East and West: The scholarly divide in anthropology

László Kürti
University of Miskolc, lkurti@ella.hu

ABSTRACT

Anthropology, especially of the Europeanist variety, has been under tremendous pressure recently to live up to two major challenges: first, to understand and describe world-wide transformations resulting from the movement of capital and peoples together with regime changes and transnational reconfigurations of former identities and, second, to grapple with the way in which scholars must live up to standards set by both the international academic community and its national variants. The bulk of contemporary analysis focuses on the former cloaked under a Western/non-Western divide in what can be termed as identity-studies, while the latter is being relegated largely to marginal national schools of knowledge production. In this paper, however, I argue that we must continue to critique the way anthropological analysis continues to depend on Western cultural categories, and the need to raise questions that may in the end lead to a very different notion of anthropology than that which we have been familiar with over the past two decades.

KEYWORDS: European and Eastern European anthropology, scholarly discourse, knowledge production

Introduction

> 'Come, it's pleased so far,' thought Alice, and she went on. *'Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?'*
> 'That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,' said the Cat.
> 'I don't much care where –' said Alice.
> 'Then it doesn't matter which way you go,' said the Cat.
> ' – so long as I get SOMEWHERE,' Alice added as an explanation.
> 'Oh, you're sure to do that,' said the Cat, *'if you only walk long enough.'*
> (Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll, Chapter IV)

'Current Polish anthropology?' – one illustrious figure of British anthropology asked me at a recent international conference. 'Why not,' answered I, without a blink of an eye. 'You mean the books published by Chris Hann and Frances Pine?' came the next question. 'No,

I mean, Polish anthropology. The anthropology of Poland published by anthropologists in Poland,' I continued with stressing the country's name intentionally. 'Sure,' answered my learned colleague and quickly put an end to our brief exchange by adding, 'There must be some, after all Malinowski came from Poland.' I love to make such quips during coffee breaks at various conferences to make my Western colleagues uneasy. Some get it, while others are rather indifferent about it. Such types of conversations must have a myriad of permutations – and I am sure my colleagues from Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia or Croatia will be able to confirm this by telling similar stories. What this really illustrates is the perplexing vast academic hiatus existing between us – 'Eastern European Anthropologists' – and our foreign colleagues. What we face within anthropology today can be described by two words: indifference and misunderstanding. In order to change this situation, we must question the prevailing assumptions lingering in certain academic discourses about the status of anthropology in and of the former existing state socialist countries and why there seems to be a continuation of a second-class status of schools representing such countries. I believe that this, too, is a part of the 'difference multiculturalism' that both Terence Turner (1993) and Gerd Baumann (1999) discuss as a bad variety of social science of culture.

Europe and European integration

> Alice went timidly up to the door, and knocked.
> *'There's no sort of use in knocking,'* said the Footman, *'and that for two reasons. First, because I'm on the same side of the door as you are; secondly, because they're making such a noise inside, no one could possibly hear you.'*
> (Alice in Wonderland, Chapter IV)

Much discussion about the European integration and the creation of a multicultural Europe of some sort has taken place among anthropologists, politicians and cultural workers as the former Soviet bloc countries joined the EU. Just how much the past years have changed our place in Europe and especially in the European cum global academic and scholarly life is an intriguing question. It is especially important to investigate whether the recent restructuring of higher education – following the 1999 Bologna Directives and the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) – has made any difference at all in the way in which we practice anthropology. It is also essential to see if any kind of European or transnational scholarship is developing and whether this scholarly globalisation has managed to create the common 'European citizenry' so eagerly sought by Brussels. But we can take this even a step further by simply asking that if there is such a creature as a citizen of Europe, should there be such as thing as a 'common European anthropologist' or only a 'EUropean anthropologist'?

The creation of European unity and citizenry has been ongoing for some time now and the results are questionable to say the least. Jan Zielonka in a recent article suggests that: 'Joining the European Union (EU) has changed the nature of democracy in the new member states' (2007: 162). He then asks whether this can 'enhance or pervert democracy in new member states from Central and Eastern Europe? Should new members

embrace or resist the European "democratic" governance?' (2007:163). Zielonka answers rather negatively: 'there will be 'some obvious negative implications for democracy in the new member states' (2007: 173). Why? More and more decisions are being made in the centre of the EU power house that have not been considered to be democratic by some of the new member states. If that is true, we should add that this change is dynamic and multidirectional for it has been increasingly changing the democracy in the old member states as well.

