



Universität
Zürich^{UZH}

Institut für Sozialanthropologie und Empirische Kulturwissenschaft

Knowledge (Trans)Formations in Anthropology 22. – 23.11.2018

Swiss Anthropological Association (SAA) Annual Meeting

Jahrestagung der Schweizerischen Ethnologischen Gesellschaft (SEG)

Colloque annuel de la Société Suisse d'Ethnologie (SSE)

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:

Gloria Wekker (Utrecht University)

Matei Candea (Cambridge University)

www.sagw.ch/seg/colloques.html

www.isek.uzh.ch/en/anthropology/events/seg-conference.html



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

Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
Académie suisse des sciences humaines et sociales
Accademia Svizzera di scienze umane e sociali
Accademia Svizzera da ciencias humanas e sociais
Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences



SAA / SEG / SSE Annual Meeting: Knowledge (Trans)Formations in Anthropology

The notion of knowledge has a long and contested history in anthropology: starting from early debates on «primitive knowledge» and studies of magic, science and religion, to diverse cognitivist approaches, analyses of the relation between power and knowledge, and ethnographies of science and expertise in the making. As such, one may argue with Boyer that «the problem of 'knowledge' has always been at the center of anthropological attention» (2005: 142).

Indeed, the study of knowledge is not merely a subfield of the discipline and therefore only of interest to anthropologists reflecting on its history and practices. Rather, it constitutes a field of inquiry that anthropology as a «Wissen-schaft» is or should be centrally concerned with. This year's annual meeting of the SSE-SEG-SAA seeks to initiate conversations on knowledge as an object of inquiry as well as knowledge as a product of anthropological work. This involves questions relating to the anthropology of knowledge on the one hand and the political, philosophical, ethical, and methodological implications of the ways in which anthropological knowledge is produced, attained, transmitted, and transformed on the other. More specifically, we seek panels that critically engage with either (or both) of the following two sets of questions:

Firstly, we invite contributions that address knowledge as an object of inquiry of anthropological research: What kinds of knowledge (cognitive, embodied, tacit, distributed, etc.) and epistemic cultures do anthropologists study in different settings? How is knowledge produced or acquired within these settings? How do(es) particular knowledge(s) influence the way people interpret and act upon the world? Who are the experts we encounter in the field? How is knowledge tied up with relations of exploitation and inequality? When and how is previous knowledge questioned, unsettled, contested or established differently? What roles do marvel, surprise, doubt, ignorance, and non-knowledge play in our fields? Secondly, we welcome discussions about knowledge within anthropology itself: Is there such a thing as anthropological knowledge? If yes, what are the conditions of possibility for such knowledge? How do we gain knowledge within and through encounters in the field, with colleagues, or while teaching? What are its strengths and shortcomings? How is anthropological knowledge production related to issues of inequality as well as political and structural precarity? Why is anthropological knowledge important at all? How is anthropological knowledge transmitted within and beyond the discipline? And how do we contribute to public debates and make the discipline heard?

Boyer, Dominic. 2005. Visiting Knowledge in Anthropology: An Introduction. *Ethnos* 70(2): 141-148.

PROGRAM

Thursday, 22.11.2018

08:00 – 09:00	KO2-F-157	Registration
09:00 – 11:00		Session 1
09:00 – 11:00	KO2-F-152	General Assembly of the Swiss Anthropological Association
09:30 – 11:30	KOL-G-212	PhD Meet Up <i>organized by the Swiss Graduate Program in Anthropology</i>
11:00 – 11:30	KO2-F-157	Coffee Break
11:30 – 13:00		Session 2
Panel 2	KO2-F-152	Patient's Digital Lives: Exploring Reconfigurations of Knowledge in Healthcare and Biomedical Research
Panel 9	KO2-F-156	Ways of Knowing in the Anthropology of Human-Animal Relations
Panel 5	KOL-N-1	Beyond Engineering – Anthropological Knowledge on Infrastructure
Panel 3	KO2-F-151	The Making of Anthropological Knowledge of/in Education
13:00 – 14:00	KO2-F-157	Lunch Break
14:00 – 16:00		Session 3
Panel 2	KO2-F-152	Patient's Digital Lives: Exploring Reconfigurations of Knowledge in Healthcare and Biomedical Research
Panel 9	KO2-F-156	Ways of Knowing in the Anthropology of Human-Animal Relations
Panel 5	KOL-N-1	Beyond Engineering – Anthropological Knowledge on Infrastructure
Panel 3	KO2-F-151	The Making of Anthropological Knowledge of/in Education
16:00 – 16:30	KO2-F-152	Coffee Break
16:30 – 17:45		Session 4
	RAI-H-041	Welcome Note <i>Klaus Jonas (University of Zurich, Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences)</i>
	RAI-H-041	Keynote I: Censorship and Method: Anthropology and the Ambivalence of Epistemic Limitation <i>Matei Candea (Cambridge University)</i>
18:00 – 19:30		Session 5
	RAI-H-041	Roundtable: What Knowledge? Whose Knowledge? Current Anthropological Knowledge Production in Switzerland <i>Organized by AnthroCollective</i>
From 20:00		Conference Dinner

Friday, 23.11.2018

09:00 – 10:30

Session 6

Panel 2	Lecture Hall	Patient's Digital Lives: Exploring Reconfigurations of Knowledge in Healthcare and Biomedical Research
Panel 8	Seminar Room	The Curatorial Challenge – Ethnographic Museum Curators' Knowledge Production Between Museum and Collections, Academia and the Public
Panel 4a	Library	Unpacking the Black Box: 'Research Assistants' and Knowledge Production in Social Anthropology

10:30 – 11:00

Foyer

Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30

Session 7

Panel 2	Lecture Hall	Patient's Digital Lives: Exploring Reconfigurations of Knowledge in Healthcare and Biomedical Research
Panel 8	Seminar Room	The Curatorial Challenge – Ethnographic Museum Curators' Knowledge Production Between Museum and Collections, Academia and the Public
Panel 4b	Library	Un-learning Anthropology through the Co-Creation of Transformative Knowledge

12:30 – 13:30

Foyer

Lunch Break

13:30 – 15:00

Session 8

Panel 1	Lecture Hall	Evocations of Evidence-Based Expertise: Anthropological Knowledge Beyond Alternative Facts and Nostalgic Positivism
Panel 7	Seminar Room	Knowledge of and in Elder Care: Anthropological Encounters with Care and Knowledge
Panel 6	Library	Making Urban Knowledge – Ethnography, Intersubjectivity and Engagement

15:00 – 15:30

Foyer

Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00

Session 9

Panel 1	Lecture Hall	Evocations of Evidence-Based Expertise: Anthropological Knowledge Beyond Alternative Facts and Nostalgic Positivism
Panel 7	Seminar Room	Knowledge of and in Elder Care: Anthropological Encounters with Care and Knowledge
Panel 6	Library	Making Urban Knowledge – Ethnography, Intersubjectivity and Engagement

17:15 – 18:15

Lecture Hall

Session 10

Keynote II: Beyond White Innocence
Gloria Wekker (University of Utrecht)

From 18:15

Apéro

19:00 – 19:30

Three Parallel Tours Through the Exhibitions

ABSTRACTS

Keynote I

Censorship and Method: Anthropology and the Ambivalence of Epistemic Limitation

Matei Candea (Cambridge University)

Thursday, 16:30 – 17:45 / RAI-H-041, Rämistrasse 74

The notion of censorship has expanded and blurred in recent decades, to denote phenomena well beyond the canonical image of state-imposed silencing. In social scientific analyses as well as in popular debates, censorship is increasingly being extended to encompass a range of subtle, infinitesimal pressures and limitations entailed in institutional arrangements or discursive micro-interactions. For some, this is a long-overdue critical realisation of the pervasiveness of silencing devices. For others it represents a dissolution of the very notion of censorship into a meaningless fudge. Drawing on ethnographic research into the regulation of public expression in France, and on reflections about anthropology's own knowledge practices, this lecture argues that we can sharpen the analysis of censorship by considering it in relation to another form of epistemic limitation - method. Appeals to method often act to limit what can legitimately be said or known - the very essence of method is to cut, to curtail and to shape epistemic practices in some ways, in order to productively extend them in other directions. The uncomfortable blurring between method and censorship is perhaps most evident when method is linked to a disciplinary episteme, marking the limits of what can legitimately count for instance as 'proper' anthropological knowledge - on reading lists, in peer-reviewed journals, in the assessment procedures of phd evaluations or appointment committees. In a critical view, much of what we comfortably think of in anthropology as method might be recast as a form of censorship. Conversely, an ethnographic view of censorship might recast it as in essence little more than method: a set of ways of curtailing epistemic practices in some dimensions which extend them in other dimensions. Both ways of unmaking the contrast miss something however: the ambivalence of epistemic limitation lies in the tense relationship between the mechanisms and the teleologies of knowledge.

Keynote II

Beyond White Innocence

Gloria Wekker (University of Utrecht)

Friday, 17:15 – 18:15 / Lecture Hall, Museum

In my lecture, I am extending an invitation to embark on a post- or decolonial, intersectional reading of Dutch history and culture, but by extension, also of other European nations that had empires during centuries. But even if a few European nations actually did not have empires, they still formed part of an ethos that put a lot of emphasis and importance on the duty «to expand beyond one's own domain». I will first zoom in on «White Innocence», the dominant Dutch self-representation, which combines a rosy, self-flattering view of the Dutch self with an erasure of the fundamental grammar of race in Dutch society. How does White Innocence manifest and by which strong paradoxes is it held up? Subsequently, I want to explore how this dominant habitus of «White Innocence» works in the Dutch academy. Here, I will investigate how «race» is a silent, but powerful organizing principle in the way that we have organized knowledge production. Finally, I will say something about how we can move in the direction of a decolonial university.

Roundtable

What Knowledge? Whose Knowledge? Current Anthropological Knowledge Production in Switzerland

Organized by *AnthroCollective*

Thursday, 18:00 – 19:30 / RAI-H-041, Rämistrasse 74

What are the conditions of possibility under which anthropological knowledge is produced, used, and circulated in Switzerland? How are these conditions changing in the context of current reforms carried out by the main funding institution of academic research, the SNSF? In this roundtable, we address the following questions:

- What are the current conditions of knowledge production in Swiss anthropology? Who carries out research, and under what conditions? How are current reforms of funding instruments like the SNSF affecting the production of anthropological knowledge in Switzerland, particularly in relation to the precarization of researchers? To what extent is it useful to consider these issues in relation to broader developments in academia in Europe and beyond?
- Who owns the knowledge that anthropologists produce and use? To what extent do the structures of Swiss universities and funding institutions reinforce global asymmetries in the circulation, use and preservation of anthropological knowledge? How are Swiss institutions of knowledge production (incl. ethnographic museums) dealing with calls for the decolonization of knowledge? And how is the production, preservation and circulation of knowledge affected by the recent implementation of «data management plans»?
- How should anthropologists respond to these different challenges? What possibilities for collaboration, action and solidarity have emerged in our discipline, in Switzerland and beyond?

With Carole Ammann (University of Bern), Rosa Cordillera Castillo (Humboldt University Berlin), Fiona Siegenthaler (University of Basel) and Sabine Strasser (University of Bern). Moderated and organized by K. Zeynep Sariaslan (University of Zurich) and Olivia Killias (University of Zurich) in the name of *AnthroCollective*, a solidarity and action network of social anthropologists based in Swiss universities. *AnthroCollective* was founded at the EASA annual general meeting 'On Politics and Precarities in Academia: An Anthropological Perspective', held in Bern in November 2017.

Panel 1

Evocations of Evidence-Based Expertise: Anthropological Knowledge Beyond Alternative Facts and Nostalgic Positivism

Convenors: *Olaf Zenker (University of Fribourg) and Julie Perrin (University of Neuchâtel)*

A spectre is currently haunting modernity at large – the spectre of «post-truth» and «alternative facts». Knowledge formations have always, of course, been challenged and enriched by dissenting voices pointing towards unfitting facts and divergent interpretations, occasionally leading to paradigmatic revolutions. In recent decades, modern science as the sole provider of certain knowledge has also been profoundly offended in its pride by «post-positivist», «post-foundational» and «post-modern» provocations, assembling projects within philosophy, cultural studies, feminism, science and technology studies (STS) and also anthropology. What makes our contemporary moment different is, arguably, that such forms of profound scepticisms have entered the political mainstream of many societies, epitomized most aptly, perhaps, by the election of a climate change denialist to the White House

in 2016. Since then, formerly mainstream matters of fact, and news thereof, have repeatedly been denounced as «fake» and been replaced by «alternative facts», to use Trump adviser Kellyanne Conway's instantly eternal phrase. As many observers have noted, this is not «business as usual» (although literally, in fact, it might be); indeed, the material and infrastructural standards of evidence-making and expertise-building seem to have profoundly changed within those sectors of reality nowadays described as «post-truth». Yet while the existence, or lack thereof, of any evidentiary basis might promise an easy formalistic way out, matters seem not as simple: it is not that the misleadingly named «post-truth» era is not evidence-based at all; instead, it seems to rather evoke a different truth of infrastructures, efforts, ingenuity and validation structures – of evidence renewed – unleashed from many of the hitherto publicly accepted sources and constraints. And after decades of post-positivist deconstruction, an easy return to nostalgic positivism seems equally out of reach.

This forcefully brings to the fore a key concern that has been central to anthropology since its very inception, yet gives it renewed epistemological, political and moral urgency: what can justifiably count as good (enough) knowledge? What kinds of evidence, in their various qualities and quantities, have to be mobilised in order to let enunciations pass as legitimate expressions of expertise? What can be the grounds, in their various materialities and meanings, on which to plausibly base political decisions with often far-reaching consequences? How do power asymmetries play into the making of such founding knowledge and how should they be organised in order to yield sufficiently acceptable results? Anthropologists have, of course, been at the forefront of describing in great detail the processes of such knowledge-making by others in diverse fields ranging from witchcraft to molecular biology. Such investigations of knowledge as an object of enquiry have produced invaluable insights into the great variety of ways, in which people validate their respective wisdoms across space and time. Ironically, however, studies in this vein have often kept some distance from its topical twin, namely the reflection of anthropological knowledge production itself. Yet, studying how other people produce acceptable forms of evidence, knowledge and expertise simultaneously requires the anthropologist, while observing, to do precisely the same. In other words, anthropological knowledge has to face questions of its own recursivity – that is, the extent to which its central tenets about knowledge production within social reality are also applicable to its own acts of anthropological knowledge production as part of that same reality.

Against this backdrop this panel invites speakers to present empirical case studies of evidence-based expertise from diverse fields while at the same time reflecting on their own thereby instantiated production of evidence-based anthropological expertise. For this purpose, two questions may guide the analysis:

1. What is the relationship between the conditions of possibility for the observed knowledge production by others and for one's own thereby realized production of anthropological knowledge?
2. Why should this particular instantiation of the relationship between observing and observed evidence-based expertise be given priority vis-à-vis alternative renderings?

In simultaneously addressing both first order constructions of the observed actors and second order constructions of the observing anthropologist and interrogating their recursive relationship, this panel thus invites presenters to bring descriptive and normative reflections on knowledge (trans)formations together in the attempt to carve out a space for anthropological knowledge that is neither completely arbitrary nor falling back on a nostalgic positivism, but is justifiable epistemologically, politically and morally at a time when some fear that now indeed just any «alternative fact» might do.

Part I – *Theoretical Reflections*

Keynote: Scientific expertise in the age of alternative facts

Harry Collins and Robert Evans (Cardiff University)

Like anthropology, the sociology of science treats knowledge as an object of sociology inquiry. In this paper, we reflect on this knowledge about knowledge and its relationship to the social context in which it is produced. We argue that the contemporary social milieu bears an unwelcome resemblance to that which gave rise to the sociology of science's first incarnation: Merton's norms of science. Merton's work was a response to the fascism of the 1930s and aimed to show that democratic values were the key to an efficacious science. In the post-war period, liberal democracy emerged as the normative political system and, in Western societies, this relatively benign period was the setting for a flowering of social constructivism that challenged the independence of science and revealed the manifest flaws of these democracies.

Now, however, democratic societies are under threat from within and the challenge for the sociology of science is to ask how, in a world of 'alternative facts', our work can provide a defence against such malign political regimes. We believe it can. To do so, we contrast democracy and populism, arguing that the key to the former is the commitment to pluralism and moderation upheld by checks and balances such as bi- or multi-cameral systems, a free press and an independent judiciary; populist leaderships attack these institutions claiming that any opposition subverts 'the will of the people'. We argue that scientific expertise – both social and natural – should also be seen as one of the checks and balances; our novel claim is that this is not because science is 'more true' but because the values that drive it are good in themselves and overlap with the values of democracy. Our conclusion is that, in order to defend democracy, the public understanding of science should emphasise not the content of science but its values as it is these that legitimate its institutional role alongside an independent judiciary and free press.

