

Wittgenstein Prize (Z49-G06)

Final Report about Funding (Excerpts)

(2000- 2007)

Andre Gingrich

Host Research Institution:

Austrian Academy of Sciences (AAS)/ Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Commission for Social Anthropology (CSA)
(since 2009: Institute for Social Anthropology/ISA)

This report was submitted to the ASF on: 06/22/2007

1. Short Version

One of the two Wittgenstein Prizes 2000 was given to anthropologist Andre Gingrich (University of Vienna and Austrian Academy of Sciences, AAS). This provided the basis for the research project 'Local Identities and Wider Influences' at the AAS (2001–2007) and the project's cooperation with other research partners. The guiding research question addressed the modalities of interaction between local cultural identities and wider influences. Inspired by anthropological works by Eric Wolf, Marshall Sahlins, and Marilyn Strathern, the central research hypothesis proposed that these modalities might take on the three different forms of seclusion, participation, and dissolution – which would then combine in various ways. Three spheres were chosen for empirical testing: socio-religious interactions in Muslim North Africa and Western Asia, cultural and legal claims in eastern and western arenas of post-Communist European transformations, and, third, ritualised forms of village life in Buddhist Central Asia. In methodological terms, new procedures of ethnographic fieldwork were combined with the analysis of past and present textual evidence and with systematic comparison. Doctoral students from the University of Vienna and a central coordination team carried out the project, whose methodological reflexivity was further enhanced by studies in the field's history and through an ASF/FWF 'translational' project.

The Wittgenstein project promoted the completion of twelve doctoral theses, nine magisterial theses, and two habilitation ('second book') projects. By 2007, almost one third (five) of the younger participating researchers had earned junior scholar awards. The project's bibliographic output amounts to more than twenty major research book publications in North America and Europe, and more than 150 academic articles and reports. On an institutional level, the AAS upgraded the core group of researchers into the present 'Social Anthropology Research Unit' with its wide network of cooperation. The project's main results concern the diversity of globalisation, which elaborates previous findings by Ulf Hannerz, Arjun Appadurai, and others: political seclusion and economic stagnation thus may endanger increasing 'participation' in some parts of Eastern and Central Europe. By contrast, some Buddhist cultures of Central Asia are struggling more intensely with tendencies towards dissolution at their margins. Finally, the Muslim Middle East's tendency towards a combination of

economic participation with religious seclusion represents the greatest paradox in this regard.

2. Report

2.1. Report on academic research (within the framework of this prize)

By way of introduction, I take the liberty of directing my readers' attention towards the brochure 'Local Identities and Wider Influences: Spotlights, Orientations and Results of the Wittgenstein Research Project in Social and Cultural Anthropology 2001–2007'. Published in March 2007, this brochure came out at the end of this project in an edition of 1,000 copies to offer some insights into project results for a wider readership, such as journalists, science politicians, practitioners, and other interested key persons. Readers of the present report also may find it useful to consult the brochure as additional illustration and as documentary evidence.

- **Development of 'Wittgenstein 2000' research activities**

The news that I had received the Wittgenstein Award, as the then second representative of Austria's humanities and the social sciences after Ruth Wodak, reached me just as I had arrived at a particular kind of crossroads in biographical and professional terms. Biographically, my social and institutional ties to the English-speaking world (I am a US and Austrian dual citizen) had been evolving to such a level that I was about to move either to a US or a UK university. Several attractive possibilities were at hand, while at the same time I had become largely disillusioned about the state of the social sciences and the humanities in the German-speaking countries, and about the opportunities they still might have to offer mid-career and senior academic representatives. Professionally, I felt that an idealistic and somewhat romantic deconstructivism had gained far too much influence in the German-speaking countries, while it was already retreating in the Anglophone world.

- *Research design*

Basically, in the summer of 2000 the Wittgenstein Prize thus persuaded me to stay on in Vienna and to use this budget for two interrelated goals. One, establishing a research project of five years' or more duration, primarily with local junior scholars from my own field in such a way that it would meet European and international standards; two, to install that project in an institutional space and context that would

allow 'sustained development' for those in the team, who would achieve excellent results. With regard to these academic goals, it seemed obvious at the turn of the century/millennium that *two general themes* would continue to inspire theoretical and conceptual debates in the humanities and social sciences during the decade to come, namely those focused on *globalisation*, and those about *identities*.

Developments since then have in fact confirmed this assessment: almost seven years later, any major debate in this field has to refer to globalisation in one way or the other, and in 2004 historian Walter Pohl as the next Wittgenstein Prize winner from the humanities also included 'identity' in the main programme title of his own Wittgenstein research project.

On the basis of this general decision about the project's thematic orientations, the next steps were the formulation of a set of overarching research questions and related hypotheses, and linking those to appropriate fields of empirical enquiry, methodologies, forms of analysis and interpretation. While these had to be identified and elaborated, they also had to be embedded in an overarching research design. The *overall research design* thus envisioned a major team effort of international standards, by which a larger number of gifted local junior anthropologists would cooperate with a small number of senior project directors within a strong international academic network on questions of globalisation and identity in the past and present. In line with the prize winner's own fields of regional expertise, and corresponding to some of the main competencies in local anthropology, the regional empirical sites in this overall research design were defined as the Arab-speaking Middle East, Central and Eastern Europe, and Buddhist/Tibetan regions of Central Asia.

- *Guiding research question*

Quite a number of authors have already made the valid point that in the social sciences and humanities, one always has to live with a certain amount of structural paradigmatic pluralism. In fact, there is hardly any period in the history of these academic fields in which one single, encompassing paradigm has completely dominated any sub-field as such. In broad terms, the social sciences and humanities of Continental Europe at the turn of the century/millennium thus could be characterised, on the one hand, by the belated tides of a heterogeneous

deconstructivism, and, on the other hand, by various brands of a 'new realism' that were still a minority orientation.

In some of my previous writings, I have criticised several elements of post-modern deconstructivism in so far as they represented varieties of old-fashioned idealistic romanticism, while simultaneously I appreciated the self-reflexive and critical innovation that other elements of post-modernism seemed to bring about. Within the minority versions of a new realism, I was sceptical about any return to the paradigms of an exclusively quantitative positivism, but supported such forms of realism that would strive to combine empirical precision with 'soft' forms of universalism. These were the epistemological orientations that had inspired me through the works of those anthropological authors who had been most influential for my own work, i.e. Marshall Sahlins, Eric Wolf, Arjun Appadurai, and, to a lesser degree, Maurice Godelier and Marilyn Strathern. Out of such an epistemological orientation and in view of an evolving research design as outlined above, the guiding research question was formulated: **'How do local identities interact with wider influences?'**

Translated into its most simplified form, this research question asked to what extent wider and global influences actually 'shaped and moulded' local systems, as Eric Wolf had demonstrated (1982); to what extent these open, local cultural systems actually managed to maintain dynamisms of their own, as Sahlins (1999) and Godelier (1991) had argued and, in fact, had shown; and what role personal and group agency played in both, as Strathern (2004) had illustrated.

From the outset, that research question was thus associated with a dense set of defining concepts and working definitions, which either referred to the existing body of literature, or which were further elaborated and published in the course of this project. Following Appadurai's notions (1996) of globalised 'deterritorialisation', the concept of 'local/locality' thus was not seen as a stable container, but as a processual and interactive spatial sphere. In line with Sahlins and Strathern, 'identity' was not seen as an individualistic or biographical term, but rather was perceived as a gendered cultural and social concept. Finally, Wolf's and Godelier's work oriented the working definition of 'wider influences'. In this sense, earlier phases of globalisation were seen as having already set in, ever since 1492. Accordingly, the common

usage of the term merely referred to the most recent and most complex phase of a much more profound process (Gingrich 2003).

In the sense of these defining concepts and working definitions, the project's guiding research question thus was to address specific arenas in the past and present of the Middle East, of Central and Eastern Europe, and of Tibetan-speaking and/or Buddhist Central Asia. By way of pursuing the more productive side of post-modern self-reflexivity, these empirical ethnographic tasks were to be combined with a continuous reassessment of the discipline's conceptual tools in the present and in the field's history.

- *Establishing institutional space*

In several ways, deliberately recruiting a large team of *local junior* researchers represented a radical step that corresponded to my assessment of where any real potential was hidden. Team efforts were to be promoted within an academic culture that until quite recently had privileged little else but individualism; very young scholars in academic anthropology from Vienna would have to go through an intense, collaborative but simultaneously competitive international academic experience. Recruitment took place exclusively by personal invitation, based on biographical career assessments and their matching with the overall research design. (It goes without saying that as with many other Wittgenstein projects, initial jealousies flared up among those who felt 'left out'.) Initially most junior scholars were offered contracts of between one and three years' duration, with the accompanying offer that their career would receive further mentoring in one way or another if the contract were successfully fulfilled. In my own assessment, almost 90 per cent of these junior scholars have more than lived up to this project's requirements and my own hopes for and expectations of them. If it was a radically innovative experiment in recruitment for the humanities and social sciences, then it worked very well indeed. Three senior researchers were hired (two as my deputy directors), who assisted me in the continuous process of monitoring, coordinating, and directing.