Democracy, equality and multicultural and civic coexistence are politically infused by unequal power relations and socio-cultural contestations. Many economist and political scientists have suggested that European integration has many positive side-effects for the new member states. Transnational bodies, such as the EU, can decide on many things and there are growing possibilities and opportunities to leave the former domestic domains and enter into the more open and larger EU arena. While this has been the case with regard to politics, legislation and economics, the question is how this actually affected the state, the local governments and policies. We can say with certainty – at least this is how I observe it in Hungary – both state and local governments have been enlarged, becoming more and not less bureaucratic in that process. In fact, some political scientists and European studies scholars suggest that a 'democratic deficit' is embedded in this process and this is further exacerbated by what Senghaas calls the 'competence gradient' (2007: 129-130). Briefly put, this concept refers to less productive and more productive economies which are confronting one another in the international market. In this competition, the former, the so-called second and third world economies are easily marginalised.

For this reason – but not for this reason only – we can say with certainty that in Central-Eastern Europe there has been a growing suspicion about the EU membership. Moreover, citizens view the results of the massive economic, judicial and political transformation as a necessary headache causing high rates of unemployment, insecurity, crime, double-digit inflation, and a relatively observable second-class status in Europe. This can also be easily witnessed by the general apathy and disinterest with the low levels of public involvement with Europeanization processes – for example the poor voter turnout at EU accession referendums or at the 2004 European Parliamentary elections. In both cases the turnout of voters in the new member states was much lower than in the old member states (Ekiert 2008: 21).

We could probably agree that this could also be the result of the general disgust with the politics that exists in the former Soviet bloc and was inherited from the former state socialism. Anybody remembering the general euphoria of 1989–1990, and the early 1990s – when citizens in the ex-socialist countries enthusiastically went to the polls in national elections – can also witness a gradual waning of that feeling from year to year. The EU – with the admission of Romania and Bulgaria in January 2008 – now consists of 27 member states, yet this conglomerate of almost half-billion people with a territory about 4.3 million square kilometres is far from united. Since the walls came down and the guns were lowered, there has been increasing talk in Brussels, Berlin, Paris, and London, of a Europe without borders. At the same time, countervailing tendencies ensued, what some home called the creation of 'Fortress Europe' (Pieterse 1991). Rather than overcoming

traditional divisions and hierarchies, the EU seems to create newer ones: the reason why Ekiert (2008: 22–23) and Zielonka (2007: 173) perhaps rightly suggest that some EU policies tend to further marginalize new member states and, with the sole exception of Poland (which is the largest of them all), this may pose serious political, economic and foreign policy conflicts in the future. Not only that, we might also add scholarly and academic ones.

There is also the problem that some governments attempt to utilize the EU to promote their countries' ethno-national unity in order to benefit co-national minorities living outside their state borders. In contrast, others use the EU to counter such tendencies. Hungary is an example of this as it is facing a serious political dilemma with regard to its Europeanizing process and is balancing its foreign policies, especially with its neighbouring countries such as Slovakia, the Ukraine, Romania and Serbia, with whom it had long controversies concerning ethno-national minorities (Butler 2007, Kürti 2001). In this respect, the nation-building processes in Kosovo, Macedonian and Moldova are comparable (Kürti and Langman 1997).

It is not difficult to ascertain then that unity – both socio-economic and political – on the European scale is fraught with contradictions. Moreover, there are linguistic, cultural and historical differences that we must deal with both as scholars and as citizens of our respective countries. For instance, Denmark and Great Britain have not joined the monetary union by accepting the Euro, while there are still many member states – mostly those that carry the stigma of the good old socialist bloc – still struggling as the acceptance of Euro is still nowhere in their near future. Only recently – in 2007 and 2008 did Slovenia, Malta and Cyprus join the Euro zone, a move that may be soon followed by Slovakia.

Aside from this, there is more confusion since the geographical territory of the EU is not equal to that of the continent of Europe. This is the case with Switzerland, Greenland, and Norway although neighbours of the latter (Sweden and Denmark) are EU members. This is the case with European Russia as well. Still there are some regions of member states that are not part of the EU, despite forming part of the European continent (for example, the Channel Islands and the Faroe Islands). Several territories associated with member states that are outside geographic Europe are also not part of the EU (such as Iceland, Greenland, Aruba, the Netherlands Antilles and all the non-European territories associated with the United Kingdom). Guadeloupe, for example, is a Caribbean island but is an 'overseas region' of France with the Euro as its currency and as such is part of the EU, although not part of the Schengen Agreement. The situation of the Azores and Madeira as Portugal, and the Canary Islands as a Spanish region is similar. Countries such as Albania, Macedonia and Turkey, are still designated as 'potential' future EU members similar to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Serbia and Croatia. However, their eventual incorporation into the EU is nowhere in sight.