Speaking power to truth: epistemic authority between legitimacy and evidence-use

Diana Elena Popescu (London School of Economics)

This paper proposes analysing post-truth's attack on knowledge and expertise as an attack on (epistemic) authority and (epistemic) legitimacy. Politicians asking the population to distrust 'experts from acronym institutions' challenge the long-established nexus between scientific expertise and epistemic legitimacy. Explanations offered by theorists of the post-truth phenomenon remain unconvincing, as many accounts identify scientists' failed predictions about e.g. the economic crisis as a cause for breaking this nexus. Against this view, this paper argues for a reverse understanding of this relationship: it runs not from truth to (epistemic) authority, but from (epistemic) authority to truth. It is not the case that the population's standards for recognising epistemic legitimacy track expertise which simply has trouble making itself known in our post-truth age - a problem amendable by e.g. bringing in more evidence. Instead, what is identified as expertise and acceptable evidence are themselves a function of what the population regards as an (epistemically) legitimate authority. The argument proceeds in 3 stages: first, making use of insights from authors such as William James and Willard v.o. Quine, the paper makes the argument that trust in epistemic authorities has always played a role in determining truth. Secondly, the paper compares this issue of recognising a common legitimate epistemic authority to the issue of recognising a common authority as discussed in political theory in general, and contemporary takes

on the social contract tradition as applied to value pluralism in particular (Moehler 2018). Building on this analysis, the paper argues, finally, that the mechanisms discovered point to an intimate connection between power and truth, inviting the audience to consider epistemic authority not (just) as a function of evidence and verification but (also) as a function of power and the struggle for it in democratic societies.

The entitlement to incompleteness: anthropology between mathematical crises and epistemic self-concept

Gabriel Zimmerer (Hochschule für Philosophie München)

Recently asked about the political climate in the USA, Barack Obama quoted Senator Moynihan: «You are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts.» This seems convincing, but hence the question is: what are facts?

As anthropologists we believe that we can respond to questions of our own social contexts best by posing them in another one. My paper would like to shed light on the crisis of anthropology and its relation to knowledge by looking at two different disciplines: philosophical logic and mathematics.

My PhD research is concerned with the concept of thinking, reviewing the logicist program of Frege/Russell/Whitehead. I could not talk about their objectives in regards to thinking, knowledge and facts without talking about truth. This field can be combined with the epistemic self-concept of anthropology:

(I) Russell's attempt to reduce all mathematics to a few basic logical operations. This elegant approach collapsed with the discovery of R.'s Paradox, leading to a more complex theory in Principia Mathematica.

(II) Gödel's critique of the PM and his reformulation of its mathematical problems into a pure mathematical language. This led to the Incompleteness Theorem and an utter reconfiguration of mathematics as a whole.

(I) shows the consequence of deducing one discipline to another – similar to STS's relation towards the natural sciences: the expansion of such translation systems leads to problems of self-reference. (II) shows the consequence of examining a discipline from within – similar to the writing culture movement: in rendering such examinations coherent there inevitably appear gaps in our analysis.

Nonetheless, facts can be distinguished from non-facts by rigorously making thinking steps visible and by actively pointing to gaps. Scientific rigor does not lead to naïve positivism, but to elaborate theory. In anthropologically oscillating between other disciplines and ours we might regain some belief in truth. I dare to write truth in the singular.

Followed by a general discussion.

Friday, 15:30 – 17:00 / Lecture Hall, Museum

Part II – Empirical Instantiations

Evidence of identity – practices of 'measuring culture' in corporate organizations

Martina Eberle (University of Bern)

In contemporary corporate discourse and managerial practice the term 'culture' – a concept originating in anthropology – is used as an instrument of governance to construct a fixed identity and a normative community to define the modus operandi with which a company

operates. It is not only used to describe the ways in which a company acts and interacts, but also how an individual employee as a member of the workforce is expected to behave and perform. 'Culture' acts as an instrument of governance enforcing a desired behavior upon employees. Historic accounts supposedly documenting company-specific manifestations of identity, behavior and practice of individual employees are used to construct collective social norms around notions of a shared identity. Previous members of the workforce supposedly demonstrate it and present and future members of the workforce are expected to incorporate it. 'Culture' acts as a normative social framework informed by historic accounts of individual sentiment and practice. Specific forms of gathering, processing, analyzing and representing data are put to use to construct a collective identity based on evidence. This paper will examine the apparatus of evidence put to work to legitimize the construction, introduction, implementation and enforcement of social norms in the contemporary workplace arguing that evidence functions as an agent to install hegemonial power and control: One single, static, undisputable reality is established through discourse and practices generating and representing evidence. Strategies and measures deployed by European powers to assess and control populations in the colonies they governed – based on accounts describing populations and their culture anthropology produced – are perpetuated in contemporary management practice (Duress, Imperial Durabilities in Our Times, Ann Laura Stoler, 2016).

Anthropologizing the boundaries of expertise: heritage designation and global normativity

Peter Larsen (University of Geneva)

Whereas the role of expertise and voice has a long-standing history and role in global heritage deliberations under the auspices of UNESCO, its boundaries, significance and authority are also subject to criticism, politics and change. This paper reflects on the author's engagement in reviewing and reforming international evaluation processes of World Heritage proposals. It particularly reflects on the changing nature and boundaries of knowledge production and normativity in the international sphere. The suggests that anthropology brings a particular gaze and conceptual apparatus to the knowledge encounter allowing for a distinct engagement with international processes of expertise.

The figure of the gatekeeper in the production of anthropological expertise

Anna-Lena Wolf (University of Bern)

The present paper interrogates how gatekeepers influence the production of evidence-based anthropological expertise. Anthropological expertise mainly relies on evidence which is deduced from experiences made in fieldwork. However, the experiences that anthropologists are able to make during their fieldwork are determined by the way in which they access their field. Therefore, I argue that the conditions of possibility for knowledge production in fieldwork are shaped by gatekeepers, whom anthropologists depend on for gaining access to their field, as well as the presuppositions that gatekeepers rely on. To illustrate my argument, I take the fieldwork trajectory of my research on tea plantations in Assam as an example. Activists constituted the gatekeepers to the tea plantations in my case. In the paper, I show how the initial framing of my research questions and the phrasing of my initial findings closely resembled the interests and objectives of the activists who helped me to gain access to the tea plantations. Furthermore, I reflect on how constructions of tea plantation labourers by the gatekeeping activists influenced my anthropological observation of tea plantation labourers. Proceeding from the concrete example of my own fieldwork, I consider the relationship between presuppositions of gatekeepers' evidence-making and the conditions of the production of anthropological evidence-based expertise.

Having, losing: distress and divination

Bettina Beer (University of Luzern)

In my paper I will analyse knowledge claims, and the nature of evidence and its use, in the context of large-scale capitalist projects and social transformations in the Markham Valley in Papua New Guinea. Increasing immigration, the growing circulation of cash, and the social and epistemic dislocations associated with large scale mining, oil palm and biomass energy projects have produced strong desires and growing anxieties among Wampar and immigrants living in the Markham Valley. The desire to have and the experience of loss have become firmly established experiences of everyday life. Experts—often non-Wampar migrants—offer divinatory powers to find what has been lost or stolen: mobile phones, cars and other material possessions, as well as spouses, lovers or relatives. I will closely describe an example of the connection between local claims to knowledge, evidence and anthropological defaults, in the context of the ambivalences that often develop during fieldwork.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 2

Patient's Digital Lives: Exploring Reconfigurations of Knowledge in Healthcare and Biomedical Research

Convenors: Nolwenn Bühler (University of Neuchâtel and of Lausanne) and Giada Danesi (University of Lausanne)

This panel seeks to explore the ways in which digital technologies, from web-based social network to self-tracking devices, transform the production and circulation of health knowledge among/on patients. Due to their widespread accessibility, digital technologies have turned out to be powerful tools in the empowerment of patients and the democratization of health knowledge reconfiguring the relationship between lay and medical expertise (Callon and Rabeharisoa 2003; Pols 2014). For example, these technologies have contributed to the development of citizen science initiatives (Ajana 2017), the creation of new kinds of biosociality (Akrich 2010; Callon and Rabeharisoa 2004), the transformation of the clinical encounter and of boundaries between clinic and research (Hogle 2016). The delegation of responsibility to citizens/patients for their own health also opens up a space for increased medical surveillance and generates normative injunctions to stay healthy and comply to treatment (Dow Schüll 2016; Lupton 2014; Schermer 2009). However, the idea of a «universal responsible, informed, and connected citizen/patient» promoted in health policy discourses about patients' empowerment invisibilises the ways in which access to these technologies and participation to the production and circulation of health knowledge are stratified according to social class, ethnicity, gender, age etc. (Baum et al. 2014; Brodie et al. 2000; Cotton and Gupta 2004).

This panel aims at questioning the impact of digitalization on the production and circulation of health knowledge by focusing on the multiplicity of assemblages connecting actors, tools, expertise, and practices in different healthcare contexts. It will especially address the entanglement between lay and medical expertise and the transformation of care practices and biomedical research, considering the diversity of social and material conditions, and cognitive and symbolic resources of users engaging with digital health. We welcome critical and empirical papers going beyond the figure of the «universal empowered and connected citizen/patient» and accounting for the complexity of these assemblages. What are the conditions of possibility for citizens/patients to engage with health digital technologies and biomedical knowledge? In which ways do they use them to access, produce, and share health knowledge? How do digital lives invisibilise other forms of knowledge, practices, and biosociality?

To what extent digital tools reinforce or transform preexisting health inequalities? How are the spheres of daily life, clinical encounters, and biomedical research reconfigured through health digitalization? Areas where these questions are especially salient are non-communicable diseases, personalized health, reproductive medicine, epidemiology, genomics and oncology.

Thursday, 11:30 – 13:00 / KO2-F-152, Main Building

Keynote: Who cares? How telecare technologies reconfigure the daily life of patients

Nelly Oudshoorn (University of Twente)

In the past 15 years, the healthcare sector has witnessed the introduction of an increasing number of telecare applications: technologies that enable care at a distance. In this paper I will argue that a focus on spaces is important to understand how telecare technologies change the daily life of patients. The introduction of these new technologies implies a shift in healthcare from the hospital to the home. To capture, and further explore, this changing spatial configuration of healthcare, I introduce the notion of techno-geography of care. This concept provides a useful heuristic to study how spaces matter in healthcare. Based on interviews with users of several cardiac telecare applications in Germany and The Netherlands, I will show how the use of these technologies transforms patients' homes. Telecare technologies not only affect the home but also transform the role of patients in healthcare. These technologies imply that patients perform tasks previously delegated to healthcare professionals. However, this work is largely invisible in dominant discourses on telecare. Based on an analysis of this invisible work the paper concludes with a reflection on the implications of ignoring patients' work.

Ambivalence in digital health: Analysing patients' approaches through co-design of an mHealth platform for HIV care

Benjamin Marent, Flis Henwood and Mary Darking (University of Brighton)

In reaction to polarised views on the benefits or drawbacks of digital health, the notion of 'ambivalence' has recently been proposed as a means to grasp the nuances and complexities at play when digital technologies are embedded within practices of care. This paper responds to this proposal by demonstrating how ambivalence can work as a reflexive approach to evaluate the potential implications of digital health. We first outline current theoretical advances in sociology and organisation science and define ambivalence as a relational and multidimensional concept that can increase reflexivity within innovation processes. We then introduce our empirical case and highlight how we engaged with the HIV community to facilitate a co-design space where 97 patients (across five European clinical sites: Antwerp, Barcelona, Brighton, Lisbon, Zagreb) were encouraged to lay out their approaches, imaginations and anticipations towards a prospective mHealth platform for HIV care. Our analysis shows how patients navigated ambivalence within three dimensions of digital health: quantification, connectivity and instantaneity. We provide examples of how potential tensions arising through remote access to quantified data, new connections with care providers or instant health alerts were distinctly approached alongside embodied conditions (e.g. undetectable viral load) and embedded socio-material environments (such as stigma or unemployment). We conclude that ambivalence can counterbalance fatalistic and optimistic accounts of technology and can support social scientists in taking-up their critical role within the configuration of digital health interventions.

The Design of self-tracking technologies and configured use(r)s: An explorative journey through standardised diversities

Laetitia Della Bianca (University of Lausanne)

This paper focusses on the social shaping of self-tracking technologies; from a case study on menstrual cycle-tracking practices, it explores how apps designers shape their technologies as well as their expected users and associated uses.

The investigated technologies –mobile apps and related biosensors – aim at determining a woman's ovulation from biosocial parameters. Their 'technosexual scripts' (Waidzunus & Epstein, 2015) envision three majors 'goals': knowing when to have sex in order to get pregnant, in order to avoid pregnancy and/or learning to know one's (hormonal) body.

These technologies are at the core of growing controversies: in biomedical literature, the discussions revolve around the accuracy – as fertility proxy – of the parameters they track. In sociological literature, scholars have shown how they convey tacit assumptions about their users' duty and needs, potentially strengthening dominant neoliberal discourses charged with gendered stereotypes (Lupton, 2015; Wilkinson, Roberts, & Mort, 2015).

I argue that despite the ever-growing number of publications in self-tracking studies, a blind spot remains: the designers' work. What kinds of knowledge underly their work? How do they use established or disputed facts about the female body? How do they configure the interpretative work inherent to self-tracking practices?

Investigating various designers' practices, I show how multiple configurations of users are enacted in practice (Mol, 2002). The empirical material is constituted of ethnographic field-notes; interviews with apps designers; and medical and grey literature.

The main objective is to contribute to the debate around biodigital technologies by further developing our understanding of the ways designers configure their users (as people, women, consumers, patients, citizen...) and of the various elements that shape this configurational work (e.g. users, technology, organisational elements, scientific, financial and material resources and others...).

Followed by a discussion.

Thursday, 14:00 – 16:00 / KO2-F-152, Main Building

Thinking critically on digital health literacy

Athanasios Priftis (Haute Ecole Spécialisée de Suisse Occidentale)

Once more, social web technologies seem to provide us with all the rights tricks, or clicks, for our individual emancipation. This time the promised land is digital health. In this article, we will demonstrate how our current definition and understanding of digital health literacy is short circuiting a different discussion, one on individuals and communities becoming digital health literate vs having the right tool, application or skill. Digital Health Literacy (DHL) has been defined as a set of skills and knowledge that are essential for productive interactions with technology-based health tools (Norman and Skinner 2006, Sørensen K et al, 2012). The term productive interaction situates DHL in a wider literacy environment including basic information literacy (enter, capture and read information), health literacy (being able to locate, understand, contextualize and interpret health information) and digital literacy (using computers and mobile devices in an effective way). In this context, DHL involves

making use of multiple competences simultaneously, including cognitive and behavioral skills which can only be developed through regular practice.

Our goal is to revisit this DHL framework that seeks to instrumentalise, individualise and normalise a space of expression, experimentation and community interaction. Through our analysis of existing digital health applications, with their mechanisms and practices, we will argue that DHL needs to be analysed under the prism of a networked citizenship. We will revisit our understanding of digital literacy and skills (Priftis A. et al, 2016) and connect them to practices that a) counter specific mechanisms of stratification in the production and circulation of health knowledge and b) provide the theoretical basis of a digital health literacy continuum: being a patient in the healthcare setting, a person at risk of disease in the disease prevention system, a citizen in relation to the health promotion efforts in life.

How Information and Communication Technology may transform the patient-healthcare professional relationship

Maria Del Río Carral (University of Lausanne) and Claudia Véron (University of Lausanne)

How Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) impact healthcare generates either great enthusiasm or strong resistances. Indeed, a recent literature review (del Río Carral, Roux, Bruchez, & Santiago-Delefosse, 2017) has revealed two main trends among current research on digital health: the first carries a «technophile» perspective where ICTs are seen as a way to develop a patient-centered approach, enhance self-management and patient empowerment. The second trend is more critical and questions the efficacy of ICT use as well as the risk of promoting a reductionist, individualistic and normative view of health. The aim of our contribution is to show that these two polarized positions remain speculative (Piras & Miele, 2017; Sharon 2017) since little attention has been paid on concrete practices of use (or non-use) and subjective perceptions and needs of potential users in health promotion and chronic illness management (del Río Carral et al., 2017). We will explore how qualitative and mixed-methods approaches in health psychology can be useful to investigate not only the potential benefits of these technologies but also their possible psychopathological effects (e.g. hypochondria). Such a perspective also seems important to take into account the particular socio-cultural context in which ICT use takes place (Lewis, 2006) and the effect of these practices at the social level, in particular on the patient-healthcare professional relationship (Akerkar & Bichile, 2004; Anderson, Rainey, & Eysenbach, 2003; Kivits, 2016; McMullan, 2006; Méadel & Akrich, 2010; Thoër, 2013). More precisely, two upcoming research projects conducted in Western Switzerland will be outlined: a) one aimed at studying the consequences of self-tracking with digital mobile technologies on subjective health, quality of life and patient-physician relationship; b) one aimed at understanding how health information seeking on Internet transforms chronic back pain management.

