### **External Affairs**

Much of the rest of my own activity since the last meeting has been related to our relationships with ESRC.

*The IBR.* The International Benchmarking Exercise has continued to move slowly, but the International Panel has now been constituted and will visit (I quote from the letter sent out by Ian Diamond and myself) "twelve UK institutions during the week of 14<sup>th</sup> -20<sup>th</sup> May, to discuss perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the discipline as it stands currently and its capacity for development in the future." I met with the panel chair, Don Brenneis, at the AAA meeting in Washington last December, and I will be liaising with him in the weeks to come as well as meeting the entire panel formally in London on the Sunday before the panel visits start and informally for dinner on the evening of the Thursday after they complete the visits. There is a formal meeting with the whole Steering Committee on the afternoon of Friday 19<sup>th</sup>, but I am speaking at a Latin Americanist's conference then, so will have to miss that. It may well prove that this is more of a blessing than a problem, since I will be able to talk to the panel members (most of whom I know well) prior to this and in a less "on the record" setting with a minimal ESRC presence. There has been a change of personnel on the ESRC side, since the evaluation officer originally in charge of this appears to have succumbed to a series of personal problems that have been one of main factors in the slow progress of this exercise, and that may help too from the point of view of our ability to shape the agenda. At least part of that agenda must address the other dimension of

recent ESRC-related business, the postgraduate training situation. There are various dimensions to this.

*The Recognition Exercise.* The most obvious is the Recognition Exercise result, from which eight anthropology departments received quotas (UCL, LSE, Cambridge, Durham, Edinburgh, Kent, Manchester and Oxford). Although this is an improvement in spread relative to the previous allocation, it still excludes RAE 5 rated research departments with substantial postgraduate numbers (such as Goldsmiths', SOAS and Sussex) and represents an overall reduction in studentships over the period 2006-2008 (since all but UCL lose quotas in the 2007/8 academic year). Here is the table, the third figure being totals for the two years (there is an option for "outlets" to use them all this year):

London School of Economics and Political Science Department of Anthropology	3	2	5
London University College Department of Anthropology	3	3	6
University of Cambridge Department of Social Anthropology	3	2	5
University of Durham Department of Anthropology	2	1	3
University of Edinburgh School of Social and Political Sciences	2	1	3
University of Kent Department of Anthropology	2	1	3
University of Manchester Social Anthropology	2	1	3
University of Oxford Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology	2	1	3

This is part of a general reallocation of resources by ESRC to support quantitative social sciences at the expense of qualitative under the now familiar rubric of "capacity building" to address "national weaknesses". So we are not the only bunnies to be unhappy about this.

But the problems are far worse than these numbers indicate. The quotas now cover 1+3 and +3 candidates and the competition pool has been reduced to 100 for all subjects (1+3 and +3). So the chances of anyone getting +3 funding after self-funding a research Masters (or being supported from institutional funds) are considerably reduced.

Here are some calculations that I did for Goldsmiths' on the likely scale of the funding reduction involved:

In the 2005–6 academic year, 264 competition awards offers made in the end, of which 10 went to Social Anthropology candidates (more than were initially allocated to us). That particular year our offer rate was one of the lowest (18%) amongst the different disciplines supported by ESRC, although our A-graded candidate percentage was also rather lower than I remember from earlier years (48%). 4 of these competition awards were 1+3, and 6, +3. We also got 10 in 2004. In 2003, we got 28 competition offers, after an initial allocation of 22, an offer rate of 28% (1 candidate did not take up the award). I don't have the previous quota data to hand, but most of the departments that had quotas before now have fewer in the two-year period than they did before. Since there are 19 quota awards nationally this year and only 12 in 2007–8, the loss of funding is very clear. With a pool of 100 and a share of competition awards that dropped from 4.4% in 2003 to 3.8% in 2005, we will be lucky to get 4 grants nationally out of the competition now. So in 2007/8, we will have fewer ESRC funded students *in total* than we have funded through quotas this year. Unless we can reverse these trends after 2007/8 we will hardly be getting more grants in total than we used to get from the competition alone when quotas were first introduced! When I was still head of department, Manchester was getting around 5 ESRC awards a year out of the competition only system. This did include a number of fees-only awards to EU candidates, however, and another significant change is that EU students can now get fully funded by ESRC if they have three years residence here (even if it's for education alone), so undergraduates from EU countries now have the same shot at ESRC postgraduate funding as UK nationals: according to Jonathan Spencer, a quota could also be used to fund two fees-only EU places, i.e. students newly arriving from an EU country.

There are other ways to get ESRC-funded students (e.g. through CASE awards or attached to research grants) and this provides some incentive for departments without quotas to maintain ESRC recognition and all the work getting that entails, even if it means shaping the entire training agenda in ways that are unattractive to non-ESRC students, but obviously there may now be more

questioning of the actual value of recognition in some “outlets”, as the “international kite-marking” argument about the virtues of ESRC recognition is a rather weak one in the real market place (and apparently not judged very significant even by most foreign research councils). Another major problem is that the quotas are selectively distributed, according to an algorithm that does no favours to anthropologists working in emerging departments or in smaller groups within broader schools. There is a considerable amount of rewarding past “success” in this formula, which takes scale of research funding as well as RAE ratings into account, very much against the spirit of our RAE 2008 sub-panel’s approach. I have asked for responses from departments on all this, with a view to taking forward a discussion with ESRC prior to the IBR, since this would appear an opportune moment. Goldsmiths’ have raised specific questions about the algorithm, and not received very acceptable answers and I am giving Victoria Goddard advice as they prepare an institutional protest. Alternatively, there might be something to be said tactically for using the IBR panel to transmit a critique, since the dearth of UK postgrads was a major point made by the last RAE panel, and its implications are now visible in the study that ESRC commissioned of anthropology employment patterns, carried out by Jonathan Spencer and David Mills. I could “filter” some thoughts about this in behind the scenes and in fact already told Don Brenneis I didn’t expect the Recognition Result to be good news. In practice ESRC seems to have ignored the results of its own employment survey in constructing the algorithm, since it estimated demand for anthropology PhDs solely in terms of lectureships within straight anthropology departments!

In any event, thus far the responses have predictably come largely from the departments without quotas in England (Northern Ireland is outside this system and anthropology in Wales is tragically now so decimated that it has no possibilities within this regime), all of which are going to have even less chance of getting ESRC funded students in the next two rounds. But there was a full response from Scotland, which doesn’t seem to have benefited much from ESRC’s supposed obligation to provide regional balance. The Scots tried but failed to get ESRC funding for a training consortium (largely it seems because they didn’t adjust enough to ESRC’s current training agenda) and given that Jonathan was our last representative on the Training Board, while Tim Ingold was our last representative on the Research Grants Board, while St Andrews has managed to tap AHRC funding, I have been having quite a dialogue with them and will enlist Jonathan and Tim’s support in future dialogues with ESRC.

**The bottom line here is that we need to try to negotiate for change in 2008/9**, since the decisions are already set for the next two years (by fiat and without consultation). This negotiation has to be about:

- (a) The total number of grants for the subject
- (b) The distribution of grants between outlets – especially from the perspective of giving departments currently without quotas a more meaningful stake in the ESRC system: this could be via redistribution of quotas – so that each recognised department had at least one – or by increasing the size of the competition again. They will not abandon quotas but quite strong arguments can be made for reducing the selectivity of allocation in our tiny pot of funding. If they want to fund “the best students” there is simply no guarantee that the best supervisors for those students will be working in the 8 departments that have quotas.