Among several options available for this project's institutional installation, preference was given to setting up this Wittgenstein project at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (AAS). In fact, at the time of writing this report, it now seems to be no coincidence at

all that with Ruth Wodak before me and Walter Pohl after me, all three Wittgenstein projects from the social sciences/humanities to date went for the Academy option, and refrained from other options such as universities or academic societies. The AAS is a very prestigious academic institution in general, but, in addition, to date it continues to offer the possibility of tenure-track positions for scholars, whereas this normal international career option was, regrettably, largely abolished for all Austrian universities in 2002. This was already foreseeable in 2000, and so my choice was an obvious one.¹ Chances for any ‘sustained development’ that might result from my Wittgenstein project thus could be optimised at the AAS, while they were soon to be minimised at the universities. As a “corresponding member” of the AAS since 1998, I therefore submitted a proposal which the AAS philosophical and historical section accepted in November 2000: as of 01.01.2001 the Wittgenstein project ‘Local Identities and Wider Influences’ was installed at the AAS’s Commission for Social Anthropology (CSA).

- *Changes in disciplinary and transdisciplinary realms*

During the early years, two very different sets of events brought about changes of varying significance for those disciplinary and transdisciplinary fields that were of central relevance for this Wittgenstein project.

Of these two events, the circumstances by which Ruth Wodak’s Wittgenstein project was concluded are too complex a matter to be discussed here in any sufficient detail. Admittedly, they were on a smaller and mostly local scale, and their knock-on effect on my own Wittgenstein project was mostly to be considered in terms of their institutional and public aspect. In retrospect, my own Wittgenstein project turned out to be more firmly established within the CSA as an existing AAS unit, while Wodak’s had been more fragile in its free-floating setup within the AAS. Simultaneously, some of Wodak’s linguistic research had been centrally addressing Europe’s and Austria’s present, whereas by definition, my anthropological Wittgenstein project largely dealt with remote and faraway areas – an aspect which was received with less scepticism. Still, after these events I became more aware of the pros and cons of having

¹ By late 2000, those few specific obstacles within the AAS, which were later to prevent any further continuity for Ruth Wodak’s Wittgenstein project after its conclusion in 2003, had not yet become conspicuous.

established my Wittgenstein project within the AAS, until the Academy began to reorganise itself, at which point its internal research atmosphere improved decisively. The second set of events concerned the tragedies of September 11th and their truly global consequences. In fact, after a long decade characterised by strong economic priorities, which began with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, 11 September 2001 initiated a new phase of globalisation. This went hand in hand with what Jürgen Habermas (2001) shortly thereafter called ‘the return of the political’. In tragic and paradoxical ways, these events and ensuing processes confirmed and strengthened the positions of those, myself among them, who until then had been a minority whenever they called for a ‘new realism’ in the humanities and social sciences. It was also in this academic sense that September 11th became a ‘watershed event’. From now on those forms of an epistemological romantic deconstructivism were on the retreat again, and their disregard for most forms of serious empirical research became less and less attractive.

Two non-academic factors, in Vienna and on a global scale, thus influenced the course of this Wittgenstein project in an unforeseeable manner. Among these two, the ‘domestic factor’ raised our institutional awareness, which in the long run actually was helpful in overcoming some institutional challenges. The ‘global factor’ also changed the public and intellectual atmosphere in Continental Europe to the extent that this Wittgenstein project found itself in a consensual majority and mainstream position much earlier than we could possibly have anticipated. As of late 2002/early 2003, the question was no longer ‘whether’ a new realist methodology was required, but rather, ‘what kind’ it should be: the project’s answer to this question would suggest improved empirical and comparative methodologies. In turn, such changing contexts greatly improved the conditions and possibilities for this project’s international cooperation and success.

- *Main orientations, hypotheses, and forms of cooperation*

The project’s guiding research question asked, in a nutshell, how local identities were coping with wider and global influences in past and present. Together with accompanying elaborations in the fields of theoretical conceptualisation, in the history of the field, and in methodological procedures, the *three major empirical spheres* for exploring the main research question could now be *further specified*. In the Arab-

speaking Middle East, these were social and religious identities; for Central and Eastern Europe, these were public and legal transformations in a post-Communist era; and finally for Buddhist Central Asia, they were specified as ritualised practices in village contexts. In this manner, each regional empirical sphere was tightly associated with a more specific set of cross-cutting topical themes, which corresponded to that region's more specific issues of 'coping with wider influences' and therefore also corresponded to the skills and tasks of the project team's researchers working in that region.

In line with these orientations and specifications, the project team organised itself into three regional sub-groups and a fourth theoretical and coordinating group. At the project's semi-public, monthly 'jour fixes', initial research results were presented and discussed by these sub-groups. Two or three lectures per term by international guest scholars helped the project to take off and to establish functioning ties of international cooperation. Once (sometimes even twice) per year, the whole team was assembled for a weekly closed session, where problems of research and cooperation were addressed, discussed, and straightened out, which was supported on these occasions by alternating keynote speakers and the monitoring of activities by the project's academic advisory board. As the project's financial administrator of more than six years, Eva-Maria Knoll had begun her indispensable and strategic work in precise budgeting, financial monitoring, book-keeping, project's financial education, and transparent accountability. Likewise, Sylvia Haas had begun to serve as the director's international manager throughout the project's duration.

Even before these orientations and working procedures were established, I had begun to formulate *the main hypotheses* that would be addressing the project's guiding research question in such a way that they could orient and inform the empirical work under preparation. At first these hypotheses were publicly presented at an ASF/FWF forum in December 2000 and at the 2002 Göttingen meeting of German-speaking anthropological societies; then they were circulated and discussed internally among project team members in 2001/02, until they were published (Gingrich 2003) on a somewhat different occasion. The very point that this project's main hypotheses were elaborated, proposed, and put to work with considerable input from the project director deserves special emphasis here. Formulating scientific hypotheses may be as self-evident among the major social sciences (e.g. economics

or sociology) as it is for life sciences or physics. For many representatives among Continental Europe's smaller disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, however, the mere formulation of any hypothesis seems, per se, an unusual and doubtful endeavour. In line with some of the negative effects of idealistic deconstructivism, the formulation of research hypotheses was often regarded as 'uncritical submission' to the 'tyranny' of the natural sciences, as a 'superfluous exercise' in gaining more academic credibility, and so on and so forth. In short, formulating any hypotheses at all for a major anthropological research endeavour such as this one was seen by many in these fields as too radical. Like my recruitment policy, this also met with much initial scepticism and criticism from colleagues, while in retrospect I see both moves as decisive elements in the initial breakthrough. The main hypothesis adopted and elaborated those partial insights of Wolf, Appadurai, Sahlins, and Strathern as mentioned above, and combined them with a more specific suggestion by Eric Hobsbawm (1990: 182–183). It can thus be summarised again (Brochure 2007: 16) as follows. Basically, three alternative forms of agency can, hypothetically, be identified, through which local socio-cultural identities pursue 'coping with wider influences': for this project, they were conceptualised as **seclusion, participation, and dissolution**. Each of these forms of agency may dominate one or several spheres of social life for shorter or longer periods of time, after which it may be superseded by one of the other forms. Simultaneously, a dominant pursuit of any one among these alternatives in one specific sphere may be combined with other alternatives in other spheres. For instance Saudi Arabia pursues 'seclusion' from major global trends in most matters related to religion, while it prefers 'participation' in global flows for most economic spheres.

This working hypothesis was proposed with the aim of directing and informing our empirical work, and to help in interpreting its future results, again, for theoretical conceptualisations of the present era of globalisation. In this sense, from the outset the project's working hypothesis also informed international cooperation, and the theoretical and methodological inspiration to be derived from it.