'The digitally engaged doctor': the discourse and the reality

Lola Auroy (Aix Marseille University)

The move to digitise healthcare management has led to the increasing use of a discourse full of promises. The rhetoric which has developed about mobile health applications and connected tools, announcing various changes designed to benefit both physicians (improving patients' follow-up and physicians' relations with their patients, lightening doctors' schedules) and their patients (giving them greater empowerment and facilitating their access to information and care) is part of this trend. What becomes of these promises, however, when physicians meet their patients? What role do these tools play in physicians' routine practices and their relations with their patients?

In the framework of the «ApiApps» project on the prescription of mobile apps in primary care, 20 semi-directive interviews were carried out with GPs working in the South of France, with a view to determining what they think about mobile health apps and what use they make of them. Our initial analyses points to the existence of a gap between these innovations and physicians' everyday practices. The present critical assessment shows the existence of this gap. In the first part of this paper, the highly technophile discourse which has come into vogue and is being relayed at political level (in the Villani report, France) as well as by the media and at institutional and industrial level, is compared with GPs' actual practices, in which mobile apps are not being used very widely or recommended to their patients. This situation seems to be mainly due to physicians' lack of familiarity with these tools, their doubts as to whether they are useful and their feeling that they risk being detrimental to patients by isolating them and giving them illusions of safety. The second part of the paper focuses on the discrepancy between the liberal, individualistic ideal of patient empowerment underlying the dominant discourse (Lupton, 2016; Al Dahdah, 2017) and the physicians' more pragmatic, slightly paternalistic approach.

Professional autonomy under clinical bureaucracy: leveraging the EHR to standardize patients and produce assent

Mira Vale (University of Michigan)

Much sociological scholarship on the medical profession documents doctors' efforts to retain professional autonomy in an increasingly bureaucratic clinical environment. This incursion can be attributed in part to advances in the scope and ubiquity of electronic health records (EHRs). Some existing scholarship suggests doctors have coped with this shift by reconfiguring their professional identities as subordinate to the digital bureaucracy. This article, however, suggests doctors are in fact active managers of how the EHR structures clinical encounters and clinical care. Using data drawn from 20 months of ethnographic observations at a large US academic cancer center, including encounters with 95 patients seeking care for newly diagnosed prostate cancer, I argue doctors leverage the EHR in clinical encounters to convince patients their preferred course of treatment aligns with their doctors' own opinion. Doctors achieve this outcome by appealing to the EHR as the principal authority in clinical encounters. They invoke epidemiological statistics and risk calculations enabled by the digital interface to «produce assent» from their patients. Furthermore, doctors call up clinical information from the EHR to devalue lay knowledge and staunch the flow of patient questions deemed clinically extraneous. Thus EHR data becomes privileged not just as an incontrovertible source of medical expertise, but also as a trump card for directing patients' treatment decisions in line with doctors' clinical judgment. Clinicians' work to standardize patients toward greater alignment with EHR structures therefore preserves professional autonomy in a new era of clinical bureaucracy, but it curtails possibilities for patient empowerment.

Digitalized pain treatment – morphine use in a Tanzanian cancer clinic

Andrea Buhl (University of Basel)

New treatment technologies have entered many African hospital settings, but the digitalization of hospital routine and patients' data is oftentimes still lacking. A hospital ethnography in Tanzania's dedicated renown cancer centre, where new technologies offer high-tech oncology treatment, showed that the documentation of patient files contrasts with these digital treatment opportunities. They are mostly handwritten and often fragmented. Patient data with documentation of diagnosis, treatment procedures, lab results, medication prescriptions, examination results with corresponding MRT or CT scans and ultrasound pictures

were kept in pink paper files. But some of them even remained in another repository or their place of origin, or were documented in different or even diverse books and folders. Thus, patients had to visit numerous points for a complete patient file, which they needed for further referral. My study was based at the office of the hospital's own palliative care team, where part of this data was documented in their palliative care books. They were responsible for administering the hospital's total consumption of oral morphine as well as those of all clinics in the country, everything handwritten. But at the end of my research, the donation of morphine dispensers digitalized patients' use of painkillers. These little machines had to be updated with patient data, and subsequently provided data about morphine use in return.

Followed by a discussion.

Friday, 09:00 – 10:30 / Lecture Hall, Museum

'There is a person behind it': Reconceptualizing digital decision-making tools

Miriam Alexandria Tyebally Fang (University of Zurich)

The clinical standardization of prenatal tests in obstetrics implicitly accepts inherent ethical issues as justifiable in relation to potential outcomes. The values of healthcare staff, policy-makers, & researchers who determine what is ethically acceptable can differ vastly from patient's priorities, understandings & experiences of their pregnancies & its implications.

Digital decision aids (DDA) aim to bridge this difference, supporting women in the decision-making process. However, they engage users as passive recipients of information, mirroring the clinical encounter. Interactive components are limited to relevant demographic or medical data input, personalizing the relevance of subsequent information presented as envisioned by healthcare staff. While claiming non-directiveness, potential decisions & their outcomes thus fall into the same decision trees used heuristically in medical decision-making.

On the other hand, the flexibility of a digital medium lends itself well to clarify the complex contextual decisions & impact of its consequences in pregnancy. A DDA that allows women to not only access credible resources while being in control of their privacy but also to facilitate the formation of trustworthy 'online villages' presents an important supportive resource in the digital age.

We present preliminary findings from an ethnography on women's pregnancy experiences, with a focus on non-invasive genetic testing. An outcome of the study is a DDA with reflective decision making at its core.

- How can personal context be put at the center of decision-making?
- How can patient narratives be used to explore key elements in the expression of personal values & decision-making processes?
- How can patient stories add a narrative frame for 'internal reflection & meaningful conversation' to augment value clarification methods?

By exploring these questions while at the same time expanding methods & media, we construct our own DDA to assist women in these complex situations.

'The online world of surrogacy': Medically assisted reproduction and digital technologies

Anika König (University of Luzern)

Surrogacy – that is the carrying of a child for others to whom it is handed over after birth – is strictly prohibited in the entire German-speaking region. Doctors, who inform their patients about the option of surrogacy or perform the necessary medical procedures risk the loss of their licence to practice medicine or may be subjected to incarceration or monetary fines. As a result, infertile persons, or people, who for other reasons cannot carry a child (such as gay couples or women, who suffer from health conditions that rule out a pregnancy), must access these medical services elsewhere. However, they cannot seek official and reliable information or advice about their options in their home country.

As a result, the internet plays an integral role in transnational surrogacy. Intended parents usually access and exchange information in internet forums and Facebook groups. People, who have already gone through the process of surrogacy and share their experiences online are the main source of information. However, in contrast to expert patient knowledge regarding other medical issues (e.g. COPD), the knowledge that is shared is not only about the medical aspects of surrogacy, but also, and perhaps more importantly, about legal and administrative problems that usually come up in such transnational arrangements.

Moreover, transnational reproduction of this kind is strongly dependent on the use of digital communication media, such as email or Skype. Without these technologies, cross-border reproductive care would not exist in the form that it has taken in the last few years – a billion-dollar industry that connects intended parents from Europe or China with gamete donors, surrogates, agencies, and clinics in Ukraine, Russia, the US or South Africa.

Using the example of transnational surrogacy, this paper discusses this entanglement of legal regulations, reproductive medicine, and digital technologies all of which enable the existence of global reproductive medicine.

Whatsapp for cancer care – circulating knowledge, circulating patients

Heidi Kaspar (Kalaidos University of Applied Research)

This paper discusses how social media helps cancer patients and their family members in Uzbekistan to reconfigure biomedical knowledge and transform their prognosis. Receiving a cancer diagnosis is disruptive; it requires numerous re-orientations including the potentiality of death and the acceptability of therapies' limitations and costs. «[R]e-orientation must be consistent with a regime of diagnostic clinical truth, while also instilling a newly purposeful biographical trajectory' Brown (2015, 131). But as regimes of diagnostic clinical truth are highly place-specific, the hope a cancer patient can 'justifiably' hold differs enormously depending on where she/he is. Patients who are sent home to die in Central Asia undergo a series of treatments and might return home with an improved prognosis elsewhere. Uzbekistan constitutes a context of national healthcare with supposedly free healthcare, but actually compromised, outdated and underequipped facilities, standards and protocols. Falling ill with a terminal disease includes a vigorous search for therapies; in fact, having the relevant pieces of information can save your life.

Social media such as Facebook and Whatsapp expand the circulation of knowledge beyond kinship and residential communities to emerging biosocialities (Rabinow 2005). The case study presents patients and their families who reject the 'death sentence' of their local doctors. Facebook and Whatsapp provide key knowledge hubs where people learn that medical truths are different elsewhere and how to access more promising regimes abroad. As

traveling abroad for treatment is on the way of becoming a normal practice for those who can afford it, and experiences of overseas treatment are circulated, the quality of national medical care is being exposed. This might lead to sweeping healthcare reforms or intensified economization of healthcare including international medical travel and the associated risks for patients and their families.

Praktiken und Einstellungen von Selbstvermesser/-innen

Mandy Scheermesser (Zürcher Hochschule für angewandte Wissenschaften)

Das Beobachten, Messen und Aufzeichnen von Körperdaten ist nicht neu. Die Praktiken der Selbstvermessung reichen viele Jahrzehnte, ja sogar Jahrhunderte zurück (Lupton, 2016, 2013; Villa, 2012, 2015), z.B. das Zählen von Schritten oder das Wiegen Körpergewichts. Neu ist, dass sogenannte Apps und Tracker für die digitale Auszeichnung verwendet werden. Das Feld des Vermessens – und im zweiten Schritt, des Optimierens – hat sich auf fast alle Lebensbereiche ausgedehnt, besonders häufig wird es in Zusammenhang mit einer Optimierung der Gesundheit praktiziert. Auch das Interesse der Bevölkerung an Selbstmessung und -optimierung hat in den letzten Jahren zugenommen. Bislang ist jedoch wenig darüber bekannt, wie Menschen ihren Körper vermessen, was sie danach mit ihren Daten machen, wie dabei ihr Erleben ist, welche Implikationen das Messen für sie mit sich bringt und wie sich dadurch ihr Alltag ändert (Belliger & Krieger, 2015; Lupton, 2013). Die vorliegende Studie ging diesen Fragen nach und schliesst diese Lücke.

Es wurden drei moderierte Fokusgruppen von ca. 90 Minuten Dauer mit jeweils 6-8 Teilnehmern durchgeführt: eine Gruppe mit Gesunden, eine mit chronisch Kranken sowie eine mit Gesundheitsfachleuten. Zusätzlich wurde ein Meet-up der Quantified Self-Gruppe in Zürich mit 5 Selbstvermesser/-innen besucht. Die Daten wurden aufgezeichnet, transkribiert und inhaltsanalytisch ausgewertet.

Die Auswertungen zeigen, dass Gesunde ihren Körper und ihr Verhalten hauptsächlich aus Spass, Neugier und für Dokumentationszwecke vermessen. Chronisch Kranke legen grossen Wert auf Datensicherheit und verwenden eher konventionelle Messgeräte. Bei beiden Gruppen zeigen sich Auswirkungen auf den Alltag, z.B. sind Gesundheitsfachpersonen derzeit eher zurückhaltend gegenüber der Selbstvermessung und tendieren dazu, lieber selbst zu messen. Bei Patienten kann die Selbstvermessung Auswirkungen auf die Körperwahrnehmung haben, wenn mehr den Daten als dem eigenen Gefühl vertraut wird.

Followed by a discussion.

Friday, 11:00 – 12:30 / Lecture Hall, Museum

Beyond expert and lay positions: How online disability communities affect/transform participants' choices, strategies and relationships within healthcare systems

Karen Mogendorff (independent researcher)

The 'expert-lay' relationship with regard to chronic conditions is a complicated one. On the one hand, health professionals specialize in medical treatments but do not know how to cure a chronic condition and know little about the day-to-day living with chronic disorders. On the other hand, patients have intimate knowledge of day-to-day living with chronic conditions by may (initially) know very little about the functioning of the healthcare system, the patient population they belong to and medical treatments open to them. Online disability communities may alter and complicate this expert-lay relationship further. Online dis-

ability communities enable congenital disabled or chronically ill citizens to learn from and co-create new understanding in interaction with disabled peers not easily encountered in offline everyday life. They may gain insight into the variety and complexity of their condition, treatments and disability management and how to best 'work the system'. Long term immersion in online disability communities enable disabled participants to develop an understanding of their condition that transcends own individual experiences and may enable them to develop alternative understandings of health and disability that may help to face day-to-day challenges that come with living with chronic conditions.

Based on literature and long-term participation and observation in an online platform for congenital disabled and chronically ill people and offline life history research with community founders and participants, I investigate how disabled citizens' digital life may affect their offline lives, particularly with regard to understanding of health and disability, treatment and relationships with health and care providers. Benefits, costs and impacts are discussed. New found understandings and ways of relating to self and others developed online do not necessarily translate well to offline contexts.

Digitally mediated encounters in reproductive health

Nicola Mackintosh (University of Leicester)

Reproduction is a ubiquitous topic which affects all the population. However, within sociology it is often categorised in subfields such as assisted reproduction, parenting cultures or childbirth risk. This paper brings together scholarship across sociology, communication studies, and computer-supported cooperative work to explore the intersection of digital health within the bio-politics of reproduction.

Increasingly, digital platforms are being used by women to manage risk and uncertainty during the reproductive process. We report on a narrative synthesis of qualitative empirical studies which explored the relational, social and embedded experiences of women as they engage in digital health practices to mediate care boundaries between home and the clinic. We draw on data (including interviews, focus groups, observations, and analyses of digital media content) from 19 studies involving over 400 women to explore women's experiences of using different forms of digital support such as the internet, mobile programmes (apps and text messaging), social media, and remote monitoring devices in their reproductive journeys.

We find that the digital supplements, blurs and challenges lay-professional boundaries, and reconfigures constructs of and responsibilities for 'care'. It can enable risk and diagnostic work to become visible, acting as a form of accounting for 'good mothering' behaviours. Temporal, spatial and relational features of the digital sit at odds with bounded, tightly regulated maternal health services. The digital also highlights notions of expertise, legitimacy and decision making.

We consider the implications of this for those managing the space between physiology and pathology in the increasingly politicized field of reproductive health.

Sharing medical data within the family: the uses of a new health App by children living with type 1 diabetes and their relatives

Mélody Pralong (University of Lausanne)

My paper addresses the ways in which children living with type 1 diabetes and their relatives manage the illness in daily living. Managing type 1 diabetes requires daily tasks,

measurements and therapeutic decisions and those are more and more delegated to different digital technologies that have been introduced for about ten years in the Swiss market. Among them are Continuous Glucose Monitoring Systems (CGMs) and Flash Glucose Monitoring System (FGM) that automatically measure blood glucose levels and that make possible to share those data to other persons, such as relatives or health professionals.

Drawing on the story of one specific family composed of Léa, an 11 years old girl living with diabetes, and her parents, Charlie and Agnès, I will highlight how the uses of a recent FGM system, and more specifically of its App allowing to share blood glucose levels and, therefore, to monitor at a distance, shape the organisation of healthcare in the domestic sphere and, broadly, the family relationships.

More specifically, I will address the following questions: how does remote monitoring shape the ways in which responsibilities, expertise and knowledge are distributed among the actors involved, both human and non-human? How does this new tool allow to take part in new activities that were «unthinkable» until then (such as participating in school camps)? How does it entail changes in the ways education, mainly in term of rights and obligations, is perceived and managed within the home? What does this new technology require in term of financial and material resources (such as smartphones and mobile subscription) within the domestic sphere?

In summary, my contribution will discuss the ways in which this new technology shape the domestic life and the sharing of health-related knowledge within it as well as how the family resources and relationships allow – or not – to incorporate this tool in the daily life of children living with type 1 diabetes and their relatives.

Followed by a conclusion and a discussion.