Obviously, all that would imply a reversing of the current preference for quantitative research (i.e. an argument that the capacity has now been built). This may not be easy to achieve without inter-disciplinary campaigning and better representation for those who would support a rolling back of the current tide on ESRC boards. There is also, I might add, an extra £3K a year in stipend for students taking quantitative programmes – this runs counter to the results of past consultations and does strongly suggest that the inner circles of ESRC are not very eager to listen!

*Representation.* To try to improve our representation in ESRC, I asked HODs for nominations for the two vacant places on the Training Board. The response was underwhelming but the results good: ASA has nominated David Mills and Peter Wade. There is still no opening for an anthropologist on the Research Grants Board, and I will continue to complain about this (again the IBR provides a nice window of opportunity). We currently have David Zeitlyn on the Research

Resources Board, and James Fairhead on the Strategic Research Board. James is pretty uncommunicative on all fronts, but David did report back to me on the fate of the Scottish training consortium bid and the ASA's own failed bid for support for our training courses under the Researcher Development Initiative, since he was involved in these. So let me say a little more about this last problem.

*ASA Training Courses.* It has been made clear to me that we made a mistake in the last RDI round by putting in a series of courses instead of one consolidated proposal: I gather that none even came close to being funded. But unfortunately there are deeper problems. ESRC will not fund courses that do not correspond to its current ideas about what "advanced training" beyond what is offered by recognised outlets should look like. If you look at what it wishes to promote through the RDI in more detail, and will actually prioritise in this round, it becomes apparent that that what we want (and what our students asked for when we created the ASA courses as a response to consultation) does not really fit this paradigm. Worse, ESRC will only pay 80% of Full Economic Cost, so even if we could come up with a course that they liked that was still relevant to the needs in our subject, ASA would not be able to meet the funding gap. I did write a letter to the Committee Chair and other key players about the important role that our established course had played, stressing that it was introduced in response to student demand, received very positive appraisals, and covered matters that some institutions could not cover in standard training (though this is a weak point, since some can and do). But I received no response from any of those involved and the criteria issued for the second round remained unfriendly to our needs and interests.

Stella was going to work on a resubmission based on a single consolidated course with Sean Conlin (now semi-retired but a longstanding ally in DfID and EU posts). However, she had not fully appreciated the impact of FEC until now, and after further discussion we have decided that another application to the RDI at this time (the deadline is April 10) is neither practical nor desirable. As an alternative, we could revert to the multidisciplinary model of the old GAPP courses, suitably updated, and seek funding from other sources that would be more likely to support a course that we and our students would find more attractive than something that would appeal to ESRC's current obsessions. There are quite a lot of possibilities here, especially given the likelihood of EU research MAs developing in the near future, and new initiatives might also be based on a regional consortium model, but all this will require considerable effort in planning and development. ASA's financial as distinct from endorsement role will have to be very limited in any new initiative, but we could conceivably find a little money for subsidising students to participate in any new programme. FEC is, however, a very different ball game to anything we have had to face previously, more or less doubling costs and putting money into the hands of institutions that may not in practice trickle down much to those delivering training or carrying out research, so finding sponsors other than UK Research Councils may well be essential.

All in all, then, the situation with ESRC is continuing a now well-established historical pattern of progressive marginalization. The only positive factor is that anthropologists' bids for research grants continue to be disproportionately successful in relation to applications and discipline size despite our lack of direct representation on the Research Grants Board. ESRC continue to cite this as evidence of their friendliness towards us. However, we seem to have few guarantees for the future, especially from the point of view of developing the discipline as we, rather than they, would want, so I foresee battling with them on multiple fronts as a major demand on my time in the coming months.

*Ethics.* One other ESRC issue that has already attracted some comment from a few departments is the ESRC Ethics Framework and its implications for fieldwork-based research. This is on the agenda for Keele, so we can revisit it after those discussions.

*AHRC.* On a more positive note, we have improved our representation in AHRC, and quite a number of departments have found ways of tapping AHRC for funding for students and research projects in the areas of overlap between the AHRC and ESRC remits and also in subfields that AHRC recognises are its primary responsibility. AHRC research programs are becoming more anthropology friendly, and Richard did a good job in getting anthropological perspectives fairly

strongly embedded in the new religion programme in particular. AHRC is **not** a substitute for ESRC: it does not have the same level of resources in terms of funding professional research beyond the PhD, it will not fund anthropology research that is clearly and unambiguously “social science”, and we are better off operating in our present interstitial position in terms of maximising the amount of resource we can extract from the research councils. But there are areas of anthropology that can clearly benefit from AHRC interest and it is possible to fund some types of PhD research through AHRC which are not presented as “straight” social anthropology, but fits cultural studies, media-visual-performance or some other type of inter-disciplinary template. AHRC also still funds stand-alone MAs.

### **How do we move forward?**

If one looks at the long-term historical pattern of research council funding attrition and agenda setting, it seems to me that social anthropology’s weakness lies not in its academic achievements but its public image. The thwarted attempt to purge the subject from the CNRS in France, on which I offered both direct and, through mobilising the WCAA, indirect support to our French colleagues, has been a salutary reminder of what is at stake. WCAA is organising sessions at both the EASA in Bristol in September and the IUAES meeting at Cape Town in December (I am co-organiser of the latter) to address this issue in a rather comprehensively international way. Even the AAA is increasingly concerned about the evident failure of its very energetic efforts at public outreach and discipline reshaping. One of my more irritating recent tasks has been a dialogue with a BBC4 producer over a series that began as ‘a three part history of anthropology’ and has now become ‘anthropological scandals’ (Malinowski’s field diaries, Castaneda, Mead-Freeman). She appears to have disengaged from this conversation now, but I have given her notice that if they make these programmes on the lines currently envisaged, I will take the matter up under the BBC’s charter on grounds of unbalanced representation. It is, however, obvious that we have to prioritise strategies for breaking out of our present academic enclavement as a central task of ASA for the next few years. One way of doing this might be getting more anthropologists writing to and in newspapers, which is relatively unusual in the UK but more common elsewhere. I will leave this and other strategies for further discussion, but the key point seems to be that we are unlikely to be able to advance our cause as an academic discipline with ESRC and other funding bodies effectively while we are still an “academic treasure” that nobody outside our own circle really understands!

### **Other Chair actions**

Not much else to report here. I have had quite a lot of correspondence with Pnina about details of the conference and its economics, and managed to squeeze space for a nocturnal HODs meeting from the congested schedule and promises of sandwiches for the lunchtime ABM. I have also corresponded with the daughter of a particularly distinguished recently deceased member. There are various people to remember at this conference and the tight schedule makes this difficult, so I innovated by moving remembrance from the ABM to a ‘day of the dead’ style commemoration-reception before the dinner. Whether this will work remains to be seen, but Pnina’s organisation left few options.

Lisette, Simone and I dealt with the latest round of Radcliffe-Brown applications without input from Iris and we have made various rule changes, now posted on the RAI website, to deal with the fact that people routinely ask for more than the official maxima, offer poorly justified budgets, and we need to make it clear that bigger grants will only generally be possible where need combines with academic excellence. We did not have any problems meeting reasonable demands in the last two rounds thanks to the Sutasoma contribution, which means that Firth money is continuing to accumulate for future needs and other purposes.