The project's *external research cooperation* (i.e. in contrast to equally intense efforts towards internal coherence and cooperation among a large team of juniors) thus clearly prioritised international cooperation within anthropology (see § 3.2. in this

report). Again, this met with some scepticism and criticism from those who 'felt left out', such as representatives of other fields in the humanities and social sciences in Vienna and elsewhere in the German-speaking countries. It is true that ever since the early 1990s, a growing demand for 'cooperation with socio-cultural anthropology' had been voiced from many sides, such as German literary studies, art history, and pedagogy. In part, this reflected these fields' deconstructive interests in relativity and alterity, which they had hoped to fulfil by more intense cooperation with anthropology. In another way, the same desire also responded to funding bodies' justified critical pressure as to whether these very large fields were not too self-contained. In short, it is a fact that the desire of others for this specific type of 'trans- and interdisciplinarity' was quite unilateral and could not be reciprocated. From its beginnings, socio-cultural anthropology was always an interactive 'lean discipline' with a strong outward orientation by definition. Lacking any tendencies towards self-containment, anthropology has always been interdisciplinary and thus, at this point at least, it needed no additional encouragement from a Wittgenstein project in this interdisciplinary regard. The prioritising of international cooperation therefore confined cooperation on a national level to the IFK (International Research Center for Cultural Studies) and to the University of Vienna, where the country's only university department (until now) for socio-cultural anthropology is located, and to its Center for Advanced Gender Studies. Cooperation with the latter was pursued in order to induce additional methodological input into the project that would be in line with my own, fairly uncompromising views regarding gender issues. Cooperation with the university department, on the other hand, had the exclusive purpose of promoting additional forums of international cooperation that would directly serve the project's aim. As of 2002, the biannual international Eric Wolf Lectures were thus established together with the IFK (2002 and 2004 financed by the project, the first published in German in 2007, the others in English) with Marshall Sahlins as the inaugural speaker. Following a Wenner-Gren Foundation-sponsored workshop in Brussels in 2002, the project also cooperated with the department in the ensuing book publication on nationalism (Gingrich and Banks 2006). In 2004, the project acted as co-host for the European Association of Social Anthropologists' 8th biannual congress in Vienna. In addition, the Wittgenstein project co-hosted several of the university department's EU-Sokrates-sponsored international Intensive Programs. By their

programmes and their schedules, all these events provided enormous opportunities for project members' learning, training, and presenting to top international standards. International cooperation thus used these channels, but also those of mutual invitations and congress attendance. The highest-intensity and the most productive form of cooperation was devoted to the University of Chicago's Department of Anthropology, five members of which (Marshall Sahlins, Arjun Appadurai, Susan Gal, Jean and John Comaroff) visited the project and its events, some of them several times. Vice versa, the project director (Lichstern Scholar 2002) and other team members regularly interacted with them. Next were the anthropology departments of NYU (Bambi Schieffelin), Oxford, UK (Marcus Banks, Robert Parkin, Charles Ramble), and Amsterdam (Gerd Baumann). All these collaborations resulted in major book publications (Baumann and Gingrich 2004, Gingrich and Banks 2006, Gingrich and Hazod 2006), or, alternatively, in a special issue of the field's flagship journal (Ochs, Swedlund, Gingrich 2002). Third in priority was cooperation with a few top units from the German-speaking countries, such as with Édouard Conte at the Department of Anthropology in Bern (EUTempus project), in Göttingen with Brigitta Hauser-Schäublin (Gingrich 2003) and Regina Bendix (Binder and Fartacek 2006), with the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle (Barth, Gingrich, Parkin, and Silvermann 2005), and with units in Bratislava, Ljubljana, the Middle East, and Central Asia.

- *Methods and methodologies*

By the middle of the project's second year, all empirical investigations were well on their way, while the self-reflexive reassessing of the field's own history had also taken root. Simultaneously, a comparative methodology, which the award had helped me to finalise during the project's initial phase, was further elaborated (Gingrich and Fox 2002). In brief, the project's main methodological procedures can in fact be identified through the following three elements: fieldwork, reassessing the field's history, and comparative analysis.

Long-term ethnographic fieldwork through participant observation in the local language is anthropology's basic methodological tool. It was developed and elaborated throughout the twentieth century, and within the context of accelerated forms of globalisation, it became further refined into various new kinds of multi-sited

fieldwork. The project thus set out to apply, but also to develop further the discipline's main tool for empirical enquiry. That tool cannot be used if the researcher is unable to communicate in a language that is locally understood. Researchers had been recruited on the premise that either they had already mastered their fieldwork language, or they were willing to acquire these skills as soon as possible. Ines Kohl (Libya), Barbara Danczul (Egypt), Gudrun Kroner (Gaza and Somali refugees), Gebhard Fartacek (Syria), and Johann Heiss (Yemen, Saudi Arabia) were the main fieldworkers in the Middle East. Most of them pursued a largely 'presentist' orientation with some attention to historical background. In Johann Heiss's case the reverse was true, which was complemented by Günther Windhager's purely historical study on an Austro-Saudi convert to Islam. For Central and Eastern Europe, the main fieldworkers were Andrea Strasser (Armenia), Jelena Tošić (Serbia), and Susanne Binder (Austria). Eva Knoll and Gebhard Fartacek (Austria) also joined this group during later stages of the project with fieldwork, while Johanna Riegler (Russia) pursued her enquiry largely through contemporary historical sources. Finally, the main tasks of field research in Buddhist Central Asia were carried out by Elke Studer and Guntram Hazod (Tibetan Autonomous Region, PR of China), Stephan Kloos (Ladakh, India), and Walter Probstler (Mongolia). Probstler's and Hazod's research focused to a larger extent on historical material, which was complemented by Hilde Schaeffler (Nagaland, India) and her exclusively historical ethnography. Jasmine Böhm's contract could not be extended after her first year.

From a methodological perspective, a dozen junior scholars thus went into well-prepared ethnographic fieldwork, which was enriched by their own textual, media, and historical research, while four additional scholars focused on historical anthropology without any major ethnographic investigations of their own. Basically, this 3:1 ratio reflected anthropology's general position at the intersection between the social sciences and the humanities, and its own preference for in situ documentation through qualitative means. Of these sixteen main researchers, ten exclusively worked in or about an area in which they themselves had not been raised ('abroad'), one carried out fieldwork in her country of origin ('at home'), whereas the research of five focused on sites and topics that were located both at home and abroad. While this second ratio does reflect anthropology's conventional priority for the 'professional stranger' and the 'outsider's' access to local interactions, it also indicates this

project's awareness of multi-sited strategies, of growing global interconnectedness, and of the fact that ethnographic procedures are by no means confined to 'remote locations' alone. In fact, the project's ethnographic dimension already demonstrates how the guiding research questions and hypotheses informed and oriented the identification of procedures and results: this project certainly did not search for any 'traditional cultures' in order to study them as such, and how they were coping with 'modernity'. That would have been the normal approach of any routine anthropology during the late colonial and the Cold War periods. As helpful as the conceptual opposition between 'tradition' and 'modernity' may have been for anthropology in those earlier periods, and as useful as it may continue to be for historical analyses, it certainly has become an obsolete methodological device for the present. Instead, this project started from the methodological premises that in one way or another, all local identities are coping with wider and globalised influences – anywhere on this globe – and the questions to be asked therefore concern how they manage to do that, how their respective historical legacies assist them in that, and in which ways they transform themselves through these processes. This is why some historical dimensions had to be included in this project's methodological procedures, and this is why 'remote' and 'nearby' sites of fieldwork were chosen not as dichotomous oppositions, but, rather, as polycentric markers on an open, global scale. While remaining self-reflexive in the good way that is required for any academic field on the move, anthropology became empirical again, and truly global at the same time. In a sense, this has become a substantial methodological contribution towards what now comes close to the German-speaking sub-division of a global anthropology.

That transformative process certainly gained additional strength through, and maybe would never have come as far without, another radical break from the field's local past. This concerns how this field until then had perceived its *German-speaking past*. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology* was published in 2005 by Chicago University Press. It was co-authored by four, one for each of the sub-fields indicated in the title. I had the honour of contributing the chapters on German-speaking anthropology. It was the first time in decades that German-speaking anthropology appeared on the cover of any major anthropological book publication in the English-speaking world. Within one year, the book received

more than a dozen very favourable reviews in top journals in anthropology and beyond. Translations of the book are under way in Polish, Chinese, Italian, and Spanish.

At the outset, I had not planned to invest such a high amount of my energy, but only – much less than that – to research specific aspects of the field’s history during the Wittgenstein project’s duration. Plans for the opening of a Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology had become public shortly before the news came out that one Wittgenstein Prize 2000 would also go to a social anthropologist, and I had taken both as a clear sign that academic authorities, finally, wanted to encourage the field to develop and grow in the German-speaking countries. Still, the invitation to contribute an extensive lecture series on the whole history of anthropology in German for the opening of an MPI in 2002, together with three colleagues with very high profiles of their own, represented an unprecedented challenge to someone who had never tried to be an expert in the history of the field. On the part of junior colleagues and senior students in the German-speaking countries, private and verbal reactions to my part in these lectures were close to enthusiastic; those of many German-speaking mid-career and senior colleagues were friendly, while others were not. When the book came out, and after the first international reviews had appeared, those unfriendly local senior voices died down. Book sales, translations, and reviews indicated that against all odds, my decision to face this challenge must have been worth it. Basically, I had argued that the mainstream of German-speaking ‘Völkerkunde’ had been led astray during major phases of its local history, and that now the time had come for it to transform itself to participate in global anthropology. If I am not totally mistaken, the Wittgenstein 2000 Prize has decisively contributed towards moving into that direction.