Panel 3

The making of anthropological knowledge of/in education

Convenors: Jeanne Rey (Graduate Institute of Geneva) and Judith Hangartner (Pädagogische Hochschule Bern)

This panel explores the contribution of anthropology to the analysis of knowledge making in various educational fields. These fields include not only formal contexts such as schools, uni-versities or vocational training, but also non formal and informal settings such as home schooling, rehabilitation programmes, social work projects, massive open online courses, community centres or children's playgrounds. Contemporary neoliberal trends exercise intensi-fying pressures on educational institutions to turn education into an investment and to produce instrumental knowledge and «human capital» in order to meet the demands of the knowledge economy. Anthropologists working in education do not only observe and analyse changing con-ditions and practices of education, but they are, as researchers and teachers, also actors in ed-ucational fields and thus are themselves subjected to these chang-ing conditions. Thereby, edu-cational anthropologists might not be integrated into anthro-pological departments but located in interdisciplinary educational institutions. Following Marcus (2008), contemporary knowledge in anthropology is not only largely fuelled by interdisciplinary movements, but fur-thermore shows its strengths in its interdisciplinary involvements. Thus, what are these strengths of anthropological knowledge making of/in interdisciplinary fields of education?

The panel pursues a twofold approach to knowledge making in education: it addresses: a)

eth-nographic accounts that focus on the making of knowledge in various educational fields; and it welcomes b) theoretically grounded reflections on the positioning of anthropology in interdisciplinary fields of education.

a) The panel invites ethnographically grounded analyses on the social implications of knowledge that is produced in fields of education: How do actors enact and contest specific bodies of knowledge and to what ends? How are educational practices affected by new demands of the knowledge economy, such as lifelong learning, self-technologies, commodification, effectiveness, or governing by numbers)? How do educational actors translate policies and how do they resist to the new demands? How is the production of knowledge related to power relations, hegemonic regimes, social distinctions, exclusion and inequality? How can anthropologists make specific contributions to the analysis of knowledge making in the context of the knowledge society?

b) We invite to reflect on the positioning of anthropologists within interdisciplinary educational institutions (such as teacher colleges, social work, vocational training, etc.): How do anthropologists frame their expertise within interdisciplinary departments of research and teaching in education? How do anthropologists collaborate beyond the boundaries of the discipline and how do they position themselves towards dominant epistemic cultures? In what ways is the knowledge that educational anthropologists produce in these fields anthropological?

Thursday, 11:30 – 13:00 / KO2-F-151, Main Building

Spaces of otherness: Educational anthropology and quests for political transformation

Gritt B. Nielsen (Aarhus University)

University students in a number of countries including USA, UK, South Africa and Denmark are increasingly mobilizing around quests for social justice, equality and anti-discrimination. They criticize the reproduction of hierarchies of knowledge based on gender, race, nationality and fight to 'decolonise' education. They advocate the university as a 'safe space', request 'trigger warnings', and 'no-platform' speakers on campus whose messages they perceive to be discriminatory. The students' fights give rise to at least two important questions for educational anthropologists. First, their fights hinge on a number of challenges related to othering, categorization and essentialisation, which are more than familiar to anthropologists. For example, what does it mean for the space of debate, teaching and learning, when students (also of anthropology) request more texts written by scholars with a certain gender, race, or sexuality? What are the differences that come to matter and to what extent are processes of othering avoided or transformed? Second, important anthropological work has been done on the ways particular policies and reforms promote (un/intended) changes in higher education, unveiling dominant power structures and the ways different actors navigate the system. Less work, perhaps, has been dedicated to what Hage (2012) calls 'alter-politics', to collaboratively exploring emerging spaces of otherness that 'lie in the cracks of the existing order'. In this talk, I argue that educational anthropologists – working both on and within systems of education – are well-positioned to avoid the kind of simplistic rejections or celebrations of the students' fights, which tend to dominate current debates. By engaging with students in a more collaborative and explorative research endeavor, combining engaged dialogue with the art of opening up spaces of otherness, educational anthropologists can potentially play a central role, both in the development of anthropology as a discipline and in the creative formation of a more just world.

Anthropology and/as global education

Angela Stienen (Pädagogische Hochschule Bern)

Concepts of Global Education are disputed concepts. However, there is consent in scholarship that Global Education is a pedagogical response to globalisation; it is expected to prepare learners for the increasing worldwide interconnectedness and the growing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty of world society. This paper presents the conceptual controversy on Global Education and highlights why radical-transformative approaches in Global Education, which seek to engage learners in social transformation, have been challenged by scholars in educational sciences because of what these scholars perceive as «hidden normativity» of these approaches. These scholars claim that Global Education should contribute in the first place to foster learners' ability of dealing with complexity, uncertainty, ignorance and strangeness. This paper juxtaposes the scholarly debate in Global Education about how and why this goal should be achieved with insights from anthropology of colonialism and the debates about the repatriation of anthropology as cultural critique. On this background it discusses Tim Ingold's argument (to which the title of this paper refers) of anthropology as education.

Thursday, 14:00 – 16:00 / KO2-F-151, Main Building

Conceptual frameworks for a study on emerging adulthood in urban Switzerland

Barbara Waldis (Haute Ecole Spécialisée de Suisse Occidentale)

In social science research on emerging adulthood, a first consensus is that the opportunities on the way to autonomy differ according to social origin, gender and education. A second consensus is that this process includes for young women and men not only integration into the job market, but also the dimensions of sexual relationships and parenthood, health care issues and a (in the widest sense political or ideological) positioning within society. A third consensus acknowledges that this process does not follow a smooth standardized trajectory, but consists of explorations, experiments, different attempts and efforts with delays, and perhaps also hopscotching or opting out.

The starting point of my research interest was the narrative of social workers in youth centers who had to deal with young people looking for professional perspectives. For the youth worker this was a new and not so straightforward task to solve. On the one hand, no professional instruments existed and on the other hand, the young people faced in their daily lives contradictory norms and expectations as defined by parents, teachers and actors on the job market.

During the elaboration of the conceptual framework for the research project, I explored the different orientations and realized that each one would lead to another type of research as the following questions reveal. Should research results be relevant for professional coaching put in place by social workers? Would an ethnographic study on the life worlds of young people, rooted in social relationships, be more appropriate? Should the main emphasis lie on the anthropological perspective on emerging adulthood with a holistic point of view (instead of focusing on the economy) or on a gender perspective, both missing in the debate?

The scope of the presentation of the three above-mentioned orientations on emerging adulthood is to reflect the challenges during the process of conceptualising an ethnographic study within the institution of a university of applied sciences.

'Russian drill' and 'spoiled princes': What teachers in kindergarten know and imagine about their children's families

Anja Sieber Egger and Gisela Unterweger (Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich)

Teachers in kindergarten develop a wide spectrum of knowledge that is relevant to manage everyday life in kindergarten. For example, they have practical knowledge of how to integrate children into the structures and processes of the organisation. A special expertise can be seen in what teachers know and imagine about their children's families. Our ethnographic research as part of the SNSF-project «Conspicuous children. An ethnography of processes of recognition in the kindergarten» shows that teachers' knowledge related to families is often highly fragmented, sometimes imagined and usually implicit. However, especially when it comes to critical situations in the everyday life of the kindergarten, teachers use this tacit knowledge as an additional resource for their argumentations and actions. In such situations, imaginations and assumptions are sometimes treated as reliable explanations and constructed as relevant knowledge in order to deal with the critical situations.

In our contribution we focus on two exemplary cases. We ask how the imagined and tacit knowledge is linked with categories of difference such as ethnicity, gender or social origin and enacted as doing difference. Thus, a boy who does not show the required skills to take part in everyday situations properly is portrayed as a «spoiled prince». In another kindergarten, the symptoms of a girl perceived as stressed out are interpreted as a result of the influence of her Russian (upper class) mother, who would, in the eyes of the teachers, exert unreasonably much pressure. Interestingly, the parents, especially the mothers, are now addressed and treated differently by the teachers. We analyse this different use of knowledge in both contexts against the background of differing power relations between teachers and parents.

Diversity and mobility as assets: educational alignment to the values of the transnational corporation in the context of international private schools

Matthieu Bolay and Jeanne Rey (Haute école pédagogique Fribourg / Graduate Institute Geneva)

In the context of neoliberalism, pervasive discourses on human capital transform both the representations of future citizen to be educated and of the next generation of workers to be trained. Work is now largely dominated by the experience of uncertainty, fast change and individualisation, and by the imperative to handle one's professional insertion and career on the longer term. This paper looks at how «international» private day schools, which have boomed in and around most economic centres in Switzerland, construct specific forms of knowledge on «diversity» and «mobility» as an instrumental response to this context.

These schools emerged in the margin of Swiss public education along with the increase of expatriate families since 2000 and with growing demand from affluent long term residents. While their mandate does not formally imply to achieve the social and structural integration of future citizens in the local fabric, these schools claim instead that they foster the insertion of pupils in a «global space» which we interpret as a mirror to the model of the transnational corporation. Based on ethnographic fieldwork in 15 international schools and with other actors of this field, we look at discourses on «diversity» and «mobility», which have a high value in corporate milieus and also largely structure the field of international education. We discuss how and what knowledge on «diversity» and «mobility» is constructed by teachers and school actors, and argue that, in contrast to the repertoires of «cultural heterogeneity» and «migration» that occupy the forefront in public national education, these notions have positive connotations stemming directly from the imaginary of the «self-as-a-business». In so doing, we address one inherent paradox to international education which both celebrates

the capacity of «international students» to adapt to fast changing contexts while deploying considerable efforts to render experiences of change as frictionless as possible.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 4a

Unpacking the Black Box: 'Research Assistants' and Knowledge Production in Social Anthropology

Convenors: Carole Ammann (University of Bern), Andrea Kaiser-Grolimund (University of Basel) and Sandra Staudacher (University of Basel)

Despite the history of the discipline, even today there are social anthropologists who present themselves as lonely wolves, not revealing much about their collaborations with 'research assistants' in the field. However, anthropological knowledge production is never the work of a single individual, not least because social anthropologists regularly work in research teams as part of bigger (often interdisciplinary) projects. People from various world regions with diverse backgrounds contribute during the different phases of data gathering, data procession, data analysis as well as during the writing and publication processes. Still, contributions of some crucial actors, as the important work of 'research assistants', are typically not adequately represented, discussed and honored in anthropological publications. Often, they are just mentioned briefly in the acknowledgments – if at all. We are convinced that, as Middleton and Pradhan state, «[i]ncorporating their voices marks a definitive step in recognizing and perhaps getting beyond the 'hidden colonialism' at hand so as to chart a more inclusive and innovative ethnography for the future» (Middleton and Pradhan 2014: 371-372).

In this panel, we thus aim at bringing into focus the specific group of 'research assistants', who strongly influence anthropological knowledge production (Gupta 2014, Middleton and Cons 2014). Helpers in the field can have multiple tasks and a general definition of their involvement is difficult to provide: They act as collaborators, key informants, cultural and linguistic translators, brokers, 'fixers', friends, lovers and much more (Hannerz 1976). Whatever name we give them, whatever kind of work they do or how they define themselves, most ethnographic field research would look different without them.

In this panel, we unpack the black box of 'research assistants' in social anthropology. Our objective is to discuss the roles of 'research assistants' and the implications that the cooperation with them have on all stages of anthropological knowledge production. Furthermore, we want to debate ethical questions which the cooperation with 'research assistants' raise. Finally, we aim at finding new ways of making the contributions of 'research assistants' more visible. For that, we invite papers which thoroughly reflect on experiences in collaborating with 'research assistants'. We especially welcome theoretically and empirically informed papers which address one or several of the following questions:

- What are the characteristics, tasks and roles of 'research assistants'?
- Based on which criteria do we select 'research assistants' and how do we train them?
- How do they contribute to and influence the anthropological knowledge production?
- How do their social identities (such as gender, sex, age, education, religion, political, and ethnic affiliation) influence data gathering and data analysis?
- How does the collaboration between researchers and 'research assistants' look like in practice and what kind of advantages and difficulties come along with it?
- What kind of ethical considerations regarding the authorship and the (unequal) relationship between researcher and 'assistants', such as power, status, and employment condi-

- tions does this collaboration imply and how could these challenges best be addressed?
- How does the availability of New Media influence our cooperation with 'research assistants' during and after fieldwork?
 - How could the work and influence of 'research assistants' become more visible in anthropological writing and publications?

Friday, 09:00 – 10:30 / Library, Museum

'Research assistants' and the composition of ethnographic text

Gerhild Perl (University of Bern)

In the introduction of my thesis on death during migration at the Strait of Gibraltar, I write the following: «My study would have taken a very different shape if it were not for Driss, who shared a great part of my fieldwork with me. During sixteen months of research, we reflected together upon what we had heard and seen and we endlessly discussed our different interpretations of situations. Even though he did not actively form part of writing this dissertation, many of his thoughts have entered it and his presence during fieldwork is made explicit throughout the thesis.»

Driss acted as a collaborator, co-fieldworker, translator and broker. He provided me access to field sites which otherwise would have remained unknown to me. In this paper, I reflect upon the benefits when we, as ethnographers, decide to 'write in' our 'research assistants'. By addressing the panel's question of how we can make the work and influence of 'research assistants' more visible in ethnographic writing, I not only reflect upon the manifold roles 'research assistants' have in the field but also in the text. I thereby understand ethnographic writing not merely as the transmission of information 'from one semiotic medium to another', rather, I consider the transportation of empirical data to text as the creation of something 'entirely' new (Nielsen and Rapport 2018: 5). By using examples of my own writing, in this paper, I reflect on the following set of questions: What role can 'research assistants' play in the creation of ethnographic text? How does the narrative voice alter if we decide to not only give our 'research assistants' a 'minor role' but represent them as 'protagonists'? How does the assistant's presence affect the composition of ethnographic text? How can we protect the assistant's privacy even if he or she does not want to remain anonymous?

Being an 'expert' in a knowledge transfer process and having your boss as your 'research assistant'

Alexandros Papageorgiou (University of Thessaly)

In recent years, several initiatives that position themselves within the cooperative (or commons) movement in Greece try to draw from paradigms of successful relevant actions that have been implemented by initiatives abroad, mainly in Europe. In my PhD research, I study the way this knowledge is transferred and 'translated' between contexts that differ from each other on many levels (political, economic, cultural). Since the ideological premise that informs such actions dictates a 'focus on locality', local conditions and needs must be given prominence and all the potentially beneficial knowledge coming from a different context must be adapted to attend to them.

However, most often these initiatives are not mobilized by the local communities themselves, but by experts who try to introduce concepts and practices to localities where these novelties could be meaningful. More specifically, the focus of my research is the role of those experts who determine to a large degree the source, type and content of the knowledge that

is transferred, as well as its ideological framework and the ways in which the transfer takes place.

I use the term knowledge brokers which I borrow from the tradition of ethnographic fieldwork, albeit twisting its meaning. In the case of my research the role of these actors is not to mediate the knowledge between the community and the researcher, nor do they always belong to the studied community. In this case, the brokers mediate knowledge between localities and within translocal networks of cooperation, they are themselves the object of study, and the researcher is one of them.

Through my collaboration with a Zurich-based NGO, I have been working for two projects of knowledge transfer from initiatives abroad to Greece, namely in the fields of co-housing and Wi-Fi community networks. So, my 'research assistant' is my boss and the implications of this relationship for the anthropological knowledge production is what I have to share.

Keynote: Friendship in the field: reflexivity, participation and autoethnography

Till Förster (University of Basel)

The experience of sharing life with others is not only a constituent part of ethnographic fieldwork, it also affects the anthropologist as a person. 'Research assistants' often become friends who influence not only the collection of 'data' – they can and often do deeply transform the personality of the ethnographer. By participating in the lives of others, anthropologists acquire tacit knowledge of how to engage in social relationships, how to nourish social ties and eventually friendships. To some extent, they thus become others – others who see the world, hear music, taste food in novel ways. Sharing social practice and sensory experience with a friend leads to mutual intersubjectivity and life-worldly understandings that go far beyond cognitive enquiries through interviews and other language-based methods.