The most irritating task of the last report period has concerned the situation with the Academy of Learned Societies in the Social Sciences. I did finally manage to communicate with Henrietta, who was eager to be relieved on the Academy Council since she was about to go overseas to do field research, and Lisa Croll happily agreed to take over. Unfortunately, the Academy then announced (in January) that Council positions were individual, so replacement of one anthropologist by

another was not possible. In fact, they even seem to refuse to allow Henrietta to resign! Caroline Bucklow, the Academy secretary, has conceded that the Academy does not work well, especially for members who live outside London, and reforms are promised, but I recently heard from Tim Allen, contemplating whether he should pay his annual subscription of £160, that even academicians in London seldom get informed opportunely, if at all, of events taking place. I am somewhat sceptical about the value to UK social science of a select few having lunch in the House of Lords, and apart from an ESRC-sponsored lecture and debate last week in London (as part of "National Science Week") that was only announced a few weeks before it happened, nothing else seems to be planned for 2006 so far, if the now out-of-date website is to be believed. As things stand, it is difficult to see the Academy as doing anything for anthropology and our lack of voice on the Council must be a serious concern, since Henrietta is not able to represent us in practice. Recruitment of new academicians seems its principal priority, while it is not very clear what is happening to all those hefty subscriptions. I suggest that we give the new leadership the rest of this year to turn the organisation into something worthwhile and devise means by which individual academicians and learned societies could have some effective input into its affairs, and in the absence of progress, seriously review whether we think it worthwhile continuing our membership. I will pursue the issue of our non-representation in policy-making if they continue to block Lisa's participation (one might have thought they would have been pleased to have someone with that level of distinction willing to do so) and consult other academicians from anthropology.

Finally, I am circulating details of the British Academy Learned Societies scheme. A letter of intent is required on this by 31<sup>st</sup> March, so this cannot wait until the committee meeting.

## **Administrator's report**

### **Annals and directory**

These finally went out over the last month – approximately 10 months late. I would propose that much of the information in both volumes is either available online or should be made available online, and hence we need to review the nature and use of these publications which cost a considerable proportion of a member's subscription. I would like to discuss this at the meeting, but in essence:

- most of the annals info could be placed online, allowing a reduction in size (and hence print cost & postage) and delays in production.
- we would retain an annals that was slimmer, referred to the web, and focussed chiefly around ASA and dept'l reports.
- Are dept'd staff lists necessary in the annals/print? Are they not held on each dept's own website?
- If we move to an online searchable directory of members, what would members want to see in print – would a list of names and affiliations be enough?

### **Membership**

We have had plenty of applications in this last year, and these are listed in the Appendix 4. I am still chasing some of the references. There are a couple of odd applications which are also mentioned in the appendix.

I am still in the processing of receipting this year's standing orders and invoicing for those who have not paid their subs this way. Getting people to pay the right amount, if at all remains problematic. However I propose to increase the time spent on this in the summer (see below).

### **Website**

The site remains on our previous host on a more stable machine. However the host is unresponsive and once the conference is over I intend to move the site to a new host. The lack of response from the host is what has prevented the AM database from being reinstated. I have run the ASA06 site for Pnina, hence saving the ASA's online brand integrity.

### **Conferences**

I have worked as a messenger for Pnina to contact the membership and I have emailed panel convenors for their abstracts, but otherwise been uninvolved in ASA06.

I have had a brief email exchange with the ASA07 convenors and plan to meet them later this year.

### **Future work**

NomadIT has not changed its admin charge to the ASA for 2.5 years, averaging approx 185 hours a year at 20 pounds/hr. I would like to increase the rate to be in line with all other 06 contracts NomadIT is taking - £25/hr (clearly above inflation but reflecting NomadIT's growing costs). I would also like to increase the hours spent on ASA admin to 230/yr in an attempt to get all members up-to-date with their subscriptions. This would allow me to increase the number of NomadIT staff working on subs. While clearly this means increased admin costs (from 3.7k to 5.7k), it also will mean increased subs income (2-4k potential gain) and a more efficiently run ASA.

By way of comparison I currently struggle to run EASA admin on 4hrs/wk, and am seeking an increase there to 5.5hrs/wk. ASA is smaller but its subs situation is far messier, so 4.5hrs/wk is not unreasonable.

This extra work is also necessary if we are to get the membership data in a fit state to upload into an online searchable system.



## Treasurer's report

I am repeating some of the points from my last report, as they were not discussed or decided upon at our last meeting (partly because my written report was very late).

1. The draft Accounts for 2005 are tabled for the Committee's consideration. (see appdx 5)
2. Royalties. We received £4,050 in royalties from Taylor & Francis and £357 from Berg, under the new agreement. The income from Berg does not represent a profit, as we made an initial downpayment of £2,290 in January, which must be recouped. Though all income from royalties goes to the Radcliffe-Brown Fund, our outlay will be deducted before royalties paid by Berg. A small income from copyright (£181) has been added to the RB donation.
3. Firth Fund. As donations are rare - none have been received this year - the principal is bound to dwindle if our members' giving spirit is not reignited. Just to remind those of you who have not read the Chair's Report for 2003: the various Firth Funds are held by the ASA, LSE and RAI. No contributions to the Firth Awards are made by RAI and LSE. At the ASA committee meeting in May 2005 it was suggested that the ASA approach the RAI to discuss the possibility of consolidating the different holdings in one Fund. Before approaching Hilary at RAI, it would be useful to have more information about the RAI holding, what use it is being put to and some ideas about the benefits of a consolidated holding - how would we like it to work for us? Richard Fardon has already indicated to us that the fund has no stipulated terms, beyond that it should be used for the benefit of the Association and students.
4. ASA conferences. In the past, conferences made a surplus, which was transferred to ASA. The 2005 conference made a surplus of £1,500 (to which should be added £500 seed money not taken from ASA and the covering of ASA committee member attendance - an additional £1,000 at least). However, £1,000 is likely to be used towards the reproduction of photographs for the volume to come out of the conference. The best way to handle this is to have all surpluses transferred to the main ASA account, as conference income, then forward the sum to Berg as an ASA subvention when requested (this was probably already handled differently). The committee might be concerned that no income for ASA is projected in the budget submitted for the 2006 conference.

The Committee must also decide whether to send an invoice to Pnina for the registration expenses (or full attendance expenses, excluding fares) of its three office holders.

5. Our finances are looking healthier this year, despite the downpayment made to Berg.

## Ethics officer's report

Ian Harper, 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Not much activity since the last meeting, except for setting up the ethics discussion for the Keele conference. As John stated, we've had a few comments about the ESRC prescription for ethical committees, and some institutions having difficulties negotiating local / national regulatory procedures. These will be discussed at the meeting, in an open forum for discussion on ethics; we have phrased it as follows:

*An open discussion on ethics in anthropology*

*Chairs: Ian Harper and Alberto Corsin-Jiminez. Keele Hall Old Library, 9.30-10.30pm, Monday 10 April*

*Have you had problems in getting approval for your research projects from your university's ethical committees?*

*Are local and national regulations making the practice of ethnography all but impossible?*

*Have you concerns with the ESRC's recent prescription of ethical guidelines and their suggested constitution of ethical review committees?*

*What can anthropology do to prove to the sciences the ethical robustness of ethnography?*

*How should the ASA respond to these varied concerns?*

*If you have been affected by any of the above, or have something to say please come and join us.*

If the committee have any comments on this please do let me know?