Most of the book’s impact, and that of some of my subsequent work on the history of anthropology, rippled out into the field at large, and beyond. At the same time, however, this also had several very positive internal knock-on effects for the project’s research team. One, it heightened the team’s awareness of thinking well through old and new concepts and methods before using them; two, it improved cooperation between the historical and ‘presentist’ dimensions within our project; third, and together with the first awards garnered by junior team members for their own project publications (Brochure 2007: 27, 49-50), this triggered a common joy in success, and

an ambition for more of the same, that I had rarely seen previously, anywhere, among junior anthropologists. In the long run, the whole 'MPI/Chicago book' effort thus certainly promoted further a competitive, team fighting spirit among the Wittgenstein research group that helped all of us to move on together.

In fact, moving on together, with an emphasis upon 'together', was essential for the third methodological element in team procedures. Between the 'singular' data of empirical fieldwork, and the project's guiding questions informed by 'general' theory and methodology, the 'specific' commonalities and differences among empirical results had to be analysed *by comparative means*. That much I had already outlined in my co-edited book on comparative methods from 2002. In order to implement and elaborate this comparative necessity one step further while individual fieldwork periods were coming to a close, three researchers were either newly hired or asked to engage more intensely with this field of tasks while giving up some of their previous commitments.

Eva-Maria Knoll therefore agreed to withdraw gradually from her assignment with Gender Studies at the University of Vienna, which she handed over to her successors there, while publishing a co-edited comparative volume on its outcome (Sauer and Knoll 2006). Meanwhile, Ernst Halbmayer and Fernand Kreff were newly recruited to support the same comparative effort. Ernst Halbmayer is a South Americanist in anthropology, and a sociologist of Europe; his inclusion in the project primarily served no regional-empirical purpose. Instead, it supported the team's 'comparative upgrading', on the basis of Halbmayer's excellent methodological skills in this realm (Today he is a professor for anthropology in Germany, at the Phillips University in Marburg/Lahn.) Fernand Kreff was recruited along similar lines, with a stronger emphasis on his profile in anthropological theories and concepts of globalisation (Kreff 2003). By contrast, Eva-Maria Knoll's own empirical work was integrated more closely into the project, in addition to her comparative qualification in gender studies, because it directly related to the transformative aspects of the team's work in Europe.

At this point, in late 2003 and early 2004, it was decided to elaborate and implement comparative methodologies not only as a tool and device for directly finalising this

Wittgenstein project, in order to move from the singular through the comparative to the more general sphere of results. In addition, the early success of the 'MPI/Chicago book' endeavour convinced us to be more ambitious in this particular field as well. As a major spin-off from the Wittgenstein project, it was decided that Ernst Halbmayer should further elaborate the methodological insights gained during his own Wittgenstein phase, and to include that more systematic methodological aspect of comparison in his habilitation, which he submitted to the University of Vienna in March 2007 (see § 3.4. in this report). At the same time, it was also decided to 'go public again' with the applied-methodological and exemplary element of comparison, by submitting that aspect of our endeavours to the newly opened ASF/FWF 'translational programme'. The ASF/FWF accepted the proposal by Fernand Kreff, Eva-Maria Knoll, and myself in 2004 as one among only three proposals from the social sciences and humanities during that first opportunity: 'Handbook of Globalisation Face to Face' (Working title, see § 3.5. in this report) will come out on the basis of an existing contract with Edition Suhrkamp, one of the very best names in German publishing in this field. It will have 120 entries, more than a third of them authored by members of our Wittgenstein project, while more than half of them will be from our cooperation partners around the globe. The entries will 'translate' the results of our Wittgenstein 2000 project's work to a wider public in applied fields of practice. This is always pursued through the comparative perspective of demonstrating how each ethnographic example illustrates wider tendencies that are addressed by each of the handbook's entries: comparative procedures in anthropology and the social sciences in a globalised world, applied and public.

- **Main results and hypotheses revised**

The '*hitherto unknown spheres of knowledge*' explored and covered by this project consist of three large sub-spheres: *First*, an empirical sub-sphere of fieldwork projects, all of them unique and unprecedented in the manner of their enquiries (see subsequent text for main results). *Second*, a profound and overdue reassessment of the field's history in German, which has already been discussed. *Third*, a methodological and conceptual elaboration of comparative procedures and theoretical assessments addressing anthropological approaches to the present era of globalisation (see subsequent text for main results).

This report can offer only an extremely minimal summary of the *main empirical results*. These are available in much more detail through the project's published three-volume book series ('Lokale Identitäten und überlokale Einflüsse', vols I–III), together with accompanying articles, book publications, or book manuscripts (dissertations) by each individual researcher, which give the full details (Brochure 2007: 65–67). Here follows a basic summary.

If we begin this overview with the regional Middle Eastern focus, Ines Kohl demonstrated in Libya the reconfigurations of local 'Tuareg' societies along, and across, an international border zone, which increasingly is being reinforced through an EU-Libyan cooperation for controlling migration processes. Half-hearted activities of coping with, and participating in these aspects of globalisation are thus accompanied by parallel strategies of 'exploiting' and 'circumventing' them. In the city of Assiut, which is regarded as Egypt's Islamist centre, Barbara Danczul analysed the interface between semi-secularised state law, shari'a, and Assiut's local customary law. Danczul's study demonstrated their mutually supportive, functional dimension within a kind of 'legal pluralism', which functions as a combined strategy of participatory local coherence in a globalised world, on the one hand. On the other hand, increasing factors of disillusionment and of 'exhaustion' with the secularised side simultaneously strengthen the customary and shari'a dimension as 'seclusive' factors in the overall process.

In Cairo, Gudrun Kroner studied Somalis as Muslim female refugees in an Arab-Muslim context, whereas in Gaza she compared that to the Palestinian situation before Israel's withdrawal. As an extreme result and symptom of globalisation, the fate of these refugees in Kroner's analysis illustrates the overarching dangers of 'dissolution', which are met by the two strategies of diminishing efforts towards participatory 'coping', and by increasing forms of seclusion in many different versions.

In Syria's rural areas, Gebhard Fartacek researched local residents' perception of jinn (demons), on the basis of his previous study about pilgrimage. The contextualisation and interpretation of this growing element of popular belief systems revealed that conceptions of these demons, and local interactions with that imaginary

cosmos, only to a minor extent represent a revitalised 'tradition' in any seclusive sense. Primarily, dealing with jinn represents a cultural elaboration that serves 'coping with the unknown' aspects of a globalised world and its unpredictabilities. For Saudi-Arabia and its historical emergence during the first decades of the twentieth century, Günther Windhager analysed the early phase of a key advisor to King Ibn Saud's court. The biography of Leopold Weiss/Muhammad Asad, however, is also significant because it represents the family background of his son, a famous anthropologist, and thus it is linked to the 'history of anthropology' dimension of this project. Asad's biography not only illustrates an early transnational example of a 'creolised' cultural broker. It also gives testimony to that biography's part in Saudi-Arabia's rise to religious coherence and economic influence.

For the Yemen in past and present, Johann Heiss – in addition to serving as editor of this project's splendid Middle Eastern volume of results – demonstrated how different genealogical registers inform and legitimise status hierarchies and their respective economic correlations. While low-status-profession groups in crafts and services display 'unclear' or 'no' genealogical background, the tribal status of peasants and farmers genealogically refers back to Ancient South Arabia. By contrast, the elaborate North Arabian genealogies of the Sada derive from the Prophet Muhammad, and they specialise in theology, law, administration, and long-distance trade, which continues to connect Southern Arabia with Southeast Asia, Europe, and North America.

The project's Arab Middle Eastern case studies thus include some of its centres of mineral resources and of affluence, some of its major demographic centres, and some of its centres of global turmoil and confrontation. On the basis of this structural heterogeneity, the project's overall findings emphasise an increasing gap between economic pluralism as a main participatory strategy in a globalising world, and a tendency towards religious seclusion. To an extent, that gap is perpetuated by global and politico-military confrontation. The widening of this gap, in scope as well as in a temporal sense, simultaneously also favours sub-strategies such as 'exploitative and non-exploitative forms of circumvention' but it also brings about increasing 'exhaustion' and despair – although in the long run, economic pluralism has a potential to prevail.

The Middle East's structural heterogeneity itself is part of the region's strategic centrality for world affairs in modern history and in a global present. By contrast on such a global scale, since modern times Buddhist Central Asia has usually represented a more peripheral 'buffer zone' between Russia, China, and India with corresponding effects of Hinduisation, Sinoisation, and Russification respectively. Within that buffer zone, local identities and ritual practices are situated along a more clear-cut dichotomy between a small number of major and minor centres, and highly diversified forms of rural and nomadic peripheries.

For one of India's northeastern Tibetan-speaking tribal peripheries, Hilde Schaeffler examined the profound impact of colonial transformations among the Naga, and of the partial success and partial failure of integrating them into the post-colonial Union of India. By assessing the works of Furer-Haimendorf, an early expert in Vienna on the Naga who later became director of the Royal Anthropological Institute in London, Schaeffler links this regional enquiry, again, to the project's 'history of the field' dimension. The analysis leads on to the present, in which these former headhunters are Christians and reside in an Indian state of their own. The Naga thus have moved away from overall seclusion into fragile forms of participation.