This paper looks at two friendships that I had been fortunate to live for many years in a village of the West African savannah where I began my fieldwork in the late 1970s. Siriki, one of the two, was a young man of about my age when we first met. He had been a fervent Muslim and later became the imam of the local mosque, but he respected me as a non-believer. Through participation in his life, I increasingly became aware of how he as a believer saw the world and in particular the precariousness of peasant life at the margins of a state that had forgotten them. At about the same time, I also met Kartcha who had been the fourth wife of my tutor. Being a woman, our friendship grew more under the surface of village life and much more slowly. Implausible though it may be, our friendship became a deep bond that built on mutual trust – perhaps precisely because it never turned into the sexual relationship that some neighbors suspected us to have.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 4b

Un-learning Anthropology through the Co-Creation of Transformative Knowledge

Convenors: Eda Elif Tibet (University Bern) and Tahir Zaman (University of Sussex)

Anthropology institutions situated in the West are hosting research projects looking at the burdened lives of those living on the margins, more than ever before. A lot of international and national level funding is being granted to study the most pressing and emotionally challenging issues from child migrants escaping wars, to people subjected to trafficking,

sexual harassment, enslavement, torture, disenfranchisement and violence in general. The nature of such work, requires anthropologists to work closely with those who experience such unfortunate realities.

Knowledge rooted in the pain, suffering, and struggle of the unfortunate, flows from peripheries and margins to the centre where fortunate job holders are located. In many instances, such knowledge is converted into data sets to be held captive as institutional intellectual property in the form of university lectures, seminars, journal articles, and monographs. This results in the reproduction of unfair theory cut off from its empirical origins - co-researchers and co-authors.

One needs to ask: whose intellect is the source of knowledge? Who do we mean by the intellectual and to whom do we assert the term? The research partner is in some respects the expert in the field. She is an interlocutor from whom we learn the nuances of a language and culture. She is often the gatekeeper to networks we otherwise would not enjoy. On the other hand, our privileged location calls attention to how she is viewed as lacking in expertise - be it requisite educational qualifications, appropriate institutional affiliations, or access to funding.

Anthropological knowledge production of all kinds is embedded in sets of social relationships (the professor, the post doc, the PhD student, research partners) as Anthropology's epistemology is itself relational—in the sense that knowledge is collaborative, dialogical, and gained by way of relations, and that (in consequence) the relationships between researchers and their collaborators become a property of the object of inquiry itself; that is, «[t]he relation between the 'knower' and the 'object' of necessity bends back into the perception of the object itself and is cemented in writing» (Hastrup 2004: 456). Hence, both as the subjects and objects of knowledge within the institutions of neo-colonial learning, we ask whose knowledge are we working with: our own or that of our research partners? And to what purpose?

Knowledge converted into anthropological language, is utilized as a source of prestige and recognition. The result opens its way to the creation of new projects. Numerous new vacancies are marketed from institutions situated at the Global North asking to work on the Global South.

Is the language of research participants and partners only made knowledge once it has been translated for the anthropologists' readership? If so, we must ask who we are producing knowledge for. «Do we» as bell Hooks puts it (1989: 15) «position ourselves on the side of colonizing mentality?» Or is our co-produced knowledge put «towards that revolutionary effort which seeks to create space where there is unlimited access to the pleasure and power of knowing, where transformation is possible?» (ibid.)

Following Hook's (1989) language as a place of struggle, and Spivak's (1988) unlearning we call authors to share their experiences of 'unlearning one's own learning' as we intend to explore the idea of unlearning one's privileges and learning in terms of ethics. In Hymes sense, we argue that anthropology needs to lose itself to find itself again (1974). Observing a movement towards claiming ownership over the making of new scientific languages within and beyond the discipline, we believe, there is a growing necessity for not working from one single expertise.

We look for contributions in search of their own language where the co-creation of transformative knowledge is being experienced and narrated. Hence, with a firm belief that theory could itself contribute to practical political change and social transformation, we

invite non-hierarchical, personal, political and even sentimental co-authored papers written through reflexive and interpretive techniques together with radical innovations and participatory working methods. We are particularly keen on hosting papers co-authored with research participants, auto ethnographies written by early career researchers, and from the perspective of forced migrants themselves.

Friday, 11:00 – 12:30 / Library, Museum

Keynote: The University for All in the Calais refugee camp

Tahir Zaman (University of Sussex)

This paper probes the borders of education in relation to contemporary refugee issues in Europe, specifically addressing the informal so-called 'Jungle' camp in Calais, northern France, where colleagues from the University of East London taught an accredited Life Stories short course between September 2015 and October 2016. The paper suggests, first, that locating knowledge production beyond the borders of the conventional university is in some ways precisely the terrain of the university and education more generally. Secondly, the paper argues that on this terrain, education can be seen to operate in a number of different directions for the different stakeholders that comprised the informal humanitarian space of 'the Jungle' – people on the move (refugees and migrants), teachers, other volunteers, associations, and NGOs. In so doing, the paper draws attention to refugees and migrants as other than individuals inhabiting precarious and indeterminate legal statuses pertaining to mobility; but rather as students, facilitators, and co-authors. Third, this paper suggests that 'the Jungle' counterposed its own understanding of 'the university' characterised by spaces of reciprocity that opened possibilities for decolonising knowledge production.

Cynicism as (failed) resistance

Jalal Imran and Ammar Almamoun (University of Oxford)

A 'refugee' or a 'forced migrant' is always faced with the process of subjectification. The gaze of others, whether individuals or institutions of all kinds, force a set of stylistic and narrative standards on the way one could produce himself in the public and private spheres. No matter what forms of expressions one adopts, he is received as performing in accordance with and within the limits of a fictional image of an exotic subject. The narratives are always received as «data» or a representation of a form of life and psychology. Some use cynical narratives and performances as a form of resisting this gaze, as a method to un-do its cultural hegemony. But this is a constant challenge that often ends in failure, since the 'victim' is always understandable; his cynicism is generously seen as form of a post-traumatic 'symptom, rather than a form of 'playing.' Playing, as intended by players, is a form of disrupting the gaze by unveiling its politics of imposing channels of producing narratives that 'fit'. There is an increasing awareness in the anthropological community of the power imbalance between scholars and their 'subjects of study.' The irony is brought to the fore when 'subjects' themselves are placed at the nexus of knowledge production in conventional forms, as in the case for 'intellectuals', artists, or academics. In this paper, drawing primarily on (personal) Syrian experiences, we highlight forms of cynicism produced in certain academic, political and cultural spheres, and define their means of undoing and failures resulting from cycles of politics of adaptation practiced to maintain the victim position. The purpose is not particularly to find solutions to such dilemmas, but we, I and I, will use the game of role-playing to undermine the structures of knowledge production and self-reflexivity we are co-creating.

Witnessing as unlearning: Listening to partiality with women war veterans in Vietnam

Rivka Eisner (University of Zurich)

Feminist philosopher Kelly Oliver asks «how can we witness and bear witness to oppression, domination, subordination, enslavement, and torture in ways that open up the possibility of a more humane and ethical future beyond violence» (2001, 18)? She answers that we must learn to witness others «beyond recognition,» through infinite encounters requiring infinite responsibility (90). But, what does it mean to try and practice this form of processual ethics, to witness toward beyondness with one's research participants? Where does witnessing beyond knowing and recognition lead in terms of our understanding of knowledge, others, and ourselves?

Listening to narratives of torture, loss, and survival from Communist-aligned Vietnamese women who were active during the American War has meant unlearning assumptions and has required reckoning with a different sort of ontology and phenomenology of knowledge. This paper explores the ways in which listening to the stories of one particular veteran, named cô Định, has taught me about 1) living with psychic and somatic wounds rather than pursuing a «cure,» and 2) my own sense of ethical witnessing as a simultaneous process of unlearning privilege (Spivak 1994) and inheriting responsibility for these memories, and the lives they implicate, (re)embody, and perform. The kind of knowledge I «gain» through listening to cô Định stories of her brother's death and surviving torture is not certain, settled, or anywhere near total. When listening to cô Định describe her life, and in particular her experiences of torture, learning «more» consists of learning the contours of absence, of touching and feeling what I do not and cannot ever fully know. Yet, as much as it is necessary to reckon with the borders of our understanding, it is equally necessary to remember and imagine with cô Định into the very beyondness of her experiences, pursuing better (not total) recognition just over the edge of what is knowable and thinkable in our own lives.

Learning to be freed: Deep encounters with the unaccompanied asylum seekers in Turkey

Eda Elif Tibet and Abdi Deeq (University of Bern)

The asylum seeking youth often voyage emotionally through the many wounds they receive along their migration journey. Having to endure the horrors of war and violence, they are haunted by the memories of neglected traumatic childhoods. This paper is based on a PhD field work period between 2015 and 2016 in Istanbul Turkey and is co-created together with the youth from Afghanistan, Somalia, DRC, Iran and Syria residing at a state care shelter for unaccompanied minor asylum seekers. Among them, Abdi Deeq becomes the interlocutor, translator, the co-ethnographer and the co-author, as we conducted youth participatory action research that involved radio shows, photography and audio visual workshops. Inspired by the pedagogies of Freire and Spivak, our gatherings provoked the emergence of what Bhabha calls to be the third space that allowed a free play of meanings and cultural identities interacting within enunciation. The life stories being shared during the radio shows, revealed hidden aspects of the youth's emotional and intellectual worlds providing with various strategies of survival. While, a mixed group of youth attending high school informed the post-colonial theory, a younger generation of Syrians revealed their current circumstances of being subjected to fatal human rights abuses, sharing their escape stories from the hands of extremist groups, imprisonment and detention to refugee camps. As often our conversations dealt with the feelings of loss, trauma, insecurity and guilt, our time together also spared place for hope, resilience, dreams and further aspirations. During the making of the photography workshops we borrowed Bhabha's lens of what he calls to be a displaced angle of vision, we looked carefully into the interstitial spaces of the beyond and in between of meaning, knowing, being and becoming. Hence the co-creative field work

experience provided a deep encounter and recognition into their legacies of pain, suffering and triumph in ways that transformed present reality and representation, as the youth longed, searched and learnt to be freed.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 5

Beyond Engineering: Anthropological Knowledge on Infrastructure

Convenors: Madlen Kobi (Università della Svizzera Italiana) and Agnieszka Joniak-Lüthi (Universität Zürich)

Infrastructure such as roads, buildings, railways, heating systems or power lines are complex social-material-technological formations. However, they are still predominantly studied by building material scientists, architects and engineers. While their perspective is important, anthropological research into the meanings and workings of the built environment demonstrates that materials, technologies and built structures are also inherently social and dynamic. Moreover, though knowledge is often framed as something invisible—existing in discourses, ideas and cognition—the anthropology of infrastructure makes clear that knowledge also manifests in and thus has to be studied in materials such as concrete, steel, tarmac or sand and their use in the construction process. This is evident in anthropological studies that engage with the role of infrastructure as a built and building part of society. Roads, for example, are platforms for projecting political agendas, expectations, fears and claims to power. Houses can embody remittances entangled in migration histories or serve as real estate investment. Mobile phone-enabled connectivity expands networks of social relations, and the mining of materials for infrastructure construction is embedded in the complex political ecology that stretches far beyond the actual construction site. Ethnographic research on infrastructure also meaningfully contributes to infrastructure studies by exploring infrastructure's mundane social life and thus highlighting its inherent dynamism. Social anthropology thus balances out the focus on engineering, technological advancement and construction manifest in glossy images from opening ceremonies by contributing knowledge on the social life of infrastructure, the often neglected impact of time, the processes of social-material decay and the complex work of maintenance.

Hence, anthropological knowledge contributes to understanding infrastructure beyond its normative function and rather as dynamically-evolving social relations between materials, humans, discourses, knowledge, environment, the state, capital and more, relations that stretch across place and time. Social anthropologists have demonstrated an explicit interest in combining different scales of knowledge in their research, e.g. the scale of political decision-making, the scale of engineering knowledge, the knowledge of technologies and materials, the knowledge of the mundane lives of the construction and maintenance workers, and the knowledge of power relations which manifest in infrastructure, among others. Anthropological research on infrastructure has thus also substantially, though often implicitly, contributed to destabilizing the notion of an anthropological 'site' or 'field', and has also sought to reflect it in its methodology.

This panel seeks contributions that, based on ethnographic case studies, discuss the intersections of anthropological knowledge and infrastructure along one or both of the following aspects:

1. In what ways do anthropologists gather (cognitive, embodied, tacit, material, technical and other) knowledge of infrastructure? Which ethnographic methods and methodolog-

ical approaches have been used? What have they succeeded in highlighting? What have their limitations been?

2. How does anthropological knowledge contribute to the study of infrastructure? How does anthropological knowledge engage with other disciplines in research on infrastructure? What kind of collaborations are possible with other disciplines such as architecture, geography, engineering and material sciences?
3. In what ways can anthropological research on infrastructure expand existing debates in social anthropology?

Thursday, 11:30 – 13:00 / KOL-N-1, Main Building

Why our cities don't fall apart: Ethnographies of repair work

Moritz F. Fürst and Ignaz Strebel (University of Lausanne)

In recent years, a renewed engagement with repair and maintenance work in the social sciences has offered perspectives on life with technology that challenge prevalent frames of 'innovation' in our understanding of technological change, and invite us to rethink knowledge and technology practices more generally in a multitude of socio-material settings within our 'broken world' (cf. Jackson 2014, Strebel, Bovet and Sormani 2019).

This line of inquiry indicates a perspective on urban infrastructure saliently absent from many, if not most, planning and design concerns. Investigated ethnographically, the maintenance, upkeep, and constant adaptation of buildings and infrastructures such as the electricity supply, transportation networks, heating and cooling systems, or sewage pipes expose a rich background of material conditions, procedural knowledge, distinct expertise, and social circumstances often overlooked in imaginaries of the 'smart', 'data-driven' and 'sustainable' city of the future.

The contribution offers an overview on the emerging interdisciplinary field of 'repair work ethnographies' at the intersections of science and technology studies, urban studies, and anthropology, and reflects on its recent developments. Based on field work data generated by shadowing building caretakers and HVAC-technicians, it will lay a particular focus on technical expertise and practical reasoning displayed in repair and maintenance practices. Furthermore, the contribution will discuss the potential of this kind of research to specify 'sustainability', 'ecological design', 'innovation' and similar buzzwords in terms of contingent achievements of localized care and repair, through distinctive methods, makeshifts, knowledge, and work practices.

Heat and dust. The ethnography of a house in historic Cairo

Dalila Ghodbane (Università della Svizzera Italiana)

In architecture, there are many studies on climate responsive buildings, especially concerning areas with hot and arid climate in the South. In the case of Egypt, the resulting imagery focuses on earth and dome architecture, as well as on what is referred to as the general template of Islamic architecture, with courtyards, fountains and wooden latticework. The visual contrast with how the Egyptian cities look like today, and especially Cairo, which is the focus of the presentation, leads architecture expert to claim the absence of concern with climate today, shown by the absence of care towards the thermal environment in houses. Such a statement relies on a definition of thermal control restrained to the realm of thermal

engineering and material heritage preservation. In other words, the observations remain attached to what architects' skill allow to perceive in the first place. This perspective can have limiting effects, but combined to ethnography, it allows to explore effectively the interaction of residents with the built structures when it comes to climatic considerations. My contribution is based on fieldwork in a house of the medieval area of Cairo through which I analyse the residents' perception of the indoor climate by documenting the way they shape it, whether intentionally or as a collateral effect of other practices. Thermal practices in the heritage built environment of Cairo are material manifestations of thermal knowledge that occasionally contradicts what architects recognise as being the qualities of the building. Therefore, challenging the hierarchy in knowledge, from thermal sciences to domestic bricolage, paves the way for accessing necessary resources to think and implement an effective, pertinent design and deal with architecture in the context of a megacity of the global South.

Istanbul's (post)-industrial infrastructures: An urban exploration

Luisa Piart (University of Fribourg)

Within the scope of state and municipal policies, internal evolutions of the urban fabric and shifts in modes of production, Istanbul's industry slowly abandoned the historical neighborhoods and waterfronts of the inner city and its location shifted to different marginal districts at the periphery. In this respect, Istanbul illustrates a general deindustrialization trend that affected many large metropolises from the 1970s onwards. Abandoned factories, shipyards and derelict warehouses: throughout the last decades the ruins of these infrastructures have been the signposts of post-industrialization, and fascinated scholars and artists alike. In Istanbul some postindustrial large-scale buildings have been renovated and turned into brand-new cultural infrastructures. Many others are being erased. Based on ethnographic material, my presentation explores Istanbul's postindustrial legacies in their diversity, and question the taken-for-granted assumption that mass production is necessarily based on factories, or large-scale infrastructure projects. Turkey is categorized as a late-industrializing country marked by flexible labor conditions and precariousness by economic experts. In my presentation, I will address a range of questions: What material remnants and traces are left behind this industrialization path? What experts, engineers, architects, but also ordinary people invest Istanbul's (post)-industrial infrastructures in the past and present? What promises did these infrastructures make and break? And what anthropological knowledge can be produced from their current situation?