The Ethics Blog has not taken off at all. I think that is because Blogs – and there are a number of anthropological Blogs that are quite good and active – need to be led much more from the front, rather than expecting people to participate. Maybe I or a group of us should be more proactive in both getting new stuff up there, and also in advertising this when new material is provided. More actively tapping into the postgraduate networks is one further possibility. Perhaps this is also another way of encouraging / working with the projection of anthropology's image that John talked about? I'd appreciate any thoughts and ideas on this.

Finally, after discussion with Trevor, I sent the proposal for the "Anthropology, Interdisciplinarity and Ethics" book outline to Pluto after rejection by Berg. David Mosse had suggested that Pluto had expressed an interest in this, after he mentioned it in the wake of his own publishing history with them; we await to hear the outcome of the proposal. If they do show an interest, then this may be an avenue for the remainder of the proposed series.

My apologies for not being able to make it to the meeting.

## Media Officer's report

Alberto Corsín Jiménez, March 2005

### Media enquiries

November 2005

- Luana Demattia, from Illuminations in London, was involved in producing a 'documentary series about Global Erotica for Channel 5 - the three documentaries would look at the revolution, profligacy and distribution of Erotica on a planetary scale over the last 100 years.' They wanted to get in touch with an expert on anthropology and sexuality who could talk to them about the sexual traits of different cultures. I suggested Sarah Green (Manchester).

December

- Helen Seaman was producing a series on the history of anthropology for BBC4. She wanted to get in touch with someone who could provide information on: (i) the history of the discipline; (ii) indigenous Mexican cultures; (iii) and the use of hallucinogenic drugs in social research. (She brought these three rather different areas together through the figure of Carlos Castaneda.) I suggested the following people: (i) Peter Riviere (Oxford), Adam Kuper (Brunel) and/or David Mills (C-SAP, Birmingham); (ii) John Gledhill (Manchester), and; (iii) Roland Littlewood (UCL).

January 2006

- Laura Tennant, a journalist with Red Magazine, was writing a piece on 'different cultural approaches to mothering' and wanted to get in touch with an anthropologist with an interest in the field. I suggested Helen Ball (Durham).
- Rebecca Woodhead, from Channel 4, was working on a series about indigenous nomadic people and wanted to consult an expert. I suggested Dawn Chatty (Oxford).
- Jon Ronson, a journalist with The Guardian, was writing a piece on the relationships between anthropologists and the corporate world. I quote from his blurb: 'Does it ever happen that - say - a credit card company might commission an anthropologist to travel somewhere with a specific brief to ascertain a certain knowledge about the human condition that would subsequently be utilized by the company for marketing purposes, etc? To be a little more specific, might a credit card company or similar business commission an anthropologist to travel to a Third World country to observe people there in the hope that it might give them some greater understanding of how to market their products in the West? Or would a company only ask an anthropologist to study a population that the company intended to specifically market to? I suggested contacting Simon Roberts (Intel).
- Laura Santana, from Indus Films, was working on a programme for BBC4 on the history of first contact in West Papua, and wanted an anthropologist who could help them think through the 'ethics' of first contact. I suggested getting in touch with Eric Hirsch (Brunel), Karen Sykes (Manchester) or Marilyn Strathern (Cambridge).

February

- Eileen Inkson, a research with the BBC History department, was working in a documentary about Bronislaw Malinowski for BBC Television. In particular, they were interested at the historical context of Malinowski's work in terms of the discipline of anthropology, the legacy he had left, and the impact of the publication of his diaries in the 60s. I suggested getting in touch with Michael Young (ANU), Peter Riviere (Oxford), Adam Kuper (Brunel) and/or David Mills (C-SAP, Birmingham).
- Lina Prestwood, a development producer for Mentorn Television, was researching into 'female-led societies and communities around the globe' and wanted to get in touch with an anthropologist specialist in the field. I wrote to Lina saying that the topic was probably too narrow for any one person being a specialist in it, but that I could suggest anthropologists with a larger interest in gender. I gave Lina contact details for Sarah Green (Manchester).
- Catherine Carr-Radio, a producer for BBC Radio 4, was 'desperately looking for someone to talk about role models: where the idea came from?, who our first role models were, and

who they were through history, i.e. Roman and Greek role models, who they are now?, what function they perform for us?' I found myself at a loss here. I wrote back to Catherine saying that I did not think 'role models' was something anthropologists studied, at least not since the 1960s (when 'role theory' was at its peak), and that the remit of her question was huge, encompassing areas of expertise such as history, social theory and psychology.

- James Leach, Editor of The Guardian University Guide, invited us to look at and revise the entry for 'Anthropology' for this year's publication of the guide. He made available a copy of last year's entry, which had apparently been written by Lionel Sims (University of East London), and which I circulated to the Committee. Simone and John got back with suggestions for changing some passages of the text. I amended the text in light of their suggestions and sent it back to Leach. I asked Leach to keep in mind that we had only made minor changes to Sims' text, who should still be recognized as the author and be told about the amendments.

#### March

- Katherine Hoare, of the BBC, was working on a joint BBC/Discovery documentary series 'about indigenous, traditional sports. The idea is to delve deep into the world of indigenous sports which are still being practised, and through that, explore the anthropology of competition.' She wanted to contact experts on the topic in the following regions: China, Australia, Oceania and South East Asia. I suggested she contacted Rebecca Cassidy (Goldsmiths) and Noel Dyck (Simon Fraser).
- Amina Cheal, a development researcher at Granada TV, was working on a programme themed 'Body Impossible'. The idea of the programme is to 'document people with amazing and unusual body traits. For example we would feature the tallest man in the world, the shortest, the fastest, possibly the hairiest etc ... The more unusual and visual the better. We have had a bit of a discussion about 'Body Impossible' and have decided that we would like to have a specialist that we can interview that would be able to give a scientific explanation as to why some people are born different and possibly is their genetic differences could be linked to who we may have lived in the past. We are also desperately looking for case studies. You may have seen in the news recently the Quadruped family in Turkey that walk on all fours any cases similar to this would be fantastic so if you can think of any existing today it would be most helpful if you could pass on the details. It may be that the person can hold their breath underwater for an unusually long amount of time, or have survived situations against all odds. E.g. the mining disaster recently in the US where out of 13 miners one survived why was this? Is there anything about his body that enabled him to survive? Can we trace back to survival modes that are ancestors may have had before we mutated. Again these are just examples.' I replied to Amina saying that I was at a loss with her enquiry because I could not see what an anthropologist could contribute to the programme – let alone whether they would want to contribute in the first place.

## **PG liaison officer's report**

Andrew Garner, 28<sup>th</sup> March 2006 (see appendices 1 and 2)

### **1. ASA Postgraduate 'Welcome Pack'**

Following support from the Committee at the last meeting, the 'Welcome Pack' proposal was discussed with the Anthropology Matters Steering Group. They welcomed the initiative and have provided an outline of what it might contain (see 'Welcome Pack' document). Working from this I have drawn up a contract for the work to be undertaken by Patrick Hazard and Beckie Marsland, with a completion date set for end of May. The work will cost £600, with photocopying and postage an estimated additional £300. David Mills at C-SAP has offered a further amount for publishing and developing the pack as an online resource (in the region of £500).

To recap, the idea is that since the ASA, RAI and Anthropology Matters are all equally concerned with recruiting postgraduate membership each year all new research students should receive a 'Welcome Pack'. This would include reduced rate membership of relevant professional organisations, information about internet resources, postgraduate activities (such as the ASA professional development workshops) – in short, every thing you need to know at the beginning of your postgraduate degree.

What does need to be decided is whether any information is 'for members only'. This is another way of asking what are the benefits of membership – an issue that I believe is fundamental to increasing membership generally. If I can access all the same information and benefits without becoming a member – why should I join? Looking at other membership organisations most try to demonstrate how joining is both sensible (look at the service/prestige/security gained) and saves money (the savings of a member attending one conference, a training course and a seminar will more than cover the initial outlay).

### **2. Anthropology Matters**

The Anthropology Matters Steering Group met in August, October and December, 2005. This has been a period of some change in the group as some of the original members move on. As a consequence there has been an ongoing discussion of how to ensure new members are recruited and that AM builds on its successes to date. Proposals have included recruiting an AM steering Group member from each anthropology department, advertising at conferences and seminars, and by AM sponsored debates. So far most new members for the steering group have been recruited through personal contacts.

*New Members to the Steering Group:* Nadine Beckman (Oxford); Cecile and Heike (Manchester); Anna Portisch (SOAS); Amy Pollard (Cambridge); Tom Wormald

*Members going:* Celayne Heaton and Mette Berg have taken less active roles, Tom Rice and Sharika have stood down, and James has left for fieldwork in India. Many thanks for all their hard work.

Mario Guimares who was the AM webmaster died in a road accident about a year ago. An event to celebrate the life and art of Mario was held on Thursday 17th November at Brunel University. His PhD on Avatars, or representations of virtual bodies, in cyberspace was awarded posthumously.

### **3. Anthropology Matters Journal**

Ingie Hovland has taken over from Beckie Marsland as general editor. Many thanks are due to Beckie for her successful tour of duty. The journal continues to attract submissions from both new and established anthropologists. The volumes recently published and planned are as follows:

- 2005, Vol 7(1): New Methods in the Anthropology of Science and Technology (ASA postgraduate panel 2003)

- 2005, Vol 7(2): The Politics of Publishing in Anthropology 2006,
- Vol 8(1): Doing Fieldwork in Eastern Europe [will go online in May] 2006, Vol 8(2): From Play to Knowledge [will go online around September]
- 2007, Vol 9(1): Fielding Emotions

Another idea (Tom Rice) was to ask 'eminent anthropologists' to write papers about their experience working towards their PhDs. This was warmly welcomed by the Steering group as a positive suggestion. Inquiries are also being made about obtaining an ISSN number for the journal.

#### **4. AM Jiscmail**

Beckie Marsland has taken over the manager's role from Christine Barry, a role which involves adding new members, posting relevant announcements (jobs, conferences, seminars) and, with the help of other members of the steering group, department seminar outlines. Beckie has ensured the list is very active. As a result the subscriptions have increased by 60 to a total of 544. This represents 32 countries although roughly half the membership is UK based and half from the Americas. Further recruits are expected from the 'welcome pack' (see below). The postings are mainly UK focused, with the odd exception for jobs and interesting international anthropology events. Linking to the RAI events list is being investigated.

There has been a recent debate on the list about usage raised by a request for what seemed to be essentially an essay reading list. Several opinions were aired online. The general feeling was not to favour the kinds of enquiries that could be easily answered using on-line bibliographies/library research etc, and that they should only be tolerated if the project is stated, and a summary of findings is returned to the list. Some people favoured reviving the discussion board - although judging by the small number of people who replied, it's not clear that the discussion board would be much used.

Also in the pipeline is establishing online book reviews. New reviews could be posted on jisc-mail as they come in, and then archived on the website. Two book reviews are in process. It is hoped that with a membership of over 500, publishers could be tempted to send review copies and reviewers could be found relatively easily.

#### **5. Contact database and website**

Patrick Hazard has taken over the administration of the contacts database while Tom Wormald continued to manage the website. Both suffered when the host site (the same as the ASA's) went down. The website was back up soon after the host was restored, but the contacts list is yet to appear. Most of the data is backed up and in the interim any requests are fielded by Tom.

#### **6. AM finances**

March 2006 balance is 1567.46. Money has recently been spent on refunding travel expenses to meetings and paying for technical work putting the journal online. They spent about £530 over the last year.

#### **7. AM debate at ASA Keele**

An AM debate 'World Weary or World Cinema: Cosmopolitanism, Film and Anthropological Research' is scheduled for a 'breakfast session' 8-9am on Thursday morning.

#### **8. Other contacts**

The University of Vienna has invited Beckie to visit and talk about Anthropology Matters in June. At the invitation of David Mills Andrew has become (translated perhaps) the ASA's representative on the CSAP reference group. The next meeting will be 9<sup>th</sup> June.

#### **9. General enquiries**

I received two emails through the pgliaisons@ email address. One, asked for general information about postgraduate courses in the UK. I pointed him to University and Departmental websites. The

second was a membership enquiry from Australia. As he did not meet any of the requirements for membership I suggested he try the RAI. Email was copied to the Chair.

## Publication officer's report

Trevor HJ Marchand, March 17<sup>th</sup> 2006

1. *Update: 2003 Decennial Conference, Manchester Anthropology & Science (Editors Edwards, Harvey, & Wade)*  
Publication originally scheduled for November 2006. The submission date for the manuscript, however, has been re-scheduled for April 2006, and publication is now set for January 2007. Cover design has been approved and confirmed.

### *Note on Cover Design*

All forthcoming ASA conference volumes will conform to the template established for the *Qualities of Time* cover design. According to Berg, "the positioning, image size and font of the text as well as blue background will remain standard as far as possible. The yellow main title will be used where possible but be subject to change if it clashes horrendously with the image."

2. *Update: 2004 'Locating the Field' Conference, Durham, (Editors Cole & Collins)*  
*Locating the Field*  
Publication date remains set for June 2006.
3. *Update: 2005 'Creativity & Cultural Improvisation' Conference, Aberdeen (Editors Hallam & Ingold)*  
Proposal received and submitted to ASA Committee's November meeting for approval. Agreed submission for the manuscript has been revised from April to May 2006, and publication is now likely to be in January 2007, and not December of this year as originally proposed. Cover illustration has been approved and confirmed.

### *Note: Inclusion of Illustrations in Forthcoming Volumes*

'Locating the Field': According to the series editor at Berg, they will print the book without illustrations on a 'digi' press, which has the advantage of making the process of reprinting simple, and print runs can be tightly controlled. The litho press used for books with illustrations, on the other hand, involves greater expense and print runs cannot be tightly controlled. The digi press will better ensure effective sales and dissemination of the book. Photo plates do not reproduce well under this printing method.

'Creativity & Improvisation': Berg sought a £1000 subsidy to include the proposed 50 black-&-white plates for this volume. This was queried by me and the volume editors. The issue was quickly resolved by the ASA Committee who agreed that the full amount could be paid from the surplus proceeds generated from that conference. This is a one-off solution, and was agreed on the basis that the publisher notified the ASA and the volume editors at a late date, compromising the efforts already undertaken by Hallam and Ingold.

Reasons for excluding or limiting illustrations in future volumes are outlined by Berg's series editor below:

"Since 2004, production costs have increased for publishers generally and the exchange rate with the US \$ is worse. Because *The Qualities of Time* was the first volume in the series, we actually took it on making a 25% less profit than we require. We made an exception for the book as it was the first in the series, but we cannot feasibly keep doing this.

I understand that the need for illustrations is something we do need to think about further for the series in general so we do not restrict the types of anthropology we can publish ... Currently our contract with the ASA states that the Publications Officer shall 'Ensure that the decision to allow the inclusion of art work for any book in the series shall be made only with the approval of the Publisher.' Currently we have been negotiating this on a book-by-book basis.

Thus the reason we could allow for the illustrations without subvention in *The Qualities of Time* was that the market and economy was much more stable for academic publishing at that time.



Every year we print about 5%-10% fewer books in both hardback and paperback form in general due to the decline in the market.

Despite this decline we will aim to print roughly the same number of books for the new ASA volume as we did for James and Mills--we are optimistic about the sales of the book and we do wish to allow for as much flexibility as possible for illustrations. With our one-off books by individual authors, we often ask editors or authors if they will take a cut in royalties in order to compensate for the extra cost involved in producing illustrations. This however is an option I would be reluctant to take in this case, as our contract with the ASA stipulates a fixed royalty, and it would then be extremely difficult from an administrative point of view to carry this out; contracts with Associations / Foundations are slightly different to individual book contracts and royalty rates are general regarded as fixed. Regarding the price of the volumes, they are unfortunately already forecast at the maximum price we can allow for a competitive market for non-members: £55 and \$99.95 in hardback and £19.99 and \$34.95 in paperback. These are the prices that the latest volume for publication, 'Locating the Field' will bear. If we raise the prices further we can only see a corresponding drop in sales, so we work to find the best balance we can."

In order to better clarify matters, 'Guidelines for ASA monograph Editors' were drawn up and issued by Berg in January 2006. In summary, the publisher will allow for approximately 15 black-&-white illustrations per volume. This number is open for negotiation with the Publication Officer and Berg, and any increase in numbers will likely depend on subsidies.

#### 4. *Update: ASA Research Methods Series*

Unfortunately, the prospects are not sunny. After some delay, Berg determined that it was not interested. In brief, the publisher is looking for books (mainly readers or textbooks) that can be marketed to larger numbers of (American) undergraduate students. This objective was likewise echoed by both Polity and Sage whom I approached afterwards. Any suggestions concerning the marketing of the original proposal or prospective publishers would be much appreciated. Alternatively, we might want to shelve the idea until publishing markets improve (if indeed they do). Please see Berg's reasons for rejecting the series below. These are indicative of the market and echo the responses received from Polity and Sage.

From Hannah Shakespeare (Berg): "The series undoubtedly has some interesting topics planned, and I would certainly be happy to look at book proposals on an individual basis. As a series, it will not be commercially viable. We have discussed already the fact that we are having problems selling edited collections generally, outside of the ASA Monographs series. The proposal for the Harper and Good volume demonstrates those aspects that make edited collections difficult to sell - it is quite long (100,000 words), the geographical coverage is not very wide, and the contributors are almost entirely UK based.

As I mentioned before, it does seem that the books really are aimed at the postgraduate market. I do not doubt that they have some undergraduate potential, but perhaps not enough considering the competing literature and textbooks available on these subjects in order to be financially viable (works by H. Bernard and R.F. Ellen). It does not seem likely that this series can be re-conceptualised as a research series aimed at lower level undergraduates, which is more the kind of thing we are looking for.

We would expect to sell perhaps 800 copies of a book such as this in paperback. We are selling about 5-10% fewer books each year as the academic publishing market changes and narrows. We now need to sell about 1100 minimum copies of a book in paperback in order to sustain our margins."

I am currently waiting to hear whether Harper & Good's volume is accepted by Pluto Press. If so, and with permission from the two editors, I plan to approach Pluto with the research methods series proposal, and ideally Harper and Good's would be published as the first in that series.

#### 5. *Digitising ASA Monographs:*

Berg plans to digitise the ASA volumes through Google. This was agreed by me and JG. In any case, Berg apparently retains e-rights to the ASA books as per clause 11 of the contract between Berg and the ASA. If there is strong objection to not digitise them, however, then they have agreed not to.

## **Conference 2008**

Veronica Strang wrote:

We are making good progress here in our preparations for hosting the ASA conference in 2008. Here's a draft (compiled by myself and Mark Busse, with input from our colleagues) of our proposed themes. It would be useful, I think, if you could circulate this document to your committee now, so that they have a chance to go through it and formulate their comments before this year's conference in Keele, at which I hope to sit down and work through this and all the practical aspects of the conference with you. We would also like to invite you to nominate someone from your executive (or another ASA member?) to sit on our academic committee for the conference. I have asked the Australians to do likewise.

*Draft – March 2006*

### **OWNERSHIP AND APPROPRIATION ASA Conference December 2008 Auckland, New Zealand**

The goal of this conference is to extend the area of anthropological theorising which has recently been dominated by the term 'property' by shifting the focus from property and property relations to notions and acts of 'owning and appropriating' which precede, underwrite and inform property relations. This emphasis is highly relevant in a globalising world, in which resources are at once being depleted and increasingly privatised or enclosed, and ideas about the very kinds of things that can be property are expanding. Anthropology, with its emphasis on agency and understanding actors' perspectives, is well placed to advance colloquial understandings of such processes.

The past decade has seen renewed anthropological interest in property. Work by Chris Hann (1998) and Marilyn Strathern (1999), among others, has demonstrated the relevance of anthropology to articulating the complex relations between people and things, as well as the negotiations between people with respect to things. Similarly, anthropology has made significant contributions to global debates about intellectual, biological and cultural property (Brown 1998, 2003; Coombe 1998; Hirsch and Strathern 2004; Posey 2004; Ziff and Rao 1997). In this conference, we seek to broaden these discussions by inviting papers that explore the more dynamic and encompassing ideas of ownership and appropriation in both metaphor and substance, in both legal and non-legal contexts, and in relation to both tangibles and intangibles. We note at the outset that appropriation refers to a spectrum of activities, some of which can be framed positively in terms of agency and creativity (Hirsch and Strathern 2004; Leach 2003), some (such as corruption) which are perceived more negatively, and some which are unequivocally nefarious, such as theft, enslavement, and appropriation through violence (Bales 1999; Haller and Shore 2005).

We especially invite papers that examine aspects of ownership and everyday life, which look at the myriad daily acts of production, consumption and social participation through which people construct identity and ownership. This includes the ways in which they express agency and power by making places, products, and practices their own (Daunton and Hilton 2001; Friedman 1994; Jackson and Moore 1995; Miller 1995, 2001), and their efforts to create claims of ownership by participating in social activities, for example by volunteering for conservation groups or church organisations. Here the investment of self into labour can be seen as a form of appropriation.

Ownership and appropriation have a particular political salience in settler societies such as New Zealand and Australia, where processes of appropriation and claims to ownership are intrinsically linked to issues of identity and belonging for the different participants in the nation state. This is

most obviously the case with respect to land and natural resources, where disputes over ownership must confront a history of colonial (and postcolonial) appropriation, as well as contemporary questions about nationhood and how best to achieve the common good. In New Zealand this is evident, for example, in recent debates over the ownership of the foreshore and seabed in which Māori claims to ownership were rejected by Parliament in favour of common ownership by all New Zealanders. While this can be considered as an act of State appropriation, in the sense of 'making something one's own', some Māori saw it as yet another example of appropriation in its other sense, of 'taking something improperly'. The continuing debate over this issue has highlighted culturally different understandings of ownership, especially in relation to parallel ideas of care, stewardship and belonging.

In Australia, ownership and appropriation remain central to political debates. There are direct conflicts over the ownership of land and resources, and also more subtle issues about the rights conferred by different forms of attachment to land, and the investment of labour and history and identity 'in place'. There are challenging questions as to whether the articulation of non-indigenous spiritual and affective relations to land, and visions of a national 'cultural heritage', constitute an appropriation of the representations underpinning Aboriginal land rights. And as Australia faces urgent problems in relation to the health of its land and water resources, the 'ownership' of environmental management is also increasingly contested.

Related issues around ownership feature in other Pacific countries, as well as in metropolises such as the United Kingdom. The current political situation in Fiji, for instance, demonstrates the continuing effects of colonial policies, as well as the connection between ethnic identity and ownership, both of land and of state institutions. Recent events in Tonga, on the other hand, point to processes and consequences of the appropriation of new resources and new forms of power by traditional indigenous elites. In the United Kingdom, debates about the right to roam and the privatisation of resources such as water and marine resources raise issues of ownership and the commons (Blatter and Ingram 2001; Strang 2004). And State ownership (of land and resources, or State-owned enterprises) raises reciprocal questions of who owns the State and – in the case of multicultural or multinational States – whether the nation state can be co-owned. We look forward to discussions which draw on the potentially diverse perspectives that conference participants will bring to these issues, and we especially invite papers from Pacific Island scholars.

Appropriation – both in the sense of making something one's own and in the sense of taking something without permission – is also relevant in discussions of intangibles such as cultural symbols, knowledge and practices. The reification of culturally significant objects and practices (in the case of Māori, for example, as *taonga* and *tikanga*) is often a precursor to ownership and hence to appropriation. A critical issue here is how – and to what extent – anthropologists reify indigenous knowledge and thus contribute to its appropriation and alienation (Posey 2004).

Appropriation, especially the appropriation of differences, has also been a key concept in feminist politics and the anthropology of gender, in thinking, for example, about the appropriation of gendered domains, the shifting appropriation of 'traditional' women's products, and whether gender mainstreaming (e.g., in social development work) constitutes an appropriation of women's interests and concerns. As with land and natural resources, the appropriation of difference is closely associated with systems of equality and inequality, and we hope that conference participants will explore the nexus of owning, appropriating, and difference on the one hand and hierarchy, stratification, and power on the other. Appropriation also appears in other areas of gender interest, such as the body, where eating constitutes the first, and possibly prototypic, act of appropriation. There are strong links here with issues of identity (Caplan 1997), which intersect usefully with a more processual view of ownership and agency.

Metaphorical concepts of ownership are also regularly used to define power and agency in other spheres. Thus one can talk of 'owning a decision', 'owning a process', or 'owning an institution or organisation' to suggest that people have made the decision, process, or organisation their own. In these instances ownership can be contrasted with experiences of alienation resulting from a lack of representation in processes and institutions. It would be interesting to explore these more figurative

extensions of ideas about appropriation and ownership, as well as those found in languages other than English, and the mutual influence between euphemistic and non-euphemistic uses of 'appropriation' in political and daily discourses.

Running through these various dimensions of owning and appropriating are our concerns with process rather than states of being, with dynamism rather than stasis, with agency and creativity rather than with property and objects, and with the materialisation of social relations and social organisation rather than with the objects that are appropriated and owned *per se*. We feel that this approach offers a broad range of potentially fruitful investigations.

### Possible Themes and Questions

1. **Changing concepts.** How are cultural notions of ownership, appropriation and property changing in contemporary contexts? How does a processual view of ownership change anthropological conceptualisations of property?
2. **Transformation.** How are persons and things transformed through processes of owning and appropriation? How is identity shaped by people's daily engagement with, and the production and consumption of, objects?
3. **Privatisation.** What are the resource implications of contemporary practices of enclosure and ownership? Is there a future for the commons? How do people think about, and promulgate, the 'common good' in a world which is increasingly privatised?
4. **Feminist politics and discourses.** How have appropriation and ownership been conceptualised in feminist theory and practice? How might feminist notions of ownership and appropriation expand anthropological understanding of these processes?
5. **Indigenous politics and discourses.** How have indigenous people been affected by changing concepts of intellectual, biological and cultural property rights; and how have they engaged with these debates? How have indigenous elites appropriated aspects of the commons, and what has been the response of other indigenous people to these events?
6. **Appropriation, the body and food.** What are the processes through which the body can be appropriated and owned? How do the relationships between food and identity intersect with concepts of agency?
7. **Anthropology and appropriation.** How has anthropological research contributed to the objectification and subsequent appropriation of aspects of culture? And how have the subjects of anthropological research responded to this?
8. **Ways of appropriating.** What are the relationships between creativity and appropriation?
9. **Nationhood, identity and ownership.** How are citizenship and national identity materialised through objects? Who owns the state? Can the state be co-owned?

### References

- Bales, Kevin, 1999. *Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blatter, J., and H. Ingram, editors, 2001. *Reflections on Water: New Approaches to Transboundary Conflicts and Cooperation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brown, M., 1998. Can culture be copyrighted? *Current Anthropology* 39(2):193-222.
- Brown, M. 2003. *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Caplan, P., editor, 1997. *Food, Health and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Coombe, R., 1998. *The Cultural Life of Intellectual Properties*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Daunton, M., and M. Hilton, editors, 2001. *The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America*. Oxford: Berg.
- Friedman, J., editor, 1994. *Consumption and Identity*. Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Haller, D., and C. Shore, editors, 2005. *Corruption: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.

- Hann, C.M., editor. 1998. *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirsch, E., and M. Strathern, editors, 2004. *Transactions and Creations: Property Debates and the Stimulus of Melanesia*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Jackson, S., and S. Moore, editors, 1995. *The Politics of Domestic Consumption: Critical Readings*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Miller, Daniel, editor, 1995. *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, Daniel, editor, 2001. *Consumption: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*. Volume IV. Objects. London: Routledge.
- Posey, D., 2004. *Indigenous Knowledge and Ethics: A Darrell Posey Reader*. Edited by Kristina Plenderleith. New York: Routledge.
- Strang, V., 2004. *The Meaning of Water*. Oxford: Berg.
- Strathern, M., 1999. *Property, Substance and Effect: Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things*. London: Athlone Press.
- Ziff, B., and P.V. Rao, editors, 1997. *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

## CONTACT DETAILS

### Professor Veronica Strang

Email: [v.strang@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:v.strang@auckland.ac.nz)

Tel: 64 9 373 7599. Ext. 82458

### Dr Mark Busse

Email: [m.busse@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.busse@auckland.ac.nz)

Tel: 64 9 373 7599. Ext. 85162

Postal Address:

Department of Anthropology

University of Auckland

Private Bag 92019

Auckland 1001

New Zealand

Fax: 64 9 373 7441

# Appendices

## 1. PG Welcome pack Contract letter

ASA

Dr Patrick Hazard  
Department of Anthropology  
University College London  
Gower Street  
London WC1E 6BT

29<sup>th</sup> March 2006

Dear Dr Hazard,

### **Contract for Anthropology Matters/ASA postgraduate Welcome Pack**

We confirm the outline proposal for a Welcome Pack prepared by you and Dr Marsland has been accepted by the ASA Committee.

**Procedure:** The work will be carried out in three stages: 1) gathering material and preparing the document; 2) photocopying, collating and posting the packs; and, 3) preparing a CD/DVD and web-based publication including additional material. This contract refers to *stage one*.

**Completion date:** May 31<sup>st</sup> 2006

**Fee:** £600 to be paid on completion of stage one to the satisfaction of Andrew Garner (ASA PG liaison). This fee to be split between yourself and Dr Marsland (£300 each).

**Copyright:** The copyright of the Welcome Pack will be vested in the ASA.

Enclosed is a purchase order as confirmation for the work. Please complete the form and return to....

Dr Lisette Josephides

cc. Dr Andrew Garner

## **2. Outline of Anthropology Matters Graduate Introduction Pack**

Format – Folder with loose-leaf inserts

### **CONTENTS**

Section 1.

#### **BASICS**

List of UK anthropology departments

- Key contacts
- Departmental seminars
- Recent PhDs
- Specialisation/research interests

Calendar of Events

Main professional bodies - info and benefits

- AM
- ASA
- RAI
- EASA
- AAA

Section 2.

#### **REGIONAL SPECIALISATION INFORMATION**

e.g. [http://europa.eu.int/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/index_en.htm)

ENGINE

Section 3.

#### **WHAT STUDENTS CAN DO**

Setting up student led-workshops or conferences  
(contributors with advice)

Funding possibilities

On-line student-led course and departmental reviews

Section 4.

#### **OTHER RESOURCES AND SKILLS**

Library web-sites

Search engines

Other resources – museums, etc.

Language learning

Film courses

Policy workshops (C-SAP contribution)

Section 5.

#### **TEXTS**



Key readings  
Academic press catalogues and discounts

Section 6.

ADVERTISING

### **WEB-BASED PACKAGE**

All the above PLUS

Anything involving discounts, up-dated info, reviews  
Interactive map  
Key contact links  
Student led reviews  
Assessment feed-back/blog

### 3. Discussion with Survival

Dear All

Attached are some documents for your perusal prior to our meeting. If you could have a look, we could come to an agreement about what kind of statement we want to make, hopefully to endorse this campaign.

Simone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** David Hill <dh@survival-international.org>  
**Date:** 24 March 2006 13:44:37 GMT+01:00  
**To:** simone abram <s.abram@sheffield.ac.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: Terms like 'stone age' and 'primitive'

Dear Simone,

That sounds great!

Re leaflets/documentation about the campaign:

Attached is a pdf of the (free) postcard we encourage our supporters and members of the public to send to the editors of publications or broadcasts who use terms like 'stone age' and 'primitive.' This outlines, very briefly, our message.

We don't have a leaflet about the campaign, but we do have a webpage: <http://www.survival-international.org/stampitout.php>

The remaining literature we have on this is really letters we've sent to individual journalists asking them to endorse it or support it, where we go into a little more detail about our concerns and our reasons. If the above isn't sufficient, do you think it would be appropriate for me to work up a letter, or statement, addressing the committee and outlining in some detail the campaign?

Thanks for all your help on this,

Best wishes,

David

Dear David,

You're very welcome. Initial response from the committee has, as I suspected, been very positive. Our meeting is on April 1st, and the annual conference is from April 10th, so we should be able to produce something useful, and hopefully fairly quickly.

If you could send me a leaflet or some documentation about the campaign, I can request a formal endorsement too.

Best wishes  
Simone

On 23 Mar 2006, at 12:25, David Hill wrote:

Dear Dr Abram,

Thank you so much for getting back to me so quickly and agreeing to raise the issue with the committee.

I should have said that, even if it is not possible for the ASA to formulate a statement of some kind, it would be excellent even if it would agree to formally endorse/support the campaign. This would allow us to use the association's name in a press release, for example. However, that said, a statement would obviously be the very best thing as far as Survival and the people we work in support of are concerned!

And thank you for your other recommendations. I shall approach them as soon as possible.

Thank you so much for your support once again and I look forward to hearing from you after the meeting.

With very best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

David Hill

Dear David,

I am responding on behalf of the committee of the ASA, having recently taken over Dr Jean-Klein's position as secretary.

I will be very happy to raise this issue with the committee when we meet (next week), and ask for their cooperation in formulating an appropriate statement.

I should also like to suggest that you write a letter to the editor of Anthropology Today, the RAI's membership magazine, to enlist further support.

I hope you might also get a response from the European Association of Social Anthropologists' Media network, who may well be able to give a more informed response in terms of media contacts or working practices.

I will get back to you as soon as I can after our meeting, and will bring you the responses of my colleagues. I feel sure we will want to support your campaign as fully as we can.

With best wishes,

Simone

Dr S A Abram  
Dept of Town and Regional Planning  
University of Sheffield

On 22 Mar 2006, at 19:11, David Hill wrote:

Dear Dr Jean-Klein,

I am writing on behalf of Survival International to you in your position as Secretary of the ASA.

Survival has launched a campaign called 'Stamp it Out', which aims to discourage the use of terms like 'Stone Age' and 'primitive' to describe tribal peoples in the media today. We think this is a very important campaign. In addition to being used almost always pejoratively, to say nothing of their inaccuracy (no matter what definition we use), these kinds of terms are very harmful to tribal peoples. This is because this idea that they are 'stone age' and 'primitive' is often used by governments, as well as multinational corporations, to justify what amounts to their persecution. Since the implication is that tribal peoples have not 'progressed' like the rest of us have, governments claim that forcibly 'developing' tribal peoples is for their own good. The results of this development, as has been the case in so many different countries, are almost always catastrophic.

We are encouraging as many journalists as possible to endorse this campaign in order to lend it weight, but we also believe it would be a tremendous boon to have a statement from the anthropological community, ie one that says that anthropologists would not use terms like 'stone age' or 'primitive' to describe tribal peoples nowadays because of the associated baggage. Primitive, in particular, has become a euphemism for anything 'not up to scratch', 'below par' etc.

As an example, we wrote to the editor of Now magazine which published a piece about a tribal people in Ecuador that described them as 'Stone Age.' The editor replied, saying they had used the term used by the anthropologist, Jean Leidloff, and that therefore they had acted in good faith. Of course, it would have been tremendous if we had been able to write back and say, 'Ok, we understand that, but anthropologists wouldn't use such terms today. This statement, for example, from the ASA states. . .'

How likely is it, do you think, that the ASA would make some kind of statement along these lines? How would you recommend Survival proceeds next? Are there any particular people you think worth contacting?

I would be tremendously appreciative of any assistance you could give us on this. I would also be very interested, if you could spare the time, to hear your personal thoughts on this issue.

With very best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

David Hill

## **4. Membership applications**

The following have had 1 or 2 referees back (mostly 2):

Rob Aitken  
Arnar Arnason  
Vibha Arora  
Susanne Brandstadter  
Peter Burns  
Neil Carrier  
Wendy Coxshall  
Inge Daniels  
Kasi Eswarappa  
Alex Hall  
Heather Horst  
Kriti Kapila  
Raminder Kaur  
Elisabeth Kirtsoglou  
Kristine Krause  
Lazslo Kurti  
John Linstroth  
Rebecca Marsland  
Sean McLoughlin  
Catherine Palmer  
Ravi Raman  
Adam Reed  
Julie Scott  
Mary Searle-Chatterjee  
Dimitrios Theodossopoulos  
Dorte Thorsen

The following are more recent and I am chasing refs:

Mr Peter Ian Crawford  
Eleni Sidderi  
Patricia Riak