By contrast, Stephan Kloos's research in a border region of Ladakh as India's northwestern, Tibetan-speaking Buddhist periphery reveals that inside these buffer zones, 'dissolution' is perhaps more imminent than elsewhere. Kloos analysed the local role of an Amchi, i.e. a healer in the popular Tibetan medical tradition, and showed how various factors undermine that role: In a context of tensions with Pakistan and in neighbouring Kashmir, the Indian state's special effort of providing secular medical services is complemented by additional monastic medical services. Both have diminished the role of popular Tibetan medicine to one minor supply service among others, and its future is thus precarious.

In the northernmost Amdo part of the Tibetan Autonomous Region of the PR of China, Elke Studer studied the historical and contemporary enactment of a Tibetan horsemen's tournament in Naqchu. This is the local version of a 'key symbol' festive event typical for the regions between Afghanistan and Mongolia. In the past, this festival celebrated early Mongolian support for the 'Yellow Hat' (Gelukpa) version of

Tibetan Buddhism and the Dalai Lama as its spiritual leader. Banned during the Cultural Revolution, the festival today has re-emerged in a secularised form under Communist control. This indicates a very fragile balance between participation and dissolution.

Ethnographic site surveys, combined with documenting local oral traditions and with the interpretation of relevant medieval Tibetan manuscripts were the core procedures of Guntram Hazod's internationally acclaimed effort towards the elaboration of historical maps for early Tibet. His work would not be possible without the support of the Tibetan Academy of Social Sciences in Lhasa. In this project, Hazod was co-editor of the substantial 'Buddhist-Tibetan volume' of Wittgenstein results, and the author of significant contributions on the early phases of Tibetan religious statehood. This is an important portrait of the enduring vitality of Tibeto-Buddhist cultures, and of their centres' ability to persist and to 'participate'.

Finally, Walter Probstler rescued a manuscript of local historiography about northern Mongolia, and about the interplay of regional and wider (Russian and other) forces with Buryat and Mongolian cultures. His ethnographic expertise in the region will transform that manuscript into an accessible edition, testifying that post-Communist conditions facilitate 'coping with and participating in' a global world in different and more pluralist ways if contrasted against the Communist era.

Summing up the project's findings in these Buddhist and/or Tibetan-speaking buffer zones of Central Asia reveals a relatively coherent overall tendency: while the diverse peripheries display clearer signs of 'dissolving into', and weaker signs of 'participating in' global developments imposed through regional majority powers, the few cultural centres testify to vital efforts towards perseverance, and to their potential for active participation.

Late-Communist and post-Communist conditions already informed some important aspects of research in Central Asia, but they had to be the central theme in studying political and legal transformations in Eastern and Central Europe. The project's findings in this field were edited in the rich 'European' project results volume by Johanna Riegler, whose own empirical work suffered to an extent – in my personal

view – from a belated prioritising of her agenda. Still, her identification of a sense of exhaustion from impoverishment and unemployment, and of disorientation among Russia's workers during the 1990s is important, as a decisive motive behind Russia's political and legal seclusion during, before new income sources from energy sales set in.

The post-Communist transition in the ex-Soviet periphery state of Armenia was studied by Andrea Strasser, during and after her long sojourn as an OSCE monitor there. Illegal 'trafficking' of women to the Middle East and to Western Europe, she discovered, goes hand in hand with a re-traditionalisation of the status of women and families inside the country. Under the global influence of new NGOs for 'Human Rights for women', however, carving out women's rights in these new contexts is feasible, and is being combined with new struggles against the disastrous global effects of trafficking women and children.

NGOs were also a central theme and fieldwork site in Jelena Tošić's research about the role of Human Rights, and of discourses about them, in Serbia (and Montenegro) as a former 'buffer zone' between East and West during the Cold War. Tošić showed how local nationalist discourses after the Civil War and international NGO engagement for Human Rights mutually paralysed one another, by each identifying the other as the cause of the country's misery, and how youth movements searched for alternatives to both.

Children by parents or grandparents from the ex-Communist parts of Europe, from North Africa, or from Asia today make up a significant proportion of school classes anywhere in the EU's major cities. These children thus not only represent one important dimension and consequence of the globalising processes of the past in the form of migration, but they also constitute domestic challenges to the EU in dealing with this effect of globalisation in the future.

Susanne Binder studied actual practices in school classes and how they relate to legal recommendations, and she compared the situation in eastern Austria with that in the Netherlands. Her findings indicate that contrary to widely differing public images (e.g. the 'liberal Dutch' vs the 'xenophobic Austrian' situation), actual conditions on the ground were fairly similar in so far as an increasing contrast has

emerged between 'participatory' legal efforts and actual exhaustion, which includes tendencies towards seclusion.

In another way, 'children and the law in Austria and elsewhere in Europe' has also been at the core of Eva-Maria Knoll's work, which focused on the diversity of legal conditions for in vitro fertilisation (IVF) in Europe and ensuing IVF tourism by women across Europe's boundaries. Outlining the interplay between the pharmaceutical industry, IVF clinics, and travelling women as interested clients/patients, Knoll demonstrates how the combination of a global technoscape with legal European diversity promotes new forms of transnational movements. In Knoll's analysis, no European country 'secluded' itself from this particular form of biomedical technology through an attempt to keep it out by legal means (as happened outside of Europe for related fields of genetic research). Also, European countries avoided an 'anything goes' policy but instead preferred creative 'participation' in this global technology by creating legal diversity. In this context, women predominantly tend to travel 'from west to east', whereas substances tend to mostly circulate 'from east to west'.

Summarising the European focus of this project thus reveals that post-Communist developments in Europe feature strong preferences towards 'creative participation' in the realm of legal and political claims that, however, tend to be blocked by 'seclusive effects' as soon as the economy gives rise to popular concerns (see also Gingrich and Banks 2006). One indicator of the ensuing tensions became visible during the Dutch and French 2005 plebiscites on a European constitution.

After this basic summary of project results on an empirical and regional level, this report will now proceed with an assessment of the project's main hypotheses and methodological contributions, towards an assessment of the project's disciplinary and transdisciplinary impact, and, finally, to a provisional assessment of the project's main conceptual and theoretical results.

An assessment of the project's main hypothesis arrives, by and large, at the conclusion that the project's empirical findings confirmed and corroborated the 'three main forms of interaction' hypothesis and its validity, plausibility, soundness, and realism. At the same time the evidence suggests some minor revisions, refinements, and further elaborations. The two most important among these minor revisions concern notions of 'apathy' and of 'circumvention'.

Apathy concerns those instances in the empirical evidence where disorientation and resignation have set in as an enduring social pattern in the face of seemingly hopeless situations with few alternatives. Apart from refugees in Gaza and Cairo, and from workers in Russia, another case in point was the Egyptian example of Assiut residents. Having difficult access to state law, they tend to resort to shari'a and customary law more often out of resignation, rather than because of any active engagement. Similarly, the findings in Serbia indicated a stalemate situation between international pressures and nationalist interests, which has also pushed many local citizens into years of disorientation and resignation. The concept of apathy thus can be developed out of our empirical findings, in order to address adequately some of their substance as *one of two intermediate categories between the three main forms of strategic agency*. That first of the two intermediate categories in fact refers to 'non-agency'. Intellectually it is derived from a social theory tradition established by Marie Jahoda and Paul Lazarsfeld (1975) through their Marienthal study on long-term unemployment during the 1930s. Our project's evidence suggests that whenever apathy emerges on an enduring and large-scale level, then this may signal a transition towards strategic alternatives.

As a second intermediate category, strategies of 'avoidance and circumvention' can be elaborated as another minor revision of the initial hypothesis. This addresses elements of case studies such as southern Libya or northern Tibet. While local actors publicly pay lip service to, and seemingly comply with, imposed regional and global conditions, and while thereby to an extent they are in fact 'participating', they simultaneously avoid and circumvent too much active engagement. In these instances, undermining and even sabotaging 'participation' may be accompanied by exploiting wider needs for avoidance, and by offering specialised services, usually of an illegal type, to that end. This second intermediate category thus refers to '*agency behind the scenes*'. Intellectually, this category is derived from a historians' research tradition that was established by James Scott (1985) and his insights about 'Weapons of the Weak' among peasants of Southeastern Asia.

An assessment of the project's main methodological contributions can, on the one hand, sum up what has already been said. Multi-sited ethnographic fieldwork in its most up-to-date versions from the new century was carried out in local languages

and was combined with historical and textual analysis, with reassessment of the field's history, and with reinvigorated forms of anthropological comparison. That broad set of specified methods with long-term participant observation at its core represented the main, solid base of procedures and methodological achievements, which were refined through the rule that in ethnographic work empathy need not equal sympathy (Gingrich and Banks 2006). On the other hand, from the outset the project was directed at minimising any Eurocentric bias in its orientation and procedures. In line with more recent debates on this enduring topic in anthropological enquiry, two feedback loops were built in. The first loop was conventional and addressed local informants' opinions by discussing manuscript versions with them, presenting research results through some of the media to local residents, and the like.

The second feedback loop was a much more innovative procedure, which resulted in a spin-off project of its own. Funded by the Austrian National Bank and the City of Vienna's Jubilee Fund at the AAS, social philosopher Madalina Diaconu from Romania and sociologist Zaynap Barat from Turkey were asked to investigate, along the lines of the Wittgenstein project's main hypothesis, how Austrian and Central European popular cultures were coping with globalisation. To that end, a widely popular TV show featuring Alpine folk and country music was analysed in front of and behind the screen – i.e. the 'Musikantenstadl' (Musician's barn). This spin-off project was monitored and coordinated by Wittgenstein team members Susanne Binder and Gebhard Fartacek, who then also co-edited the resulting book (2006). This became a significant achievement and media success in its own right. To a wider public, it reversed the conventional wisdom that it is always Western European and North American scholars who study cultures elsewhere. As a methodological feedback loop, this spin-off project further softened any artificial boundaries between 'us' and 'them', and reinforced the project's main outcome that we live within one globalised world with which we may cope in ways that are similar and different.

An assessment of the project's disciplinary and inter- (cum: trans-) disciplinary impact, again, can first summarise what has already been outlined above. The project promoted and accelerated an ongoing departure from idealist deconstructivism in German-speaking socio-cultural anthropology, and contributed

towards its empirical reorientation along the lines of a self-reflexive, new realism. Favoured by dramatic changes in public global opinions, such as those around September 11th and its consequences (but also, for example, the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004), this project took decisive steps (publications, conference contributions, invitations, awards, recognition within the discipline) towards transforming German-speaking anthropology into what is now close to the German-speaking sub-division of international anthropology. Within that German-speaking sector of the field, and largely thanks to its junior team members and their good work, the project further promoted the profile of the Vienna cluster of research networks and institutions as belonging to the very top centres in Central and Continental Europe – well connected to all major international centres of anthropology elsewhere in Europe, Asia, and North America. On an interdisciplinary level, the project's main interlocutors outside anthropology came from sociology, regional history, and to a lesser extent linguistic/philological studies, philosophy, and folklore studies/ European ethnology. As a result of that cooperation, an improved awareness about anthropology's relevance can be expected among clusters and segments of sociology, regional history, and European ethnology, and vice versa.

Within the narrow scope of a report like this, an assessment of this project's main conceptual and theoretical results can only feature a brief outline. Apart from the format's limitations, it should also be mentioned that in a certain way, some of the author's major theoretical elaborations will be grounded in the project's results, and thus they can only begin now after the analysis of empirical findings has been concluded and synthesised. The following conceptual conclusions are therefore merely condensed versions of what is already on its way to publication (i.e. primarily the three volumes of the Suhrkamp handbook), or anticipate some of the author's future work. Basically, however, I see the successful departure from a previously dominant conceptual opposition between 'traditional' and 'modern' as the project's theoretical starting point. Any older conceptual derivations of that opposition can now be abandoned. While that opposition may maintain some relevance for historical investigations into pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial processes, a 'presentist' premise now embraces the commonalities and differences, the paradoxes and trajectories within one globalised world. On this basis, the former 'great divide' (which still informs much of cultural studies) between previous colonial powers and their

allies, on the one hand, and formerly colonised subjects and their aspirations, on the other, is not ignored for its impact upon the present. Still, it becomes merely one among several polycentric and multifaceted distinctions in the global present. In fact, it would be completely misleading, if not straightforwardly pejorative, if one were to continue to exclusively qualify, say, India's aspirations in the present only in terms of its colonial past. From such a perspective, the 'post-modern moment' of the 1980s and 1990s with its achievements and failures in fact did not signal Fukuyama's 'end of history', but rather the end of modernity as it was known until then.

To an extent, it remains a matter of definition whether the present is conceptualised and theorised as 'second modernity' (Beck 1997), as 'alternative modernities' (Arjun Appadurai 2002), as pluralist globalisation, and so on and so forth. What does matter, at least from the vantage point of this project's results, is that beyond the emergence of several global '-scapes' (Appadurai 1996) and a few 'Global Cities' (Sassen 1991), this era displays very little potential indeed for moving any closer towards a globally homogenized period of 'McDonaldisation' (Ritzer 2004), or towards any coherent world economy with a few monopolies and one global market as predicted by Marxists. Instead, '**transnational connections** and flows' (Hannerz 1996) promote **global diversity** in all major fields of world society, which clearly emerges from this project's main conceptual and empirical findings, as much as from the most promising results of current social sciences at large. Commonalities and unifying factors do play an increasing role in some dimensions of these processes, but, simultaneously, collective differentials persist or transform themselves while new ones emerge. Some among these differentials are cultural. On a conceptual level, any coherent, stable, or 'closed' notion of culture is as obsolete as are corresponding notions of tradition. Yet, fluid, dynamic, and interactive forms of culture will continue to matter as part and parcel of global diversity.

2.2. APPENDIX I

- **Project-related expenses and sequences**

What follows here are short summary statements

Mentoring and promotion of junior scholars: As outlined in the accompanying brochure (Brochure 2007: 68), a significant part of this Wittgenstein budget was spent on the promotion of junior scholars – in sum, twenty-five students participated, furthermore, among eighteen other employed persons fifteen were junior scholars, and apart from three seniors, seventeen additional junior scholars had other forms of contracts. The duration of employment for those fifteen junior scholars was up to three years for eleven of them, and five years for the others. The promotion of junior scholars resulted in twelve doctoral theses (ten of them already submitted), nine MA theses (eight of them already submitted), plus one habilitation (submitted; another habilitation by a senior scholar will be submitted in 2007). In addition to directly counselling and mentoring their careers, and providing for their income through the budget, additional expenses were raised for promoting their careers through training workshops in professional English, and through investing in professional copy-editing of some of their English publications. Five among these junior scholars (i.e. basically one third of those employed) received academic awards (details in Brochure 2007: 59). Three among the junior scholars supported by this project have since received long-term funding for their PhD studies at UK or US universities (University of Chicago, University of California, Berkeley). Among those eighteen researchers employed in the Wittgenstein project (including the fifteen juniors), only three (i.e. the seniors) had been regularly employed in other research institutions/projects before entering the Wittgenstein project. After the project's ending, that figure of three has risen to ten, who will continue to work primarily as researchers.

Invitation of guest researchers and international cooperation: Mostly as a function of the project's priorities in cooperation, as already outlined above (details in § 3.2.), a grand total of forty international or national guest researchers were invited to participate in one way or the other in the course of this project (see Brochure 2007: 69) – as keynote speakers, guest lecturers, workshop and conference contributors,

or co-contributors to publications. One third of them came from institutions in the German-speaking countries (including Austria), two-thirds from other EU countries, the US, or Asia and Africa. Among that overall group, one third came from sociology, political sciences, historical studies, geography, linguistic and philological studies, philosophy, and psychology, while two-thirds came from socio-cultural anthropology.

For a socio-cultural project like this one, *acquisition of technical equipment* could be confined to the normal requirements of regular electronic and library equipment.

Symposia and conferences have already been discussed in the section on national and international cooperation. The list of main expenses consists of the biannual Eric Wolf Lectures, the EU-Sokrates Intensive Program (both in cooperation with the University of Vienna's Department for Social and Cultural Anthropology), the project's co-hosting of the 8th EASA conference of 2004 in Vienna, project symposia, and project members' international conference participations.

Science communication and media-related activities: This aspect received continuous efforts and investments by the project, very well supported by the ASF/FWF. Since the frame of this report is far too restricted to cover all relevant results in this regard, readers are invited to consult, at least for the media side of project activities, the project's website (in itself one of these results) under <www.wittgenstein2000.at/PRESSE/PRESSE_START.HTM>.

In addition to that website and the final print brochure on the project's results, major highlights of the project's media activities included: a special internet programme by the project director in the ORF's new 'science.at' website, a report by the German-speaking cultural channel 3Sat ('Kulturzeit', November 2005) and by ORF 1, reports in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* and the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, active participation in the FWF/ASF's '10 years Wittgenstein award' public event (September 2006), repeated coverage in all major Austrian daily and weekly print journals, countless interviews and reports on the Austrian Public Broadcasting Program Ö1 – this project's most faithful media companion, regular press releases by the Austrian Academy of Sciences on the project, and, finally, as of summer 2006, a regular biweekly academic column by the project director in the Austrian daily *Die Presse*.

APPENDIX II

2.3. Research institution's foundation:

The Wittgenstein project at first provided a decisive boost for revitalisation of the AAS's CSA at which it was installed, thereby continuing at first what had been the case with a smaller number of research projects until then. During its course, this project helped to strengthen the academic standing and public profile of the CSA to such an extent that the AAS decided step by step to take over some of the project's most committed researchers on (one- or two-year) contracts from its own budget. After a regular CSA international academic evaluation concluded in early 2004, the AAS presidential council accepted that evaluation team's final recommendation: they suggested that because of the Wittgenstein project's achievements, the CSA should be upgraded in terms of staff and budget. On 1 January 2007, the CSA was thus replaced by its successor, the Social Anthropology Research Unit (SARU), which today is the Institute for Social Anthropology (ISA). The former Wittgenstein project's director is now director of ISA, and leading former Wittgenstein project members now have three of the four tenured academic positions (Eva-Maria Knoll, Gebhard Fartacek, Johann Heiss) in ISA, while others have non-tenured or new 'soft money' positions. In short, the Wittgenstein 2000 project in social and cultural anthropology has found an institutional form of 'sustained development'. At the same time and through the decisive help of the Wittgenstein project, social anthropology in Austria has also moved beyond the meagre formula 'one social anthropology museum plus one university department'. With the Wittgenstein-assisted establishment of ISA, Austria has thus finally followed the example of other smaller affluent European countries such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. Not only in terms of content, output, and training, but also when seen through an institutional lens, the Wittgenstein Award has thus helped socio-cultural anthropology in Austria to reach, and to stabilise itself at, a top level of European quality.

As far as expenses are concerned, the only factor that I do regret is that the award cannot be spent on 'buying out' the prize winner from his regular university duties. These duties are quite heavy at Austrian universities, and particularly so in small departments: I therefore had to combine the maintenance of my duties at the university with directing this large project at the Academy. In turn, unfortunately it was

not possible for me personally to carry out a long and intense fieldwork period, either in Tibet or in the Middle East. So by and large, my research could not ground itself on additional ethnographic fieldwork of my own, but instead it focused on the conceptual, methodological, historical, theoretical, and coordinating aspects of the project.

More important than facilitating a new level of productivity for my own research, however, was that the prize allowed me to combine this with, and to initiate, a large-scale, empirical, and comparative project with junior researchers, and to carefully help them prepare their fieldwork sojourns, which were sometimes situated in remote and dangerous locations. In addition, the prize allowed hitherto unheard of investments in preparations for the publication of junior research results. It thus helped them to strive for international careers at the earliest possible stage, assisted by excellent networks of international prize-supported ties. It has been pointed out that five of them received junior research awards, three junior researchers can now continue their careers with well-funded PhD stipends at top international universities, while most of the junior researchers who were employed for the first time can now continue their careers, having attained doctoral degrees, as professional researchers at home.

APPENDIX III

2.3. Additional consequences of the Wittgenstein Prize

Significance of prize-related research activities for your research unit(s): This point has already been covered in outlining how at the AAS, the Wittgenstein project helped to revitalise the CSA at first, and subsequently provided the decisive rationale for later upgrading the CSA into the AAS's SARU. Through the project's domestic cooperation, it was also possible to promote the potential and qualities of the University of Vienna's Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology (conferences and lectures, and joint publication of a book featuring the joint achievements of socio-cultural anthropology in Austria for the Vienna EASA congress in 2004; see Khittel, Plankensteiner, and Six-Hohenbalken 2004).

Research unit's support for prize-related research: In sum, the AAS's support for the Wittgenstein project was overwhelming, as is testified by the AAS Secretary

General's preface, in addition to that of the ASF/FWF's President, for the brochure accompanying this report. The AAS has actively helped and promoted 'sustained development' for all relevant outcomes of the project, by promoting three key researchers from the project team into AAS tenured positions, and by founding SARU.

Relevance for junior training development outside Wittgenstein project participation (integration of project results in university teaching programmes, etc.): Almost all those eighteen researchers employed by the project gave, or still give, university courses. This primarily concerns the University of Vienna, but also Danube University Krems, and, in addition, the university department's partner institutions in Ireland, Sweden, France, Spain, and elsewhere through the EU-Sokrates Program. Insights, hypotheses, and methods of this Wittgenstein project continue to play the role of key elements in these courses, in addition to my own extensive teaching activities.

Relevance for non-academic spheres (industrial cooperation, impact upon society, etc.): When I found out that cooperation with industrial companies in basic research is possible it was at first surprising, and later encouraging, for a project from the humanities and social sciences such as this. When at one point the project budget was tight, which made it temporarily impossible to finance Gudrun Kroner's research, a proposal was submitted to the German Thyssen Foundation. That major German industrial player, through its private research foundation, helped to fund Kroner's research in Gaza for several years. In turn, this encouraged others in the team to test out similar support from elsewhere: as a result, the Austrian Mineral and Petrol Company OMV supported our former project team member Ines Kohl's research in Libya throughout the past two years. As for the impact upon society, that was primarily promoted through three channels: a) the project's own media activities, which have already been outlined above; b) the ASF/FWF channels, through which the project's director was invited to serve on various occasions as referee (e.g. for the international 'New Frontiers in Evaluation' Vienna conference accompanying Austria's EU chair in spring 2006, or on various panels of the City of Vienna's research funding institution WWTF), or as conference speaker (e.g. at the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs' Conference 'Islam in a Pluralist World' on the eve of Austria's EU chair, November 2005); c) finally, the prize promoted my regular

invitation as conference speaker at the National Defence Academy (LaVAk) on topics such as UN-guided peace-keeping efforts in the Middle East, Islam in Europe, and the like.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A) References cited (no project outcomes)

APPADURAI, Arjun (1996): *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

APPADURAI, Arjun (2002): *Sustainable Diversity: The Indivisibility of Culture and Development*, in: UNESCO Cultural Diversity Series No.1, 9–16

BECK, Ulrich (1997): *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung*, Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp

GODELIER, Maurice (1991): 'Wird der Westen das universelle Modell der Menschheit? Die vorindustriellen Gesellschaften zwischen Veränderung und Auflösung', in: Wolf Lepenies (Hg.): *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin- Jahrbuch 1989/90*, Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung: 180–200

HABERMAS, Jürgen (2001): *Glauben und Wissen, Friedenspreis des Deutschen Buchhandels 2001*, Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp

HANNERZ, Ulf (1996): *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*, London-New York: Routledge

HOBSBAWM, Eric J. (1990): *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Cambridge: University Press

JAHODA, Marie, LAZARSELD, Paul F., ZEISEL, Hans (1975): *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal. Ein soziographischer Versuch über die Wirkungen langandauernder Arbeitslosigkeit*. Neuausgabe, Frankfurt/Main: Edition Suhrkamp

RITZER, George (2004): *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*, Revised new century edition, London-Thousand Oaks: Sage

SAHLINS, Marshall (1999): 'Two or Three Things That I Know About Culture', in: *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5: 399–421

SASSEN, Saskia (1991): *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton: University Press

SCOTT, James C. (1985): *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, Yale: University Press

STRATHERN, Marilyn (2004): *Partial Connections*, Updated edition, Lanham: AltaMira

WOLF, Eric (1982): *Europe and the People without History*, Berkeley: University of California Press

B) References to publications resulting from the Wittgenstein project

BARTH, Fredrik, GINGRICH, Andre, PARKIN, Robert, SILVERMANN, Sydel (2005): *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology – The Halle Lectures*, Chicago: University Press

BAUMANN, Gerd and GINGRICH, Andre (eds) (2004): *Grammars of Identity: A Structural Approach*, London: Berghahn

BINDER, Susanne und FARTACEK, Gebhard (Hg.) (2006): *Der Musikantenstadl: Alpine Populärkultur im Fremden Blick*, Wien-Berlin: LIT

GINGRICH, Andre (2003): 'Kriegerische Verflechtungen und ethnologische Reflexionen: Für öffentliche Stellungnahmen ethnologischer ExpertInnen', in: Hauser-Schäublin, Brigitta und Ulrich Braukämpfer (Hg.): *Ethnologie der Globalisierung. Perspektiven kultureller Verflechtungen*, Berlin: Reimer, 153– 166

GINGRICH, Andre and BANKS, Marcus (eds) (2006): *Neo-nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*, London-New York: Berghahn

GINGRICH, Andre and FOX, Richard G. (eds) (2002): *Anthropology, by Comparison*, London-New York: Routledge

GINGRICH, Andre und HAZOD, Guntram (Hg.) (2006): *Der Rand und die Mitte. Beiträge zur Sozialanthropologie und Kulturgeschichte Tibets und des Himalaya* (Sitzungsberichte Bd. 753 der Phil.- Hist. Kl.; Reihe Forschungsschwerpunkt Lokale Identitäten und überlokale Einflüsse Bd. III = Veröffentlichungen zur Sozialanthropologie Bd.9), Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

KHITTEL, Stefan, PLANKENSTEINER, Barbara, SIX-HOHENBALKEN, Maria (eds) (2004): *Contemporary Issues in Socio-Cultural Anthropology: Perspectives and Research Activities from Austria*, Löcker: Vienna

KREFF, Fernand (2003): *Grundkonzepte der Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie in der Globalisierungsdebatte*, Berlin: Reimer

OCHS, Elinor, SWEDLUND, Alan, GINGRICH, Andre (eds) (2002): *Repertoires of Timekeeping in Anthropology*, *Current Anthropology*, Supplement Issue to Volume 43, August–October

SAUER, Birgit and KNOLL, Eva-Maria (Hg.) (2006): *Ritualisierungen von Geschlecht*, Wien: WUV

3. Supplementary Documentation to: Final Report, Wittgenstein Prize 2000/Andre Gingrich

3.1. Academic publications (list of ten most important volumes)

1. Lokale Identitäten und überlokale Einflüsse, Band I
Johanna Riegler (Hg.): *Kulturelle Dynamik der Globalisierung. Ost- und Westeuropäische Transformationsprozesse aus sozialanthropologischer Perspektive*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (2005).
2. Lokale Identitäten und überlokale Einflüsse, Band II
Johann Heiss (Hg.): *Veränderung und Stabilität. Normen und Werte in islamischen Gesellschaften*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (2005).
3. Lokale Identitäten und überlokale Einflüsse, Band III
Andre Gingrich und Guntram Hazod (Hg.): *Der Rand und die Mitte. Beiträge zur Sozialanthropologie und Kulturgeschichte Tibets und des Himalaya*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (2006).
4. Andre Gingrich and Richard G. Fox (eds): *Anthropology, by Comparison*. London/New York: Routledge (2002).
5. Gerd Baumann and Andre Gingrich (eds): *Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach*. London: Berghahn (2004).
6. Frederik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman: *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology. The Halle Lectures*. Chicago: University Press (2005).
7. Günther Windhager: *Leopold Weiss alias Muhammad Asad. Von Galizien nach Arabien 1900–1927*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag (2002).
8. Fernand Kreff: *Grundkonzepte der Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie in der Globalisierungsdebatte*. Berlin: Reimer Verlag (2003).
9. Birgit Sauer und Eva-Maria Knoll (Hg.): *Ritualisierung von Geschlecht*. Wien: WUV (2006).
10. Andre Gingrich and Marcus Banks (eds): *Neo-nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*. London-New York: Berghahn (2006).

3.2. Participation at international academic conferences (list of ten most important)

1. Invited contributor at three consecutive conferences of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) in Copenhagen (2002, co-convenor), Vienna (2004, convenor), and Bristol (2006).
2. Invited contributor to UNESCO-sponsored workshop at the UN summit on 'Sustained Development', Johannesburg 2002, South Africa.
3. Invited speaker at the inauguration lecture series 'Four Traditions in Anthropology' on the opening of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale 2002, Germany.
4. Invited contributor at the Austrian Academy of Sciences' first Ernst Mach Symposium on Interdisciplinarity, Vienna 2003, Austria.
5. Invited speaker at the American Anthropological Association's Presidential Panel 'Evidence in Anthropology', Chicago 2003, USA.
6. Keynote speaker at the Annual Meeting of the EU-Sponsored European Doctoral Programme in Social History, Slovakian Academy of Sciences, Bratislava 2003, Slovakia.
7. Invited speaker of the Austrian EU Chair's Conference 'Islam in a Pluralist World', Vienna 2005, Austria.
8. Invited contributor to the Austrian Science Ministry's International Conference 'New Frontiers in Evaluation', Vienna 2006, Austria.
9. Invited contributor to the EU-, Japan-, and GOI-sponsored Conference 'Belonging, Citizenship and Democracy in the Himalayan Regions', India International Centre, Delhi 2007 (March), India.
10. Invited speaker at the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research Symposium, 'A New Epistemology for Anthropology', Lisbon 2007 (September), Portugal.

3.4. Habilitations/Dissertations/Magisterial theses

A) Habilitations: 1 (finalised)

Finalised:

Ernst Halbmayer (submitted in March 2007): *Variationen des Multiversums. Welt differenzierung und Kommunikation bei den heutigen Carib- sprechenden Indianern*

B) Dissertations: 12 (10+2)

Finalised:

Binder, Susanne: *Migration, Segregation, Integration*. 2003, Universität Wien

Danczul, Barbara: *Blut wird niemals Wasser werden! Lokale Strategien zur Beilegung gewalttätiger / fehdeähnlicher Konflikte in Oberägypten*. 2005, Universität Wien

Davis-Sulikowski, Ulrike: *Panther und Chamäleon. Macht, Vodun und Politik in Bénin*. 2002, Universität Wien

Fartacek, Gebhard: *Zonen der Ungewissheit Lokalkulturelle Konzeptionen über Dämonen und deren Relevanz für das Leben in der syrischen Peripherie*. 2004, Universität Wien

Haas, Sylvia: *Die Braut – Frau. Einige Überlegungen zur Kultur und Gesellschaft der Tuareg unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kel Ahaggar (Algerien) ; Gedanken zu nomadischer Lebensweise, Geisterglauben, sozialer Hierarchie und Ehe*. 2002, Universität Wien

Kohl, Ines: *Identitäten zwischen Grenzen: Strategien der Zugehörigkeit von Tuareg (Imājeghen) in Lybien*. 2005, Universität Wien

Kroner, Gudrun: *Jenseits von Ortsgebundenheit , eine komparative Analyse von weiblichen Flüchtlingsschicksalen in der arabisch-islamischen Welt*. 2006, Universität Wien

Strasser, Andrea: *Global Rights, local contexts. Sozialanthropologische Analysen zu Menschenrechten von Frauen im postsozialistischen Armenien*. 2007, Universität Wien

Tošić, Jelena: *Global Rights, Local Contexts. Menschenrechte und Globalisierung in der postsozialistischen Transformation Serbien und Montenegros*. 2005, Universität Wien

Windhager, Günther: *Leopold Weiss alias Muhammad Asad. Nahost-Korrespondent der Kölnischen Zeitung*. 2005, Universität Wien

Ongoing:

Hohlbrugger, Sabine (to be submitted in 2007): *Schwulsein in einer marokkanischen Stadt. Eine Ethnographie zu sozio- religiösen Kontexten und biographischen Werdegängen*

Knoll, Eva-Maria (to be submitted in 2010): *Fortpflanzungstourismus. Handlungsoptionen in einer pluralistischen Welt*

C) Magisterial theses: 8

Finalised:

Böhm, Jasmine: „Türken-Images“ im öffentlichen Raum. *Eine ethnologische Spurensuche in Wien*. 2001, Universität Wien

Höglinger, Monika: *Kopftücher in Wien. Einblicke in verschleierte Lebenswelten: Eine ethnologische Studie zur Bedeutung des Kopftuchs für muslimische Frauen in Wien*. 2001, Universität Wien

Jabloner, Anna: *Are Cyborgs Ethnicized? Zur Konzeption von "Race" bei Donna Haraway*. 2004, Universität Wien

Kloos, Stefan: *Good Medicines, Bad Hearts: The Social Role of 'Amchi' in a Buddhist Dard Community*. 2002, Universität Wien

Knoll, Eva-Maria: *Reproduktionsmedizinische Imaginationen. Überlegungen zum österreichischen IVF-Diskurs aus ethnologisch- feministischer Perspektive*. 2001, Universität Wien

Kreff, Fernand: *Globalisierung in Repräsentationen von Kulturen, Gesellschaft und Lokalitäten. Selbstreflexionen der Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie*. 2001, Universität Wien

Schäffler, Hilde: *Ethnologisches Wissen, Objekte und koloniale Macht. Eine kritische Bearbeitung der von Christoph Fürer- Haimendorf gesammelten Objekte aus Nagaland*. 2004, Universität Wien

Studer, Elke: *Wettreiten für die Götter. Ritual im Wandel; religiöse, politische, historische und rezente Veränderungen des nordtibetischen Reiterfestes in Nagchu*. 2002, Universität Wien

3.5. Follow-up activities

A) FWF/ASF – projects

- **Submitted and accepted:** L 64-G06 'Handbook of Globalisation, Face to Face' (end: Summer/autumn 2007)
- **Submitted and accepted:** P19677-G14, 'Networks of a Diaspora Society' (start: February 2007)
- **Submitted and accepted:** P19839 'Upheavals – Collaborators, Defectors and Outcasts. Socio-cultural Anthropology at the University of Vienna during the Nazi period' (start: autumn 2007)

B) Other projects

- **Submitted and accepted** as grant holder: EUPO135 of the EU's Tempus Program/JEP: 'Capacity Building in the Social Sciences for Palestine' (CASOP) (concluded in 2010)
- **Submitted and accepted** as grant holder: OMV Petrol Inc. Libyan branch office commissioned research project, 'Beauty assists our Being. Costume and decoration among Saharan residents' (concluded in 2009)
- **Submitted and accepted:** Az. 10.04.1.134, of the Fritz Thyssen Foundation (GER): 'Beyond the Ties of Home. A Comparison of Female Refugees in the Arab Islamic world' (concluded in 2009)