Thursday, 14:00 – 16:00 / KOL-N-1, Main Building

Having 'open eyes' in Makeni Northern Sierra Leone: Roadwork in progress

Michael Bürge (University of Konstanz)

Insights presented in this paper stem from two years of fieldwork between 2007 and 2013. I elaborate here how infrastructures emerge around 'Open Eyes'. 'Open Eyes' is a crucial road junction in the city of Makeni, constantly transforming and central as an engine and selectively porous screen for the 'development' of the 'backward' and 'infrastructurally marginalized' city. 'Open Eyes' owes its name to the fact that people claim to have and to need here particularly open eyes and differently attuned senses to properly dis/engage with flows of people, goods, technologies and other forces that are not immediately sensible for everybody to progress in life. Thus I elaborate in this paper on the correspondence of «place making» and «sense making», people's everyday attempts in grasping and fixing a highly elusive socio-material environment for personal social advancement. Sensing with people's daily roadwork, the ways they dis/engage with different forms of infrastructures and agents,

suspend their absence and make sense of how the forces underneath or within might affect their lives, opens anthropologists' «eyes» for more ephemeral dimensions of infrastructures that transcend the concrete locality.

'Open Eyes' is not simply the intersection of strips of tarmac. As a busy marketplace, it opens up to activities and places in different regions and realms, offering people opportunities to work the road and to make encounters with multiple agents to progress in life. In the 2010s, considerable investments in «common-sense infrastructures» affected 'Open Eyes'. Roads were tarred, a railway built and power-lines installed and connected. Makeni's 'sub-standard infrastructure' was visibly improved. People realized, though, that they could not straightforwardly catch up on 'development' and connect to 'modernity'. The forces animating the formerly desired infrastructures turned against the people, urging them to further investigate alternative channels to ensure their progress.

More than transport: Contesting ethnic culture on the ancient tea horse road in Lashi Hai (Yunnan, China)

Seraina Hürlemann (University of Lausanne)

Due to its formidable location on the Ancient Tea Horse Road, the Lijiang area, inhabited by the Naxi ethnic minority, became a prosperous cultural centre and vibrant hub for trade at a nexus of roads in all directions. Today Lijiang is one of China's top tourism destinations. Whereas the Ancient Tea Horse Road, as a concept, is rather new (the name first occurred in 1990), it consists of roads, supposedly rather ancient, connecting southern Yunnan with the Tibetan Highlands. Transportation of goods and people today has been shifted to new roads, railways and the air, yet there are still caravans riding along the perceived remnants of the Ancient Tea Horse Road. Those are caravans of tourists who, were attracted by the imaginary of adventurous travel through the wild, remote mountains.

In some places, material relicts of an old road have been found, in Lashi Hai, my case study site however, it is rather new roads, bringing in visitors from Lijiang Old Town, just an hour's drive away. Arguments remain heated, on whether or not the actual caravan route did ever pass by the villages of Lashi Hai, certain is however that for the tourists now it does. Back in time, the Tea Horse Road allowed for economic prosperity, and so it does now again, by means of tourism. Yet roads have always served as well for establishing political influence and power in peripheral regions. Even though today it has no function as battleground for actual warfare anymore, power and control are still established via the Ancient Tea Horse Road. This happens by integrating the area into a neoliberal market economy, introducing consumer culture and hence consolidating dependencies as well as hegemonic hierarchies. At the same time, the material ground of the Ancient Tea Horse Road in Lashi Hai remains a battleground, on which local identities are negotiated at the tourist encounter and representations of minority culture are contested, sold and re-appropriated again by Lashi Hai's residents.

Do it for the culture. The infrastructures of milk preservation

Matthäus Rest (Max Planck Institut für Menschheitsgeschichte, Jena)

As Ashley Carse recently unearthed «infrastructure was initially an organizational and accounting term used to distinguish the construction of work that was literally conducted beneath unladen tracks (roadbeds) or was otherwise organizationally prior to them (surveys, plans, bridges, tunnels, embankments) from the superstructure of roads, train stations, and workshops that were situated above or constructed after the tracks.»

Following this logic, I wonder whether microbial dairying cultures could also be understood as infrastructures. For millennia they have been essential for human survival through their ability to transform nature's most perishable food - milk - into a stable acidic substance that with the addition of heat can become a longterm storage for protein and fat, also known as cheese.

Working with archaeologists, archaeogeneticists, microbiologists, policymakers, cheesemakers and herders in Jordan, Europe, the United States and Mongolia, I want to ask what can be gained from thinking the history and present of milk preservation through the lens of infrastructures. Recent technological innovations - from pasteurization to spray drying - have completely changed the valorization of microbial activity. While to this day in Mongolia the name for starter culture is synonymous with wealth and inheritance, Western dairy farmers have to deliver a raw material that microbially is as inactive as possible. At the dairy plant the milk is further processed into a sterilized raw product to which industrially bred and controlled microbes are added.

The global replacement of microbial infrastructures leads, for now, to two major questions: how does the increasing industrialization of dairying effect the diversity of lactic acid bacteria on a global level? And how is it connected to the increasing problem of milk indigestibility?

Input presentation: The social life of infrastructure – existing and emerging debates

Agnieszka Joniak-Lüthi (University of Zurich)

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 6

Making Urban Knowledge – Ethnography, Intersubjectivity and Engagement

Convenors: Barbara Heer (University of Basel) and Silke Oldenburg (University of Basel)

Robert Park's seminal essay on «The City» (1915) promised in its subtitle «Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the city environment». Quite common to the Chicago School of Sociology was the impetus to not only describe urban lifeworlds, but also to raise issues for public engagement.

Today, a century later and for the first time in history, most than half of the world's population live in cities and urban anthropology has developed into a sprawling field. The emergence, the «turns» and the growth of urban anthropology, not least related to these broader demographic and societal changes, entails research on the myriad of social phenomena in the city as well as thorough reflections on the implications of the urban context in which these phenomena occur. Providing a window on complex processes of urbanization (structural development of a city) as well as changing modes of urbanity (the lived experience of a city), recent studies focus on built forms and social relations, urban imaginaries and shifting power relations in the city, in their entanglements and disconnections in a global world. This raises new epistemological questions which, as we argue, should become more systematically included into the urban research agendas.

Therefore, our panel aims to investigate issues and dimensions of knowledge production in and on urban contexts, in and beyond academia. Combining conceptual, empirical and 'engaged' takes on knowledge production, we intend to explore the social complexity of cities

in particular contexts while including a reflexive perspective on the mechanisms of 'making' urban knowledge.

The epistemological question of how (urban) knowledge is generated is entangled with and stimulated by interdisciplinary approaches such as Urban Studies or Urban Geography. While the latter were for a long time predominantly engaged in research on the Global North (Europe and North America), anthropologists had much earlier started to focus on researching cities in Africa, Asia or Latin America. In general, doing research on and in cities is inseparably linked to sociopolitical forces and practices. Hence, processes of making urban knowledge have many repercussions for learning and thinking about cities and wider engaged practice.

We therefore welcome papers which are empirically grounded in ethnographic fieldwork and deal with epistemological challenges on doing research in the city and the kinds of knowledge that are generated.

- On an empirical level, is there a rural-urban divide in ethnographic fieldwork and knowledge production? Are there distinct urban forms of knowledge or a particular 'interdependence of minds, bodies and environments' (Marchand 2010) while researching the urban? How do we recognize, research and make meaning of intersubjective moments of encounter among urbanites or between them and the urban built environment? How can we access urban practices lived by others? What does this imply for approaching the urban through ethnography?
- On a conceptual level, how can we study embodied 'local' knowledge in the urban sphere? How can we as anthropologists relate to urban practices and their embodied forms of articulation or to what extent does the urban social structure shape urban practices or is shaped by it? How do we actually generate anthropological knowledge in and on cities? Which approaches are apt to decipher and interpret knowledge?
- On a political level: We would also like to raise questions of engagement and ethics, based on an imagination of the urban «as a complex terrain of politics situated within and between the multiple worlds of research and activism» (Oldfield 2014: 2077). When assuming that knowledge is about power (Foucault 1976), the city can be understood as a social field where different forms of urban knowledges, ranging from spatial specialists like urban planners and architects to politicians, grassroots urban movements and ordinary urban dwellers, compete with each other. How does knowledge produced by urban anthropologists interfere in such urban politics?

Friday, 13:30 – 15:00 / Library, Museum

Becoming Urban: Encounters of self and other

Till Förster (University of Basel)

Becoming Urban explores urban encounters between self and other in two West and Central African cities. Through the lens of two events – a hairdresser's studio that serves as a meeting point of the youth and a wedding in a suburban neighbourhood – I analyse the multifaceted body-space relationships of urban everyday life. Based on these autoethnographic vignettes, I trace how lived daily experiences of changing body-space relations affect the identity of the anthropologist and how these experiences slowly turn into habits that lead into an unconscious but intentional understanding of what kind of social space the city is. How does this 'embody' inform the anthropologist's conception of the city? How does it sediment in the anthropologist's own body? How do different urban 'embodies' relate to each other? And how do different embodies through their interaction constitute cultural and idiosyncratic elements of urban life? How do we as anthropologist weigh and judge such

embodied experiences?

Doing mobile ethnography

Monika Streule (ETH Zürich)

This paper explores and discusses the experimental, critical, and self-reflective use of differing methods in urban studies. In the context of frequent calls to investigate urban processes in a planetary and comparative perspective, the empirical groundedness of research is among the particularly complex challenges urban scholars are confronted with. The key question is: how can qualitative-empirical methods, like ethnography or qualitative mapping, be adapted to explore contemporary urban conditions. This paper seeks to contribute to current debates by introducing a specific methodological design of a mobile ethnography, in three main ways: first, by offering a theoretically informed and empirically grounded transductive research design, second, by proposing a complementary set of cartographic, historiographic and comparative methods of which mobile ethnography is a part of, and third, by suggesting post- and decolonial methodological perspectives, both conceptually by engaging with Latin American urbanisms, as well as empirically by furthering collaborative ways of knowledge production. To conclude, the paper stresses the need to continually develop new inventive methods for comparative urban research, for two main reasons: (1) to enable scholars to question established geographical representations and parochial imaginaries of urban space, and (2) to problematize methodological and theoretical dogmas with situated knowledge.

'Clínica peripatética' as sensuous way of urban knowledge making in Rio de Janeiro

Maria Lidola (University of Konstanz)

In the course of the 2000s, primary healthcare-based family clinics were established throughout Rio de Janeiro's favelas in order to guarantee the Brazilian Constitutional Right to Health, especially for vulnerable populations who haven't been addressed by medical coverage until then. The underlying social medicine approach of these family clinics does not only take the social embeddedness of these people into account, but also their socio-ecological environment, which is why medical staff is urged to attend the population primarily in their homes and local communities within the favelas. Home visits started to be considered as one of the most important accesses for local knowledge on health and well-being of people living in precarious urban areas, and walking in and across favelas became a main activity of the «clínica peripatética».

The paper discusses these home visits as temporary and emplaced intersubjective encounters, and as an embodied and sensuous form of making urban knowledge at the interface of urbanity and urbanization. In a first step, I will show, how different social backgrounds and embodied biographical knowledges of medical staff and local population shape these encounters and forms of urban experiencing and knowing. In a second step, I will look at these home visits from a methodological perspective as ethnographic tool of a sensuous scholarship by drawing on Ingold's approach on perceiving, tracing and knowing «lo urbano» through movements.

Making urban knowledge in a French School of Architecture

Claire Bullen and Nadja Monnet (Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Marseille)

If urban anthropologists are more used to treating architecture and the spatial organisation of the built form as an object of analysis, in France the split between in Schools of Art and Architecture at the end of the 1960s has meant that teaching the social sciences has become obligatory in Schools of Architecture. This has created an opening for a small number of anthropologists to teach alongside architectural colleagues. Their role is to offer an overview of anthropological tools and techniques and to encourage a more critical appreciation of the built environment. As part of a larger conversation about the purpose and potential of such transdisciplinary collaborations, we draw on observations from teaching anthropology in the School of Architecture in Marseille (ENSA-M). Feedback from students suggests that the introduction to anthropology has changed the ways in which they understand and, eventually, go on to design diverse cityscapes. Yet, the task is not easy. Teaching of anthropology within the institution of a sister discipline is inflected by unequal views about the values of different kinds of knowledge, with implications when it comes to the allocation of material and symbolic resources. ENSA-M offers an interesting entry point to explore intersecting forms of urban knowledge and power, as funding for teaching has been cut in order to pay for a new building, a flagship construction directly linked to efforts to on-going efforts to change Marseilles impoverished and ethnically-marked city-centre neighbourhoods and to reposition the city internationally. Drawing on ethnographic observations from students and colleagues in the school, this paper will first offer an analysis of the structural factors that affect how anthropological knowledge is transmitted, and then reflect upon how this 'encounter' between different ways of making, and different forms of exploring the human conditions can best be brokered (Ingold 2013; Vella and Brunfaut 2015).

'Let's Eat Them Together'. Food procurement practices of domination and resistance in the city of Athens.

Nafsika Papacharalampous (University of London)

This paper discusses how food procurement and practices of food sharing at times of crisis become political acts and how the horizons of the rural and the urban collapse. Athenian market spaces today are transforming and we witness the rising of a new urban shopping model.

More specifically, of the various grassroots solidarity initiatives in the city of Athens, this paper focuses on those relating to sourcing food, namely no-middle-men markets, as they offer an interesting lense through which to view the new formations of market spaces and the political foodways created in Athens. The no-middle men markets operating around the city challenge pre-existing capitalist structures. At the same time, they bring Athenians closer to nature and to the rural, by restoring the broken foodways between the country and the city. At times of crisis Athenians go back to practices of the past and to the comfort of the rural. As nature forms part of the Greek cosmology, the symbolic revival of foodways links to a re-affirmation of identity.

This way of understanding and dealing with the crisis manifests as well in the middle-upper class Athenians. These Athenians create their own political foodways forming networks of small neighbourhood clusters shops, in a new rising shopping model of sourcing food directly from/closer to nature which resembles the old ways of shopping. These become part of exonerating the rural and reaffirming Athenians' rural identities. In essence, these shops

operate in the same way the no middle-men markets operate, but in a different class sphere. Across class divides, the crisis has affected Athenians in similar ways: they tap into past practices and exonerate and celebrate the rural.

By researching all these movements described here this paper illustrates how across class divides, the rural-urban divide can collapse at moments of encounter of the rural in an urban context.

Introducing cooperative housing in Athens: engaged (and) anthropologist

Alexandros Papageorgiou (University of Thessaly)

In recent years, several initiatives that position themselves within the cooperative (or commons) movement in Greece try to draw from paradigms of successful relevant actions that have been implemented by organizations and initiatives abroad, mainly in Europe. In my PhD research I study the way this knowledge is transferred and 'translated' between contexts that differ from each other on many levels (political, economic, cultural). Since the ideological premise that informs such actions dictates a 'focus on locality', local conditions and needs must be given prominence and all the potentially beneficial knowledge coming from a different context must be adapted to attend to them.

However, most often these initiatives are not mobilized by the local communities themselves, but by experts who try to introduce concepts and practices to localities to whom these novelties could be meaningful. More specifically, the focus of my research is on the role of those researchers and activists who mediate knowledge within translocal networks of cooperation and who determine to a large degree the source, type and content of the knowledge that is transferred, as well as its ideological framework and the ways in which the transfer takes place.

Through my collaboration with a Zurich-based NGO, I have been working as an activist for projects of knowledge transfer, one of which is in the field of co-housing, from initiatives abroad to Greece. Hence, being member of a team of experts who try to find out how the first project of cooperative housing in Athens could be realized, I am at the same time part of the object of my study. While I participate as an engaged actor in the effort to study how the Zurich housing cooperatives model could inspire a similar endeavor in my native Athens, I also need to be a distanced anthropologist conducting fieldwork on myself, among others. The ethical and practical implications from my experience in this double role is what I would like to discuss.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 7

Knowledge of and in Elder Care: Anthropological Encounters with Care and Knowledge

Convenor: Piet van Eeuwijk (University of Basel / Zurich)

Care understood as both social practice and cultural concept is inherently interrelated to knowledge. Human care is a rich body of knowledge creation and of manifold knowledge manifestations. Knowledge shapes not only close kin care relations and care arrangements, but also professional competence and hierarchies in institutionalised care.