This confusing geopolitical conglomeration reveals that Europe is not the European Union – its geopolitical entities are still expanding (or contracting?). It then logically follows that EU membership does not and should not define Europeanness and European-identity, no matter how much some states, political organizations and policy-makers wish that it did. Further complicating the picture is yet another political tinkering under the rubric of the 'Bologna Protocol' that has also been signed by some countries

that are not a part of the EU. The Reykjavik Declaration, for example, was signed by Iceland and the protocol accepted by the Swiss. Thus they both joined the EHEA even though they wish to remain outside the EU. Croatia, to give another example, has managed to switch to the entire education based on the 3-2-2 model and the Bologna credit-transfer system even though it is only hoping to be an EU member state. What all this really means is that there is a rather unbalanced, uneven and instable European integration process, both in the political-economic and the cultural-educational fields.

European anthropology?

> *'I didn't know that Cheshire cats always grinned; in fact, I didn't know that cats COULD grin.'*
> *'They all can,'* said the Duchess; *'and most of'em do.'*
> *'I don't know of any that do,'* Alice said very politely, feeling quite pleased to have got into a conversation.
> *'You don't know much,'* said the Duchess, *'and that's a fact.'*
> (Alice in Wonderland, Chapter IV)

Along this line, we may ask whether, with all these countervailing tendencies of European integration, there exists a noticeable deficit in the scholarly world in general and in anthropology in particular. Would a simple application of this political-economic model to the academic sphere (its structure, output and place in the international division of the higher-education labour market) reveal marginalisation or even peripherialisation between social scientists living and working in the developed and less developed countries of Europe? Should we take, for example, the above-mentioned political, economic and social difficulties as a model for the general state of the art for the humanities or the social sciences as well? As Joseph Nye argues (2004), what characterizes the new international politics is the emergence of 'soft' power. In contrast to the old hard power, military might or coercion, this power utilizes the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and even policies for influence (Nye 2004). For Nye, this is a significant factor in affecting societies and communities by simply using the ability to attract them to follow examples set. This concept has often been mentioned as the power of a postmodern kind. So far, I have not found anybody using this model and so I intend to argue here that Eastern European academic life is very much under the influence of this kind of soft power. Arguably, this has been a visible constrains in terms of research orientation and scholarly output for decades. Far from being part of a hard power or a 'war', or even a culture war, as Nye (2004) suggests, Western academic ideologies and theoretical paradigms have been making their soft power intrusion into this region. Made attractive by the Western producers and believed to be useful by some Eastern consumers, Western theories – whether of the structuralist or the postmodern kind – have indeed been the predominant practice in East European social sciences. However, I argue that this seemingly more democratic and humane form of academic soft power is not what academic life really should be. For this leads to what Michal Buchowski terms a 'stigmatized brother' syndrome (2006: 463), and what Ines Prica refers to as the lack of 'complimentary insights' in Eastern and Western academic discourses (Prica 2007: 166).

For some time, there have obviously been many reasons for the maintenance of a second-class status of the East by the Western scholarly community. As some have suggested, Central-Eastern European countries have been fraught with religious and populist fervour since 1990 (Bugarič 2008, Rajcic 2007) The logical reaction in some Western circles has been blunt: if political life is mortgaged to the yoke of populist ideology, academic life has been tied to some outdated traditionalism of some sort. To be sure, the populist version of nationalism is visible throughout our region (Hanley 2007), but an equally forceful argument can be made that these are equally loud and popular in the West as well. Remember France, Belgium, Corsica, or Cyprus?

But I now digress. Western colleagues have been very eager to accuse East EUropean anthropologists – and much more those of ethnographic and folkloristic schools – of such 'un-European' and 'undemocratic' academic traditionalism but are rather parsimonious when it concerns a more balanced understanding of the described phenomena in their own countries.

Nobody can disregard the tremendous changes the anthropology of Europe has experienced since the early 1990s. Despite the noticeable globalisation process of the social sciences, have global flows of anthropological knowledge changed under the pressure of the 'soft power'? I am afraid the news is not what anybody wants like to hear. A stubborn patter of 'difference multiculturalism' homogenizes and marginalizes Eastern European scholarship, as is observable in the works by anthropologists in Western Europe and across the Atlantic. Colleagues flippantly utilize Europe simply to mean Western Europe or the European Union, an essentializing handling that would be unthinkable for Africa, South America or Asia. Edited volumes published in the US seem to find pleasure in their own philosophizing more than listening to the voices of others, which is, after all, what anthropology is all about (see for example, Burawoy and Verdery 1999; Markowitz and Ashkenazi 1999; Berdahl, Bunzl and Lampland 2000). Works that give equal access to native anthropologists living and working in Central-Eastern Europe are few and far between (cf. Kideckel 1995).

Such a glaring Western bias is noticeable in the oft-cited volumes edited by our European colleagues, for example Jeremy Boissevain (1992), Sharon Macdonald (1993), Thomas Wilson and Estellie Smith (1993), and Goddard, Llobera and Shore (1994). These are mostly analyses on the anthropology of the European Community. In these early 1990s books, there are only two chapters on Central-Eastern Europe, and only one of them is written by a local scholar. The only interest in Eastern Europe by anthropologists was a belated cry about the war atrocities between the former Yugoslav regions (Bowman 1994). Even though recent editions reveal vibrant national scholarly traditions in Eastern and Central Europe (Dracklé, Iain, and Schippers 2003, Dracklé and Iain 2004) these are hardly credited in Western academic discourses.

But to really make a convincing argument of how 'bad' social science is practiced currently, I call attention to an edited book by Marion Demossier aptly titled *The European Puzzle*: *The political structuring of cultural identities at the time of transition* (2007). The lack of regional diversity is astonishing as the ten contributors represent only Great Britain and France. This is not only surprising, it is really sad to witness such an overt

homogenisation and regional imbalance existing today. Ten years ago, an American anthropologist recognized that the most important barriers separating scholars in the East and West is economic as well as disciplinary (Lampland 1999). We may rightly question whether this disciplinary boundedness has at its core a conscious (or unconscious?) intellectual marginalization of the other Europe, a phrase coined earlier by the writer Philip Roth.[1] We could argue endlessly why this is so and how it came about but that is not my aim here. However, I would like to illustrate my argument with specific examples.

The publishing and job markets

> *'I never heard of "Uglification,"'* Alice ventured to say. *'What is it?'*
> The Gryphon lifted up both its paws in surprise. *'What! Never heard of uglifying!'* it exclaimed. *'You know what to beautify is, I suppose?'*
> (Alice in Wonderland, Chapter V)

It is not a sacrilege to admit that the anthropological traditions in Europe, other than the Anglo-Franco, have been simply disregarded by the prime movers of Western anthropology. Volumes published on the state of research in Austrian (Khittel, Plankensteiner, Six-Hohenbalken 2004; Seiser, Czarnowski, Pinkl and Ginrich 2003), and German anthropology (Kokot and Dracklé 1996) are unique but hardly make any dent in Anglo-Saxon anthropology. Outside the German-language area, we seem to be engaged in shadow-boxing. Slovenian colleagues single-handedly embarked upon their anthropological Mediterranean Ethnological Summer Schools and have been publishing the results in English since the early 1990s. Peter Skalnik has also initiated his private anthropological battle by publishing and distributing volumes and case-studies in English on his own (Skalník 2002; 2005). These are truly pioneering efforts and I did not even mention others that exist within the confines of museums and institutions that hardly, if ever, will be called upon outside their national realm. Will such volumes see the light in the next decade, works that would be forthcoming from smaller and lesser-known scholarly traditions? Will they be taken seriously and read by our learned colleagues in the West? I may be a dreamer – just like most anthropologists are to a certain extent otherwise they would not embark upon a science that Edmund Leach called a monstrous form of inquiry – but I am not stupid. Such individual projects may be few and far between with their energetic and obsessive leaders eventually burning out in the process of ignorance and futility.

But there is more. In 2001, the European Parliament adopted the 'New European Labour Markets, Open to All, with Access to All' program 'for a more uniform, transparent and flexible regime of recognition of qualifications'. If anybody tested this by applying for

---

[1] It was the American writer Philip Roth who edited a book called *Writers from the other Europe* (1980), a collection that included selections from the works of Milan Kundera, Bruno Schultz, Danilo Kis, and Tadeusz Borowski. Since then a whole series of books in politics, economics, film studies and literature utilize 'other Europe' to refer to the former socialist states. I find it extremely interesting in this context that this notion is even extended to the study of medieval tribes such as the Avars, Cumans, Bulgars and Khazars (Curta and Kovalev 2007).

a teaching job at a British, Dutch, German or French university, he or she may be up for a disappointing treat. My advice to my younger colleagues is: they need not bother. Despite the EU decision for the recognition of diplomas and qualifications, for Central-Eastern European anthropologists to obtain a high-level teaching job in the West is to daydream. Why? Bluntly put: they do not fit most job descriptions advertised. Between 2000 and 2006, I have been the Secretary for the European Association for Social Anthropologists editing the Newsletter, which published about a dozen jobs advertised, roughly two jobs per year. The RAI newsletter, Anthropology Today, have also advertised few vacancies, mostly in Great Britain, but these were limited to specific qualifications outside our reach. We all know that there are decreasing possibilities for anthropologists to find jobs in the European academic setting and this has been the case for some time now. Yet some people do manage to get jobs offered to mostly non-Europeanists and non-Central-Eastern European citizens.

There are many 'practical' reasons for the lack of hiring and mobility between the East and West. The language skill and publications are mentioned overwhelmingly by colleagues as the most important reasons why East European scholars are not a 'sellable commodity' on the Western European job market. Another major issue often raised by Western colleagues concerns Central-Eastern European anthropological (or ethnological) traditions that are branded old-fashioned, often nationalistic. Moreover, criticism is often raised that such outdated orientation is mortgaged to and limited by the study of one's own society. Make no mistake: this is also an outright homogenisation of East European scholarly tradition. Obviously, there were some schools like that, but not all. What is appalling in such discourse is that outmoded theoretical orientations also existed in the West and some schools there also inherited that problem as well. To put it bluntly: wrong-headed scholarly directions or twisted navel-grazing theories have not been the prerogative or East European schools of anthropology per se. Institutions in the West also had a good share of that. What all this boils down to is the problem that there seems to be a general lack of understanding, even sympathy, on the part of some colleagues, department heads, and administrators – those who are in positions of power to evaluate our scholarly backgrounds and qualifications – who not only question our scholarly traditions but simply believe them to be exercises in futility.

To be eligible and competitive on the job market has to do with academic affiliation and obtaining a tenure-track position, which are themselves often based on scholarly work especially publication records (professional journal articles, monographs, etc.). The 'publish or perish' slogan so well-known in the US higher-education has a special, rather distorted, meaning in European academia as well. Scholarly works printed in local languages, say Romanian, Hungarian or Croatian, do not necessarily reach the right academic circles in the West and those published in English (cf. Naumescu 2007, Sántha and Safonova 2007) may take many years before they are recognized if at all. One never really knows if studies appearing in national journals such as the Romanian *Martor*, the Croatian *Narodna Umjetnost*, the Polish *Lud*, the Slovak *Slovenský Národopis*, the *Anthropological Notebooks* published in Slovenia, or the Hungarian *Ethnographia* are ever read by our Western colleagues. It is certain that East European scholars have a myriad of stories

about the time and money spent on mailing articles and books to institutions or individuals abroad, or more embarrassingly carrying them to conferences where they eagerly 'donate' them to colleagues with the hope that they will eventually read them or, God forbid, even cite them in their next essay. To illustrate, I mention a ghastly discovery. A while ago a retired colleague of mine from the US graciously offered some books and journals from his library. To my surprise I received volumes of some of the above-mentioned journals many of which were still unopened. Obviously my colleague never had time to read them, and never had the courage to tell his European contacts not to bother with the (rather expensive) overseas mailing and stop sending these journals to him.

Neglecting to read scholarly work by one individual may be just one indication of how absent-minded professors live and work. However, when it happens repeatedly within community of scholars it just may be a case of organized dismissal. Another example may prove this point. Following in the feverish Andersonian mood about the nation as an invented community, but well-before the publication of Nira Yuval-Davis's celebrated book, Gender and Nation, in 1997, I happened to write one of the earliest analyses on gender, socialism and nationalism, an article published in the American journal, *Anthropological Quarterly* (Kürti 1991); it was republished two years later in an edited volume. Since that time, many similar treatises, chapters, and volumes appeared on the subject some with almost the same title but hardly anyone has referred to my essay. I also wrote an article on the dilemmas of the changing nature of fieldwork practices in socialist and post-socialist communities published in Social Anthropology (Kürti 1999, and a slightly different version appeared as well in Šmitek and Muršič 1999). To my surprise, a colleague published an article on almost the same topic in the same journal, and while much mention is made of (still) fashionable names like Clifford and Marcus, Geertz, Turner, there is no mention of my article (Shokeid 2007).

I do not want to single out my work here, for there are more telling examples revealing that there is no guarantee that those who should read our work will ever do so. A recently edited collection on post socialism has a chapter on Poland written by two Dutch anthropologists (Kalb and Tak 2006). However, none of the anthropologists who live and work in Poland are included in their references. I am thinking, of course, among others names like Michal Buchowski, Marian Kempny, Grazyna Kubica, Zdzislaw Mach, and Janusz Mucha. Is it possible that my Polish colleagues did not write anything of value that Dutch colleagues could utilize? Another monograph describing East German industry and working-class culture (Müller 2007), has a similar glaring gap. In the preface, the author acknowledges the help of many colleagues, including a Hungarian sociologist but not the anthropologist who has also worked and published on a similar topic years before (Kürti 2002). However, the author does not cite the equally important work of polish anthropologist who has published his research with regard to the transformation of Polish society (Buchowski 2001; 1997). Calling attention to such forgetfulness/absentmindedness is not just a personal vendetta against the mistreatment by Western-centric anthropology. Being cited, or having a recognition of one's work by others may have serious repercussions in terms of academic advancement, hiring or scholarliness as defined in various national settings. This is even more serious as the impact factor or citation index are fast becoming

the standard of measurement of scholarly work in most countries by now. Such utter disregard of a certain kind of scholarship attests to the state of anthropology in general and, specifically, the imperfections of Europeanist anthropologists. For what are we to make of such myopia parading as French or Anglo-American 'superior' anthropology? And how are we supposed to understand newly published ethnographic material as genuine when they exhibit such ignorance? These questions may urge us to seek answers that would offer a departure from the existing but biased standards in anthropological practice.

Aside from this, there are more obvious obstructions hindering us from the East which makes it extremely difficult to contribute to both knowledge production as well as consumption. While our learned colleagues from the West are being offered prestigious contracts by publishers, especially university presses, most of us are left wandering from one to the next, often begging for a little recognition. It would be unfair to single out illustrious colleagues by pointing to the many books they have offered to the international community. I take it that most of my colleagues are able to come up with their own examples. It is revealing, however, that many of our publications appear under the aegis of little known presses or institutions; it is very common that we resort to publishing our work on our own, attempting distribution by any means possible.

No doubt publishing in prestigious academic journals has its own internal pitfalls. Hardly a question of linguistic competency, the editorial boards of major anthropological journals – *Annual Review of Anthropology, American Ethnologist, Identities, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, American Anthropologist* and *Anthropological Forum* name only a few – *are* composed mostly of Western colleagues. In this respect, *Critique of Anthropology* – journal published by SAGE – is interesting; it is published in Europe but without a single Central-Eastern European editor on the board. What is more, it has about sixteen anthropologists from the U.S, many of whom are from the City University of New York alone, and several from Goldsmiths College in the UK. By the way, this is the journal that boasts that it 'challenges received wisdoms inside academic anthropology and in society at large, presenting work that is innovative, challenging, sometimes experimental and often uncomfortable.' Surely being told about having such a highly selective, but a kind of inbred Western editorial board should be a rather uncomfortable idea.

To take another example, I looked at briefly EASA's own journal, Social Anthropology, and the book review section (now interestingly managed by one of our colleagues in Ljubljana) to see just who is commissioned to writing book reviews. In the five most recent issues I checked, only 10 out of 105 book reviews were written by scholars from the former socialist bloc. Curiously, this is comparable to the percentage of East European membership of EASA. Is this accidental? I am sure we all have some answers to provide, but what we all have to realize is that visibility brings vision and vice versa and that the production of anthropological knowledge – even if it is only in the form of book reviews – has a lot to do with being allowed access to the channels providing visibility.

Conclusion

> '*Well, perhaps you haven'*t *found it so yet,'* said Alice; '*but when you have to turn into a chrysalis–you will some day, you know–and then after that into a butterfly, I should think you'll feel it a little queer, won't you?'*
>
> '*Not a bit,'* said the Caterpillar.
>
> (Alice in Wonderland, Chapter III)

To close this essay on the divided nature of the anthropological enterprise in Europe on a more positive note, I offer some suggestions that may subvert such a hegemonic practice and Western predominance. For the question ahead of us remains: how can we join Europe like this? How can we manage to be competitive on the European level if the job market, research possibilities and publishing arenas are not open to us? If we are not allowed to participate in an environment that is 'open to all, with access to all'? For there cannot be any doubt that anthropological knowledge circulates globally in a predetermined and unidirectional way. In this milieu, I am quite sure, that our Anglo-American colleagues know more about South American Indians or native Papua New Guinea than they know about the work of their fellow anthropologists living in East and Cental Europe. No accident then that we know less about each other than they know about the aggression of female chimps or Nepali elephant handling – two subjects I just happened to pick out from recent University of Kent lecture series. It would be easy to dismiss all this by telling that maybe they do care but their foci lie elsewhere and that is fine, too. Yet, the marginalization and dismissal of scholarly traditions other than the Western ones cannot be questioned. Today, Anglo-American anthropology is the largest knowledge production economy and its overwhelming presence on the global anthropological market is worrisome to say the least. Its sheer size in both publishing and practicing is immense but so is its classist and Western ethnocentric bias toward European anthropologies. If this situation continues unaltered, then the global triumph of Anglo-American anthropology no doubt will push contested forms of anthropologies out of existence, offering increasingly dissatisfied anthropologists no choices but either joining the ranks or simply withering away. This, to me, is a wholly unacceptable scenario. Generating new anthropological knowledge can only take place by reconnecting mainstream anthropology with the hopes and needs of the more marginalised anthropological traditions of the world.

Translating works from languages other than French or German may be a good start (there are some initial but hardly sufficient attempts both within EASA and the AAA). Sharing research opportunities and grants with the inclusion of more and more colleagues from the East is another must. There are just too many failed projects submitted by Eastern European colleagues to the 6th and 7th Framework Programs of the European Commission, and there are plenty of successful ones in which prestigious Western institutions are the sole beneficiaries. Offering easier access to power centres, whether in book publishing, journal issues, book reviews, and conferences, is also necessary. Similarly, inviting colleagues from elsewhere (and not only from the Third World) to institutions for lectures and meetings, rather than passing invitations among themselves would be a nice

shift from the current dominant practice.

All these are just a drop in the anthropological ocean but in order not to drown in it we need to provide each other with intellectual life jackets to fight stubborn divisiveness built upon mistrust and vicious competition. With all the political, technological and economic transformation around us, it is not naïve to think that academics should start to make a real difference by changing their values and attitudes first before they wish to change the world. A democratic scholarship depends on vibrant forms of academic debates with an understanding of the various cultural meanings employed by all of us rather than unidirectional dissemination of theories. Shared dialogues and a mutual exchange of ideas are not difficult to achieve if there is a will. This said, then, it is more paramount now than ever that we engage in substantial, candid and open discussions as equals where we can share both thoughts and emotions, read our books and create positive images of each other. Like Alice said: '*what is the use of a book without pictures or conversation*?'

References

Berdahl, Daphne, Matti Bunzl and Martha Lampland (eds.). 2000. *Altering States. Ethnographies of Transition in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Boissevain, Jeremy (ed.). 1992. *Revitalizing European Rituals*. London: Routledge.

Baumann, Gerd. 1999. *The Multicultural Riddle. Rethinking Nation, Ethnic and Religious Identities*. London: Routledge.

Bowman, G. 1994. Xenophobia, fantasy and the nation: Ethnic violence in the former Yugoslavia. In: Victoria Goddard, Josep Llobera and Chris Shore (eds.), *The Anthropology of Europe. Identities and Boundaries in Conflict*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 143–171.

Buchowski, Michal. 2006. The spectre of Orientalism in Europe: From exotic other to stigmatized brother. *Anthropological Quarterly* 79(3): 463–482.

Buchowski, Michal. 2001. *Rethinking transformation. An Anthropological Perspective on Postsocialism*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Humaniora.

Buchowski, Michal. 1997. *Reluctant Capitalists. Class and Culture in a Local Community in Western Poland*. Berlin: Centre Marc Bloch.

Bugarič, Bojan. 2008. Populism, liberal democracy, and the rule of law in Central and Eastern Europe. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 41(2): 191–203

Burawoy, Michael and Katherine Verdery (eds.). 1999. *Uncertain Transition. Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Butler, Eamonn. 2007. Hungary and the European Union: The political implications of societal security promotion. *Europe-Asia Studies* 59(7): 1115–1144.

Curta, Florin and Roman Kovalev (eds.). 2007. *The other Europe in the Middle Ages. Avars, Bulgars, Cumans and Khazars*. Leiden: Brill.

Demossier, Marion (ed.) 2007. *The European Puzzle. The Political Structuring of Cultural Identities at a Time of Transition*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn.

Dracklé, Dorle, Iain Edgar and Thomas Schippers (eds.). 2003. *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology. Learning Fields Vol. 1*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Dracklé, Dorle and Iain Edgar (eds.). 2004. *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education. Learning Fields Vol. 2*. Oxford: Berghahn

Ekiert, Grzegorz. 2008. Dilemmas Europeanization: Eastern and Central Europe after the Enlargement. *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 25: 1–28.

Goddard, Victoria, Josep Llobera and Chris Shore (eds.). 1994. *The Anthropology of Europe. Identities and Boundaries in Conflict.* Oxford: Berg.

Hanley, Seá. 2007. *The New Right in the New Europe. Czech Transformation and Right-wing Politics 1989-2006.* London: Routledge.

Kalb, Don and Herman Tak. 2006. The dynamics of trust and mistrust in Poland: Floods, emotions, citizenship and the state. In: Maruska Svasek (ed.), *Postsocialism. Politics and Emotions in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 196–213.

Khittel, Stefan, Barbara Plankensteiner and Maria Six-Hohenbalken (eds.). 2004. *Contemporary Issues in Socio-cultural Anthropology*. Wien: Löcker.

Kideckel, David A. (ed.). 1995. *East European communities. The Struggle for Balance in Turbulent Times*. Boulder: Westview.

Kokot, Waltraud and Dorle Dracklé (eds.). 1996. *Ethnologie Europas. Grenzen. Konflikte. Identitäten* [*European Ethnology. Borders, Conflicts, Identities*]. Berlin: Reimar.

Kürti, László. 1991. The Wingless Eros of Socialism: Nationalism and Sexuality in Hungary. *Anthropological Quarterly* 64(2): 55–67.

Kürti, László. 1997. Globalisation and the Discourse of Otherness in the 'New' Eastern and Central Europe. In: Prina Jane Webner and Tariq Modood (eds.), *ThePolitics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community.*London: Zed Books, pp. 29–53.

Kürti, László. 1999. Cameras and other gadgets: Reflections on fieldworks in socialist and postsocialist Hungarian communities. *Social Anthropology* 7(2): 169–187.

Kürti, László. 2001. *The Remote Borderland: Transylvania in the Hungarian Imagination*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Kürti, László. 2002. *Youth and the State in Hungary: Capitalism, Communism and Class*. London: Pluto Press.

Kürti, László and Juliet Langman (eds.). 1997. *Beyond borders. Remaking cultural identities in the new East and Central Europe*. Boulder: Westview.

Lampland, Martha. 2000. Afterword. In: Daphne Berdahl, Matti Bunzl and Martha Lampland (eds.), *Altering states. Ethnographies of transition in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.* Ann Arbor, pp. 209–218.

Macdonald, Sharon (ed.). 1993. *Inside European Identities*. Oxford: Berg.

Markowitz, Fran and Michael Ashkenazi (eds.). 1999. *Sex, Sexuality, and the Anthropologist*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Müller, Birgit. 2007. *Disenchantment with Market Economics. East Germans and Western Capitalism.* New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Naumescu, Vlad. 2007. *Modes of Religiosity in Eastern Christianity: Religious Processes and Social Change in Western Ukraine, Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia Bd. 15*. Berlin: Lit Verlag

Nye, Joseph S. 2004. *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1991. Fictions of Europe. *Race and Class* 32(3): 3–10.

Prica, Ines. 2007. In search of post-socialist subject. *Narodna Umjetnost* 44(1): 163–186.

Rajcic, Agnes. 2007. Populist construction of the past and future: emotional campaigning in Hungary between 2002 and 2006. *East European Politics and Societies* 21(4): 639–660.

Sántha, István and Tatiana Safonova. 2007. *Companionship among Evenki of Eastern Buryatia: a Study of Flexible and Stable Elements of Culture. Working Papers of Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology No 99.* Halle/Salle: Max Planck Institute.

Seiser, Gertrud, Julia Czarnowksi, Petra Pinkl and Andre Gingrich (eds.). 2003. *Explorationen ethnologischer berufsfelder. Chancen und Risiken für Universitätsabsolventinnen* [*Explorations of ethnological career fields. Opportunities and Risks for University Graduates*]. Wien: WUV.

Senghaas, Dieter. 2007. *On Perpetual Peace. A Timely Assessment*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn.

Shokeid, Moshe. 2007. From the Tikopia to polymorphous engagements: Ethnographic writing under changing fieldwork circumstances. *Social Anthropology* 15(3): 305–319.

Skalník, Peter (ed.). 2003. *The struggles for sociocultural anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe.* Prague: Set Out.

Skalník, Peter. 2005. *Anthropology of Europe. Teaching and research. Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology 3*. Prague: Set-out.

Šmitek, Zmago and Rajko Muršič (eds.). 1999. *MESS Mediterranean Ethnological Summer School Vol. 3*. Ljubljana: Unversity of Ljubljana.

Turner, Terence. 1993. Anthropology and multiculturalism. *Cultural Anthropology* 8(4): 411–429.

Wilson, Thomas. M. and M. Estelle Smith (eds.). 1993. *Cultural Change and the New Europe. Perspectives on the European community*. Boulder: Westview.

Zielonka, Jan. 2007. The quality of democracy after joining the European Union. *East European Politics and Societies* 21(1): 162–180.

POVZETEK

Antropologija, še posebej pa njena evropska različica, je bila v zadnjem obdobju pod velikim pritiskom, da bi se lahko soočila z dvema glavnima izzivoma. Prvi izziv je bil razumevanje in opisovanje svetovnih sprememb, ki nastajajo zaradi toka kapitala in ljudi ter zaradi sprememb režimov in transnacionalnih rekonfiguracij bivših identitet, drugi izziv pa je bil spopad z načini, na katere se morajo znanstveniki podrejati normam mednarodne akademske skupnosti in njenih nacionalnih variant. Pričujoča analiza se osredotoča na problematiko, ki jo zaznamuje ločevanje med zahodnim in nezahodnim v okviru študije identitet, s katerimi se največ ukvarjajo obrobne nacionalne šole produkcije vednosti. V prispevku se zavzemam za nadaljevanje kritike tiste antropološke analize, ki še vedno temelji na zahodnih kulturnih kategorijah, izpostavljam pa tudi potrebo po postavljanju vprašanj, ki lahko na koncu pripeljejo k zelo drugačnemu razumevanju antropologije kot je bila tista, s katero smo se srečevali v zadnjih dvajsetih letih.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: evropska in vzhodnoevropska antropologija, znanstveni diskurz, produkcija vednosti

CORRESPONDENCE: LÁSZLÓ KÜRTI, Department of Political Science, University of Miskolc, 3515 Miskolc, Hungary. E-mail: lkurti@ella.hu.