In elder care, knowledge – and in particular authoritarian biomedical expert knowledge –

correlates in ambivalent way with A) the experience-grounded and -driven lay knowledge of caregivers and care-receivers and B) the ethical knowledge of care as moral practice dealing with emotion, love, hope, fear, uncertainty, need and dependency. Care and knowledge in that sense represent this 'everyday' in mutual antagonism (Das 2010) where older persons in need of care and their carers try to gain control in their daily struggle for a 'good life'. Professional expertise and competence are powerful notions in care relations – such as the analysis of evident diagnostic results or the cognition of the efficacy of pharmaceuticals – and try to govern an appropriate 'science-based' elder care regime. But how about the ethics of elder care where chronification of diseases, immobilising frailty and disability, burdening dying and death and corresponding moral emotions are outside the realm of biomedical discourses and thus of scientific knowledge (Park & Akello 2017)?

Both in Global North and Global South, lay people are the main caregivers in elder care arrangements. Their lay or popular knowledge is created in a threefold agentic way – caregiving as past experience, as current application and as projection into the future – and reflects thus the notion of (idealized) care morality including social proximity, solidarity and interdependency. However, this lay elder care – whether established in kin, non-kin or mixed and inter-, intragenerational or combined care arrangements – is challenged by two major 'streams of expectation', namely the quest of older care-receivers A) for a comprehensive, yet more reliable and supportive psycho-emotional humane lay care, and at the same time B) for a stronger direct commitment of biomedicine for their impairments and by this the provision of a body-centred elder care based on medical expert knowledge. By means of authoritative, evidence-based medical knowledge which, however, transfers the responsibility for everyday (health) care to lay people, elder care experiences currently and globally an increasing medicalization through a scientific knowledge-based disciplining of both the elderly person in need of care and his/her lay caregiver(s) – but under exclusion of the moral perspectives of elder care.

Care embraces manifold practices which challenge conventional approaches of anthropological empirical methods. Many facets of elder care are invisible, incorporeal and nonverbal; elder care, moreover, encompasses both good and bad care that ranges from real compassion to negligence and abuse (Mol, Moser & Pols 2010). Not only pets, robots, smartphones, but also hospital nurses and medical technical devices provide direct elder care such as a life-prolonging dialyse machine (Mol 2008). Elder care is intrinsically associated with personal sensitivities and intimate occurrences – 'care realities' that are per se kept as undisclosed, unseen 'practices' within a strictly limited private, moral and also gendered space. Finally, elder care in institutions as well as formalized elder care represent not only a tough terrain for anthropological studies, but also a field of potential 'clash of knowledge' in particular between the varying carers. The issue of the researcher's positionality in these contested fields becomes a very challenging one.

In conclusion, we may raise some further questions emerging from above introduction. Whose knowledge counts in elder care? Is knowledge in care per se an antagonism to morality, ethics and also emotions and love in care? How does lay knowledge in care harmonize with professional and also institutionalized elder care provision? Does transfer of knowledge occur in elder care and, if yes, in which direction(s) and which kind of knowledge? Which knowledge is created in elder care relations? Who judges what the 'right' knowledge is in elder care? How do lay caregivers deal with expert knowledge (and vice versa)? How much is knowledge in elder care gendered? How can anthropology capture methodologically the many facets of elder care such as invisible, intimate phenomena and emotions or sensations? We invite papers which not only deal with these particular stated questions, but also go beyond them, whether in Global South or in Global North.

Keynote: Reciprocity: the soul of good care. Cross-cultural resemblances

Sjaak van der Geest (University of Amsterdam)

The tendency to stand 'eve' with others is a basic element in building and maintaining social relations, even in situations that seem clear examples of uneven relationships such as care for vulnerable people. This keynote will discuss this sometimes unlikely social 'law' with regard to care for older people in various cultures and conditions. Understanding the 'invisible hand' of reciprocity in family based care is a prominent example of 'knowledge of elder care'.

Les soignants et le soin relationnel en structure d'hébergement pour personnes âgées: quelles spécificités?

Pascale Beloni (University of Limoges)

Tous les pays vont relever des défis pour s'adapter au vieillissement notamment lorsque la dépendance aboutit à un placement en institution. Une étude épidémio-anthropologique menée en France dans dix maisons de retraite du Limousin et de l'Ile de La Réunion a permis d'identifier les spécificités du soin en institution pour personnes âgées et les savoirs qu'ils supposent. La relation est une de ces spécificités.

De fait, la relation soignant/soigné est basée sur des connaissances faisant appel au savoir-être pour créer un lien de confiance et faciliter l'intégration dans la structure. La relation est alors un « un soin de vie » qui a une fonction sociale (Collière 2001). Cette relation semble s'intégrer dans un temps à part, hors des tâches soignantes. Il s'agirait, selon les soignants, d'un « soin » impliquant un éclairage de savoirs particuliers.

Mais aussi, ce « soin de vie » se nourrirait de données socio-anthropologiques sur les résidents, partagés et perçus par les soignants comme un savoir utile à l'individualisation des soins. Ce partage est vécu comme un déclencheur d'intérêt du soignant pour la personne âgée donnant sens à la relation (subtilité de la pratique soignante, Hesbeen 2002). On remarque alors que la relation semble s'institutionnaliser sous le couvert de l'animation au sein des maisons de retraite.

Plus encore, cette relation s'inscrit dans la capacité du soignant à développer un « savoir éthique » relevant d'une disposition à agir selon ses valeurs personnelles et professionnelles pour rechercher la prise en charge la plus adaptée à la personne âgée. Dans ce contexte, certains discours de soignants sont de véritables dilemmes éthiques.

En conclusion, la situation en maison de retraite questionne pour les soignants, les compétences et l'expertise liées aux savoirs relationnels. Ce soin « invisible » et les savoirs qu'ils supposent ont toute leur importance en structure d'hébergement car il serait le socle en parti d'une socialisation réussie.

We are supposed to be doing silent reporting, but...

Hanna Marie Ihlebæk (Oslo Metropolitan University)

This article draws on an ethnographic study of knowledge and professionalism among nurses working in a Norwegian hospital cancer unit, exploring nursing handovers as situations for sharing of knowledge about the patients' complex needs of care. More specifically, the article investigates the apparent mismatch between the replacement of oral reporting

with computer-mediated documentation, referred to as 'silent reporting', introduced by the management to facilitate more efficient and effective alteration between shifts and ensure continuity in care, and the consistent prevalence of talk among the nurses. Drawing on perspectives from Barth on culture phenomena as knowledge, and Carr on enactment of expertise the paper argues that this shift represents a potential constraint on the articulation and sharing of certain types of knowledge, legitimising and reinforcing existing knowledge hierarchies in clinical practice. Adopting insights from research on the multifunctional role of handovers, and on accountability and autonomy in decision-making, allows for an investigation on how handovers involves multiple interactions with humans and non-humans in a clinical context, which is increasingly characterised by reliance on healthcare information technology and management control mechanisms. The main finding elaborated on is the incompatibility between the nurses evaluation of the formal requirements of the written report and the knowledge considered necessary to share in order to provide good medical care. Nuances, uncertainties and risks characterising both the explicit knowledge prone to documentation, and the subjective and embodied ways of knowing were considered inappropriate to document in the written report by the nurses. Thus, despite their acknowledgement of the utility of written documentation, and in opposition to management procedures the nurses continued to talk, as reflected in the often-uttered comment, «We are supposed to be doing silent reporting, but...»

Followed by a discussion.

Friday, 15:30 – 17:00 / Seminar Room, Museum

Music therapy improvisations in Northern Italy retirement homes: Modes of knowing as models of efficacy in care-giving settings

Leonardo Menegola (Associazione Nazionale Ecobiopsicologia Milano)

Basing on fourteen years fieldwork in retirement homes in Milan, Italy, in a double role as a Ph.D. medical anthropologist and a music therapist myself, this paper focuses on improvisation in «music therapy» (MT) practices in Northern Italy.

By analyzing interactions among music therapists and elderly clients suffering with physical and mental impairment, I focus on the ways in which non-verbal communication underpins forms of knowledge that are employed to construct the meaningfulness of therapy and its mechanisms of efficacy. Medical anthropological reflection follows, to understand how MT treatments embody particular conceptualizations of illness and care, and how they tend to vest patients with a particular kind of agency and personhood.

What kind of knowledges is MT based on - both as a social and historical phenomenon, and as an object of ethnographic research? How can the ethnographic representation of MT treatments draw on «somatic modes of attention» (Csordas 1993) in order to analyse how the interactions between music therapists and patients organize the meaning itself of the therapy? How the improvisational soundscapes (Kheshti 2009) shared by the therapist and the patient rely on specific codifications of feelings and performative formations (configurations) of sensoriality, which raise «another sense», or «other senses» in the work of therapy? By answering these questions, the paper shows that the «sense of healing» in MT is based on particular politics of personhood and the Self, which in their turn are based on particular kinds of interactions carried out in MT sessions. Finally, epistemological and methodological concerns are addressed on the difficulties and challenges of the music therapist-ethnographer double role, and on how the forms of sensorial, performative, non-verbal knowledge music therapy builds on can raise significant questions on the gnoseological status of an

anthropology of and through the senses (Stoller 1997, Classen 1997).

Doing 'Mediterranean' care in Swiss nursing homes: what kinds of knowledge do professional carers need?

Eva Soom Ammann (University of Applied Sciences Bern)

The proposed paper is building on a recently published paper (Soom Ammann, Rauber & Salis Gross, 2018, published in *Mortality*) describing the care practices of a nursing home ward offering specific services to former 'guest-workers' of Mediterranean migrant origin within a mainstream nursing home in Switzerland. Based on ethnographic data from a research project on nursing home end-of-life care in a pluralised society, it focused on how 'Mediterranean' care is 'done' by professional carers compared to standard care in nursing homes. 'Doing Mediterranean-ness' is, as has been shown, characterised by 'performing sameness/otherness', 'staging family' and 'achieving understanding'. Regarding nursing practices, the most prominent characteristic is an increased performance of informality in carer/cared-for relationships. With respect to knowledge on elder care, practices on the Mediterranean ward are of interest regarding the fact that carers working on this ward are supposed to provide not only the usual competencies of professional long-term nursing care, but also to have language competencies as well as 'cultural knowledge' on a supposed Mediterranean way of life. Ideally, care workers are also expected to bring along 'biographical knowledge' in the sense of sharing migrant experiences with the residents. Ethnographic data on how care is adapted to being 'Mediterranean', however, points to the fact that the notion of adequate 'cultural' or 'biographical' knowledge qualifying professional carers to provide 'Mediterranean' care is a tricky endeavour when it comes to concrete practices of care, especially in the context of organizational constraints and severe staff shortages in old-age long-term care.

Cultivating A Culture of Care

Susan Riva-Mossman (Creighton University)

Action research projects can engender hopeful healthy aging, crafting platforms adaptable to demographic and ecological change in vulnerable Alpine regions. Socially sustainable Alpine wellness engendering flourishing Alpine communities requires the support of communal authorities willing to give a legitimate place to participatory research endeavors. The case study of the Commune de Bagnes in Valais demonstrates how communal authorities, organizations like Pro Senectute, local stakeholders, as well as academic facilitators come together to co-construct collaborative interfaces. Participatory research methods elicited a 'dream of the future', where resilient communities and social innovation are enkindled through participatory governance initiatives. This example illustrates how a Culture of Care can be fostered in relation to hopeful healthy aging.

Care and support of older people in the Netherlands who want to die because they consider their life 'completed': Conflicting views and knowledge claims

Els van Wijngaarden (University of Humanistic Studies Utrecht), Priya Satalkar (University of Basel) and Sjaak van der Geest (University of Amsterdam)

A small proportion of older people in the Netherlands wish to end their life because they feel it is 'completed'. Supporting them in making the right decision and achieving a dignified voluntary death is a form of elderly care. But that care is a contested and murky issue, full of contradictions and conflicts, as is the case in several other care practices in the face

of life and death. In the case of euthanasia on the ground of fatigue there are mainly three 'parties' that tend to have radically different ideas about this type of voluntary death, which may turn the final years of these older people into a confusing and painful period. The three parties are the older people, their children and other loved ones and medical professionals.

For the older people who do not want to live any longer life has lost its attraction; they feel out of place in the present world and are tired of living. They long for peace and rest. They claim to be the only ones with a proper understanding of their death wish because they are the ones who feel the pain and uselessness of a completed life. On the basis of that knowledge they expect support and care from their children and others who are close to them.

Children, other relatives and friends react in various ways; children in particular are likely to oppose their parents' plans and try to make them change their minds. One of their arguments is that they and the grandchildren love them and do not want to lose them. They may even accuse them of choosing a selfish solution for their fatigue and being unwilling to look for other solutions.

Medical professionals, who are the gate-keepers and executors of euthanasia according to Dutch legislation, have the final say in judging the motives of people who request euthanasia. Although doctors recognize and respect the personal reasons of older people in their wish for voluntary death, they also believe that their motives may not be well-considered or serious enough to legitimize euthanasia. Alternative solutions could still be considered.

This clash of knowledge claims has confounded personal cases of older people's death wishes as well as public, political and legislative debates.

The paper is based on qualitative researches by Van Wijngaarden among older people who have reached the stage of voluntary death and by Satalkar among supporters of 'completed life' euthanasia.

Followed by a discussion.

Panel 8

'The Curatorial Challenge - Ethnographic Museum curators' knowledge production between museum and collections, academia and the public'

Convenors: Mareile Flitsch (University of Zurich) and Guenther Giovannoni (Museo delle Culture Lugano)

The panel aims at focussing on the current situation of a particular predicament of curators in ethnographic museums. The everyday work of curators as well as their exhibitional output is constantly challenged by theoretical discourses (currently for ex. «the figure of the curator») on the one hand and a lack of practice oriented research on ethnographic collections and exhibiting, of object analysis, on the translation of ethic or museological standards into museum practice of publishing, preservation and display, on the other hand.

More than a hundred years after the opening of ethnographic museums in Europe, most of the modern anthropological museums have today radically changed their way of doing research and presenting their results to the public through a new museography. National and international collaboration networks between museums are leading to a noticeable improvement of the available work tools for curators. Those specific tools are the result of different factors, such as the transfer of knowledge, the different perspectives and opinions

of the different actors involved, improving negotiation and exchange processes between the partners and, lastly, the diverse ways and roles of modern communication and new media.

Even though each museum is distinguished by a peculiar cultural, economic and political environment and reflects different structural situations, there is something that unites a great part of modern anthropological museums. Ideally, the curator's work, under the supervision of a forward-looking direction, is today characterized by a careful and scientifically rigorous research, aimed at the production of knowledge. This is then transmitted to the public, both through exhibitions and catalogues, and through other forms of communication. The heterogeneity and intrinsic complexity of the collections as well as of the themes of anthropological relevance that are addressed through these, though, not only require from the curators an adequate academic preparation, but also an ongoing evaluation of new maturity of analysis. This allows the development of new insights on the collections, calls into question the tools and processes used for work within museums, and pushes the curators to compare them with those of other professionals.

Despite promising premises, the feeling among museum curators is that sometimes the work undertaken within museums is not given the right value. It becomes increasingly difficult to apply for funding and museum curators are aware that funding tools for research in museums are yet few. Thus while the importance given to research in museums is increasing, the necessary funding opportunities for such research are not. Is the old span between museums and university on the subject of validation of knowledge production still persisting?

And finally, how about the public? Can museum audiences satisfy their expectations of knowledge by visiting anthropological museum exhibitions? What are the experiences and best practices that are made by curators in ethnographic museums today?

The panel aims at highlighting curators' strategies of social anthropology knowledge production within museums, nationally and internationally, and beyond the discipline to the public. Which kinds of curator formations do we need at universities? Which kind of trans-professional and transnational dialogue proved to be promising? And how about funding?

Friday, 09:00 – 10:30 / Seminar Room, Museum

Impulse lecture: The academia-museum-public-research-relation: About some current challenges of curatorial work in ethnographic museums

Mareile Flitsch (University of Zurich)

Participatory museum research

Samuel Bachmann and Alban von Stockhausen (Bernisches Historisches Museum)

According to the ICOM definition of a museum, research is one of its major functions, besides collecting, preserving, publishing and exhibiting (im)material heritage. However, most museums do not have the necessary resources anymore, required to undertake serious research in connection with their collections. Knowledge production is outsourced to representatives from academia, who are willing to engage in research on particular collections. Budgetary items dedicated to curator's research, are cut back and replaced with items focusing rather on the more immediate and less sustainable, publicly visible outcomes of museum work, such as exhibitions, popular publications and outreach activities. The scientific function of the museum becomes reduced to its role as an archive of material culture and its

social function is economised to the mediation of knowledge – produced by others – to the broader public.

At the same time and in line with this transformation, many of the new concepts of museum work are related to paradigm of (visitor) 'participation'. Seemingly 'low-threshold' interactions aim at making sure that while 'academic' knowledge continues to be transmitted to the public, the knowledge produced by the public is also taken into account. Often neglected in this policy-turn is the fact that the ethnographic research method itself, especially in regard to museum collections, has a strong participatory share and potential. This holds not only for the collecting of knowledge provided by the public, the research within specific source communities, but also regarding the dependency of research on public and private partners. Based on an analysis of historical and contemporary strategies of knowledge production in museums, the presentation argues that «research» and «participation» do not exclude but enrich each other. The discussion is opened, of how a concept of «participatory museum research» can become an essential element of ethnographic curatorial practice.

More than objects. Connecting collections and people: The curatorial challenge at the Oceania department of MEG

Roberta Colombo Dougoud (Musée d'ethnographie de Genève)

Most collections housed in Ethnographic museums have been gathered in the last two centuries with the underlining conception to bring together the material heritage of colonized peoples that were considered as vanishing. Museums set themselves the task of preserving, documenting, studying, and exhibiting the material culture of the «Other» for the future. As a matter of fact, collections conservation is the *raison d'être* of a museum. Nevertheless, objects are not only «things» made out of different materials: they are tangible materialisations of values, meanings, and interpretations, which were created, exchanged and consumed. Connecting collections and people becomes then a challenge for museum curators opening a wide range of researches and collaborations.

In my paper I shall present some experiences coming from three exhibitions I curated at MEG (Ethnographic Museum in Geneva) *Bambous kanak*, *Traces de rêves* and *L'effet boomerang*, focusing on the collaboration with source communities and contemporary artists to connect collections and people.

Friday, 11:00 – 12:30 / Seminar Room, Museum

Museums, universities and private foundations of public interest: Governance alternatives for a better integration between institutions and optimal participation of funding

Guenter Giovannoni (Museo delle Culture Lugano)

The governance of museums is increasingly entrusted to private foundations. They must have at heart not only the conservation, the research, the valorisation and the communication of the heritage formed by their museum's collections, but also a sustainable economic management and a fruitful and virtuous relationship between the museums and other local institutions, including universities.

In these perspectives, can a private foundation of public interest be a valid solution for a healthy growth of museums? The example of the *Fondazione cultura e musei* in Lugano.

Followed by a discussion

Ways of Knowing in the Anthropology of Human-Animal Relations

Convenors: Irina Wenk (University of Basel) and Raphael Schwere (University of Zurich)

What and how can we know with animals? With the arrival of the «animal turn» in anthropology, questions about ways of knowledge production, this time across species barriers, and ways of understanding «others» have come to the forefront of the discipline (again).

As a branch of the ontological turn influenced by post-humanist thinking, the animal turn in anthropology calls for conceptualizations of society and of social phenomena that include other-than-human animals and overcome dearly held dichotomies of culture versus nature and of humans versus animals (Hurn 2014; Wenk 2016). An anthropology that moves beyond the human recognizes the fundamental premise that there is no human life without other animals and that no society exists that «can be prefixed by the name of a species» (Ingold 2013, 19f.). What we find instead are communities of animate beings that are principally hybrid in their species composition, where meaning, interests, and affects are shared (Ingold 2013) and lives entangled in a myriad of complex ways.

Once we begin to recognize that all forms of social and cultural life are decisively shaped by social actors other than humans, we realize that the social goes beyond one species. As anthropologists interested in human-animal relations, we are only beginning to understand what constitutes the social beyond humankind while setting out to explore principles of sociality by including animals as active participants in anthropological fieldwork.

In this panel we want to explore how anthropologists can make sense of the complex inter-subjective entanglements that make meaningful lives possible. We analyze how anthropological knowledge and the ways of its production are being transformed by the inclusion of animals in what may be called a post-anthropocentric anthropological practice or an anthropology beyond humanity (Ingold 2013).

We seek contributions that empirically, methodologically, and theoretically engage with human-animal lives and relationships. Our first objective is to attract contributions that examine how these entanglements produce ways of knowing, learning, and becoming, and what thinking with and through animals means. We are looking for contributions that consider some of the following sets of questions:

1. How is anthropological knowledge produced about and with animals? How is it stored, exchanged, distributed, exploited, negotiated and transformed on both sides of this relationship? Or, in other words, how do animals and humans co-produce knowledge in co-constituted social and cultural contact zones (Haraway 2008)?
2. How can we approach the animal turn's consequential epistemological and methodological «problem of 'knowledge'»? And how can animals be integrated into anthropological research as subjects with individual experiences and as sources of knowledge?

Our second objective is to launch the Swiss Network of Anthropologists Working on Human-Animal Relations. Doing so, we want to gain an overview over work being done in this growing subfield in Switzerland and provide a platform for future research and fruitful exchange under the SEG that helps make this world a better place for both humans and non-human animals.

Part 1 – Animals and Experts

Keynote: Be(a)ware of the dog: The animal turn(ing) and the evolution of anthropology

Samantha Hurn (University of Exeter)

The 'animal turn' has facilitated the widespread recognition that nonhuman animals play active roles in all aspects of human social lives. However, we are still grappling with the theoretical, methodological and ethical implications of these inextricable entanglements – the wheels of the animal turn are still turning. The paper will attempt to make some sense of (i) what it means for anthropologists to live and work with other-than-human beings in the contemporary world, and discuss (ii) why taking nonhuman interlocutors seriously is important for the 'evolution' of anthropology as an academic discipline. The paper will be illustrated with a series of ethnographic vignettes from fieldwork conducted with individual members of diverse cultural and taxonomic groups. These include (amongst others) stray dogs and animal rights activists in Romania, baboons and conservationists in South Africa, and captive elephants and their keepers in the UK.

Beekeeping practices as an expression of the human bee relationship: An approach to investigate the interaction of different actors in Swiss beekeeping

Karin von Niederhäusern (University of Zurich)

The focal point of this paper is to provide an ethnographic perspective on the relation between honey bees and humans in the environment of hobby beekeeping in Switzerland. It explores which mental models of human-animal relations guide Swiss beekeepers in their activities and how those models are reflected in the beekeeping practices they apply. It is assumed that these practices influence the behavior of honey bee colonies in such a way that they induce indirect interactions between beekeeper and bee colony. In analyzing how these two very different beings communicate, the element of beekeeping practice – added as a third actor – will serve firstly to bridge the human-animal distance and secondly to observe and assess the aforementioned indirect interactions between beekeeper and bee colony. The model derived from these considerations, describing human-practice-animal relations, serves as an instrument for the analysis of human-bee relations based on empirical data from participant observation and interviews with Swiss apiculturists. The goal of this paper is to reveal the benefits of formulating a new area of research focused on the interrelations between humans, bees, and apicultural practices.

Knowledge about working equines: The dominance of naturalism in a British animal hospital in Egypt

Jenny Nerlich (University of Bern)

In social sciences, the relationships between humans and working equines has been widely neglected despite the fact that charity organisations like «The Brooke» call attention to the often miserable conditions of working equines, for instance in the Middle East. Equines work mainly in transport and often suffer from malnutrition or lameness. For my master thesis, I conducted fieldwork in a British animal clinic in Egypt. I analysed the transmission of knowledge and experiences between Egyptian veterinarians (vets) and owners of working equines. The clinic offers free medical treatment for working animals, mainly donkeys and horses, and furthermore fosters the education of animal owners provided by vets. One aspect of this education is the imparting of scientific-based knowledge and the perception

that animals are sensitive beings. By contrast, most local medical treatments, for instance «firing», are strongly rejected by the vets. «Firing» is a local method of burning hot metal sticks on the legs of the equine to stimulate the appetite or strengthen the animal. I suppose that the method of «firing» indicates an analogistic worldview of the animal owners. In my presentation, I will focus on one certain aspect of my master thesis: Based on Descolas (2011) model of ontologies, I argue that the understanding of scientific or naturalistic knowledge as solely correct and effective stems from a fundamental ignorance and misunderstanding of the ontology of the animal owner and therefore of their knowledge and experiences. Although observations of the owners are required to diagnose diseases, knowledge is basically transmitted in one direction from vets to animal owners. Thus, a naturalistic hegemony regarding knowledge and animal perceptions is perpetuated within the clinic.

Thursday, 14:00 – 16:00 / KO2-F-156, Main Building

The skilled vision of camel experts and Somaliland's transition to postdomesticity: Preliminary results of an ethnocamelological study

Raphael Schwere (University of Zurich)

While in humanities and social sciences much has been written about the economic value and cultural importance of camels in Somali territories, few academics scrutinized the nature of direct camel-human encounters: What happens when man and animal initiate contact, interact, establish a relationship, depend on and form each other's lives? Companion animals are «partners in the crime of human evolution» (Haraway), which, I argue, holds true for Somaliland's camels. Humans and camels strode jointly through time and space, through environmental, politico-economic and socio-cultural events and transformations.

Somalilanders directly encountering camels on a regular basis demonstrate elaborate abilities in looking at camels. In this paper, I will try to shed light upon the «skilled vision» (Grasseni) of different actors appraising needs, constitution, worth, etc. of camels. I will present data about the respective skills of camel herders, traders and butchers and put hypotheses about the transformation of these abilities and human-camel relations in general forward for discussion.

The presented material was collected in an ongoing anthropological PhD research project about changing skills of camel experts in Somaliland, for which I follow herders, trade middlemen, butchers and chefs as they raise, broker, butcher, and prepare camels for consumption.

Maternity experience and the fluffy sibling: Relationships with dogs and cats in the post-natal period, a moral challenge for parents and midwives

Patricia Perrenoud (Haute Ecole de Santé Vaud)

While in humanities and social sciences much has been written about the economic value and cultural importance of camels in Somali territories, few academics scrutinized the nature of direct camel-human encounters: What happens when man and animal initiate contact, interact, establish a relationship, depend on and form each other's lives? Companion animals are «partners in the crime of human evolution» (Haraway), which, I argue, holds true for Somaliland's camels. Humans and camels strode jointly through time and space, through environmental, politico-economic and socio-cultural events and transformations.

Somalilanders directly encountering camels on a regular basis demonstrate elaborate abilities in looking at camels. In this paper, I will try to shed light upon the «skilled vision»

(Grasseni) of different actors appraising needs, constitution, worth, etc. of camels. I will present data about the respective skills of camel herders, traders and butchers and put hypotheses about the transformation of these abilities and human-camel relations in general forward for discussion.

The presented material was collected in an ongoing anthropological PhD research project about changing skills of camel experts in Somaliland, for which I follow herders, trade middlemen, butchers and chefs as they raise, broker, butcher, and prepare camels for consumption.

Followed by a discussion.

Part 2 – Tensions, Moralities, Entanglements

Before consumption: Ambiguous moralities and equine liminality in European horse (meat) production

Irina Wenk (University of Exeter)

This paper presents insights from a recently started post-doc project, which explores the ambiguous moralities that bind young horses' fates to practices of horse breeding, horse trading and rescuing. Every autumn, hundreds of thousands of foals are presented at horse markets and auctions and increasingly now on the Internet. They are for sale to the highest bidder. During those weeks in autumn, foals enter a state of liminality. Those deemed most likely to embody desirable breed-specific traits will be retained to enter future breeding programs; all others are disposed of, mostly turned into meat. In those few weeks between weaning, market and slaughter, some foals get a chance of being rescued.

The presented research explores what this annual conjuncture of possible life or imminent death signifies for individual horses, for human actors involved, and for the horse (meat) production system at large. Socio-hippography considers equine being as the starting point from which to explore more-than-human communities as networks of agentive individuals entangled in complex social relations. The approach integrates equine existence and experience into the complex fabric of human sociality, moves beyond anthropocentrism, and foregrounds the experiences of nonhuman equine informants through embodied communication and the documentation of equine biographical narratives. Fieldwork is carried out primarily in Austria, where a cohort of foals is followed over the period of two years from birth to sale to possible rescue. Socio-hippography combines anthropological research methods, ethnography, ethics, and biography with hippological knowledge and practice.

Reflecting on socio-hippography as a means for human- and animal-informed knowledge production and exchange, the paper touches upon the politics of rare breed conservation, horse (meat) production, animal rights activism, and the lived experiences of horses as liminal beings in the contemporary world.

Wolves, livestock guardian dogs and the multispecific co-production of the natural. A case study from Switzerland

Nikolaus Heinzer (University of Zurich)

The return of wolves to Switzerland causes many uncertainties and negotiations. By crossing physical and non-physical borders wolves act upon society by subverting given categories, spaces and identities. When asking what wolves do with Swiss society and what society does with the wolves (Frank and Heinzer 2017) we learn a lot about this society and its inter-

actions with an animal that with its elusive and infiltrating character embodies a challenging and ambiguous notion of Nature.

In this paper, I want to focus on a specific set of non-human actors in the wolf field and have a closer look at the multispecific landscapes (Tsing 2012) in which these are entangled with humans. For this, I engage with livestock guardian dogs (LGDs) and their relations to breeders and owners, to hikers and bikers as well as to sheep, herding dogs, game animals and wolves. This confronts us with a «co-constituted social and cultural contact zone (Haraway 2008)» in which multispecific actors co-produce knowledge about dog breeding, herd guarding and effectively protecting livestock from wolf attacks, but also about naturalness, authenticity and social compatibility. LGDs are very interesting actors to look at because they represent the merging of the idea of an archaic instinctive being and the complex requirements of a complex society. LGDs, thus, reflect the hybrid conceptualisation of Nature and Culture in contemporary Switzerland. Wolves and LGDs help bring to the fore (multispecific) social negotiations of the concepts of Nature and Culture, negotiations in which they themselves display remarkable agencies.

The paper is based on ethnographic research material collected for the author's doctoral thesis.

Followed by a discussion.

INFORMATION

Venue

November 22
General assembly and panels

KO2

University of Zurich
Karl-Schmid-Strasse 4
8006 Zurich
Room KO2-F-152
Room KO2-F-151
Room KO2-F-156
Room KO2-F-157

KOL

University of Zurich
Rämistrasse 71
8006 Zurich
Room KOL-N-1

November 22
Keynote and roundtable

RAI

University of Zurich
Rämistrasse 74
8001 Zurich
Room RAI-H-041

November 23

PEA

University of Zurich
Ethnographic Museum
Pelikanstrasse 40
8001 Zurich



Internet

To connect to the internet, please use the following link <http://t.uzh.ch/coa> and register with the event ID: 18SSA2896

How to get there

Reaching the Main Building (Hauptgebäude) by Public Transport

From Zurich main station: take tram 6 in the direction of «Zoo» from «Zürich, Bahnhofstrasse/HB» to the stop «ETH/Universitätsspital.» Or take tram 10 in the direction of «Zürich Flughafen, Fracht» from «Zürich Bahnhofplatz/HB» to «ETH/Universitätsspital». From there it is a short walk to the main building.

Reaching the Ethnographic Museum (Völkerkundemuseum) by Public Transport

From Zurich main station: take tram 6, 7, 11 or 13 from «Zürich, Bahnhofstrasse/HB» to the stop «Rennweg». Walk to the Pavillon Sculpture between the stations «Rennweg» and «Paradeplatz» and turn to the right. Follow Pelikanstrasse until you reach the entrance of the museum.

Reaching Zurich Main Station (Hauptbahnhof) from Zurich Airport (Flughafen)

There are trains every few minutes from Zurich Airport to Zurich Main Station. The travel time is about 12 minutes. Please check the timetable on the SBB website.

Reaching the restaurant «Karl der Grosse» from the Main Building (Hauptgebäude)

From «Kantonsschule» take tram 5 (direction «Laubegg») or 9 (direction «Triemli») until «Bellevue». From there walk along the river Limmat until you reach Kirchgasse. Turn to the right and walk to Kirchgasse 14, next to the Grossmünster.

Registration

Deadline for online registration: 01.11.2018

On-site registration: Thursday, 8:00-17:00 in room KO2-F-157, Main Building

Please note that an additional fee of 10 CHF will be charged for registration and payment on site. It is also required that you pay the exact amount in cash and Swiss Francs.

For more information

<https://www.isek.uzh.ch/en/anthropology/events/seg-conference.html>

<http://www.sagw.ch/seg/colloques.html>

Organizers

Sandra Bärnreuther (UZH)

Annuska Derks (UZH)

Olivia Killias (UZH)

Johannes Quack (UZH)

Barbara Waldis (HEVS)



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



Universität
Zürich^{UZH}

Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
Académie suisse des sciences humaines et sociales
Accademia svizzera di scienze umane e sociali
Accademia svizra da ciencias umanas e socialas
Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences

