Introduction

Re-turns, Entanglements and Collaborations

Anthropology in/of Europe

Jelena Tošić, Sabine Strasser and Annika Lems

This collection is a testament to the power and creativity of anthropology. As the editors of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) Book Series from 2020 to 2024, we took the occasion of the publication of its fiftieth volume to celebrate this milestone with a book that amplifies the great diversity of people, schools of thought, histories and approaches making up our discipline today. The guiding idea was simple: we wanted to include a broad range of anthropologists at different stages of their careers to meet, discuss and collaboratively engage with anthropological knowledge in and of Europe. The EASA Book Series has been showcasing work produced by members of the Association for over twenty years, so it figured as a great vantage point from which to look at key questions, themes and concepts that have marked anthropological debates in Europe over the past two decades. The idea was to present reflections on themes that keep recurring throughout the book series. To do so, we invited eight mid-career anthropologists (some of whom have published within the series) to take charge of eight key recurring themes and think about their purchase for the discipline's past, present and future. These eight chapter editors in turn invited a range of authors who enter(ed) these debates at different points in time, to collaboratively work on these issues. While the eight key themes were suggested by us based on questions that have kept resurfacing in the series, we encouraged authors to take them as a point of departure for open-ended discussion rather than as an

assignment to establish definite answers based on clear-cut analytical categories. As a result, the pillars for the book's eight chapters are formed by cross-generational conversations about identities, im/mobilities, belief(s), power(s), capitalism(s), time(s), Europe(s) and ethnographies. These chapters do not aim or claim to represent the full breadth of anthropology in Europe, or to deliver a coherent depiction of debates in the respective fields of research they touch on. Rather, they offer a cross-sectional view of the series, a snapshot of core themes that continue to preoccupy authors across generations and disciplinary transformations.

As a volume of an anthropology in and of Europe, this book aims to be an experiment in collaboration as much as a testament to anthropology's vitality and relevance in a world that sees itself confronted by challenges of a planetary dimension. When we first started to think about the possibility of creating this volume, we quickly agreed that this needed to be a collective endeavour. It had to make visible the various perspectives, positionalities, histories and future imaginaries marking anthropological work in and of Europe. To achieve this, we needed to include as many voices as possible. After an initial round of workshops with the chapter editors, it became apparent that this cacophony required a commitment to collaborative modes of thinking and writing. The eight thematic chapters thus evolved in the form of productive in-depth conversations, which inspired the unique textual shapes and entangled approaches that can be found in this book. None of the chapters follows the same pattern. While some feature short individual articles, others are written dialogically or as coproduced texts. The outcomes are engaging thought pieces that invite the reader to return to essential 'turns' and reflect on core themes and questions that continue to mark the discipline across times and spaces. Rather than enforcing a coherent line of thought, the authors were given the freedom to work in an open-ended manner and encouraged to test out what happens when anthropologists across generations work together and think collaboratively. In turning incoherence into a productive epistemological tool, the contributors to this volume pay tribute to the fact that anthropological knowledge is not created in the unilinear and consistent matter that is usually presented in publications. By encouraging thinking outside the box and engaging with collective forms of writing, the book also celebrates the value of collaboration in a neoliberal publication landscape obsessed with authorship, rankings and metrics. The logic and set-up of the volume corresponds with its intended nature as a space of multiple and nested collaborations. In this vein, we invited Steven

Van Wolputte, an anthropologist experienced in drawing, to visually and narratively reflect on the chapters and add implicit, unexpected or appealing connections between the different chapters, thereby creating an additional line of communication between the parts of this book.[1] Finally, instead of the classical format of an 'Afterword', we have invited Peter Hervik to collaborate with AI and engage with its effects on the future of anthropology.

Anthropology in/of Europe(s)

In writing this volume, we cannot but draw on the incessantly repeated questioning of anthropology in and of Europe that has marked debates since the turn of the century (Strathern 2006; Loftsdóttir, Smith and Hipfl 2018; Laviolette, Green and Martínez 2019; Martínez 2020). At the core of the book's contributions lie the ways in which the constructions of 'Europe' (and 'the West') – both as a historical and cultural contested space of power and of (reflexive–critical) knowledge production – change and shape how anthropologists perceive their work, its aims, impacts and ethics. Mirroring its simultaneously shifting, translocal and elusive nature and its violent concreteness as a contested geopolitical and epistemological space, Europe is a changing feature throughout the book. While some chapters treat it as a socio-political horizon against which their research takes shape, others look at it through the lens of particular genealogies of knowledge production. Rather than aiming for a definite 'location' of Europe in geopolitical or epistemological terms, the contributions show when and how Europe emerges as a core topic, and what implications this has.

One dominant conceptual trope for framing Europe is crisis. A new set of multiple and entangled crises and related 'crisis talks' that emerged after the implosion of real-socialism and the Yugoslav wars not only shattered Europe. They have come to stand for what Europe is and how it is (to be) explored. Interwoven and intersecting 'waves' and forms of crisis (welfare-state crisis, financial crisis, austerity crisis, crisis of multiculturalism, refugee crisis, the war against Ukraine, etc.) came to (re)constitute Europe as an object of anthropological enquiry. This goes hand in hand with a critical reflection on the sources and architects of 'crisis talks' (Loftsdóttir, Smith and Hipfl 2018; Lems, Oester and Strasser 2019) and the function and responsibility of anthropological knowledge in terms of potentially enhancing and reproducing the politically exploited sense of crisis

as a means of occluding processes of (neoliberal–conservative–authoritarian) restructuration and deepening inequalities.

Perpetual crisis (implying a continuous threat of dissolution) and its constitutive function are a feature anthropology and Europe share. Crisis talk about the decline of the subject of anthropological studies is not new. In fact, even the founding figures of early anthropology doubted the very existence and legitimacy of the emerging discipline. Bronislaw Malinowski, Margaret Mead and Claude Levi-Strauss feared for its significance if 'primitive peoples', who were to be explored by anthropologists, would, due to their contact with Europeans, no longer need exploration. Maurice Godelier, who had conducted research among the still 'isolated' Baruya in the 1960s, also saw the end of the discipline approaching as the autochthonous groups were increasingly integrated into emerging nation-states. The next shock wave gripped the discipline in the early 1970s, when Talal Asad's (1973) critique accused anthropologists of their ignorance of colonial encounters and Johannes Fabian carved out 'temporal Othering' as a key recolonizing feature of anthropological practice (Fabian 2014 [1983]). The next troubled period was sparked by globalization, which caused debates on the disappearance of anthropologists' very stock in trade. Yet, all these critical moments did not contribute to the 'end of anthropology' (Kohl 2010; Comaroff 2010) but permitted very specific transformations of the discipline that finally became epistemological challenges and key elements of its knowledge production: such as self-reflection; cocreation; and postcolonial, feminist and more-than-human approaches.

These epistemological pillars of the discipline and ensuing questions about political, social and cultural experiences, performances and critique paved the way for a new professional organization for anthropology in/of Europe: the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA). EASA was founded in the late 1980s, not least in contrast to the 'epistemological relativism' of US anthropology and still hesitant about who should be seen as a social anthropologist in Europe. Initially, EASA's project was kept within the 'intellectual sterling zone' (Hannerz 2008: 220), in which the social-anthropological project shaped collaboration across borders and areas. However, it welcomed mainly those trained in and committed to the epistemological model of social anthropology and who were willing to transform it into a 'social anthropology of Europe'. When Damiàn Omar Martínez analysed books that led to the new association as well as EASA newsletters and conference reports to understand the internal struggles marking EASA, he identified

a continuity of the contradiction between 'EASA's inclusive and cosmopolitan aspiration and the exclusionary practice of boundary-work' (Martínez 2020: 14). After the fall of the Berlin Wall and despite EASA's emphasis on building a shared platform for East and West, Southern and Eastern European anthropologists, folklorists and ethnologists described their experiences of the organization in terms of paternalism or even (intellectual) colonialism. These contradictions were exemplified by disappointed local committees of EASA conferences in the South and East about West/North-dominated executive boards, perceived sometimes as opinionated and ignorant of local specificities. EASA has always aimed at being a multi-centred and federal 'space of critique' of European anthropology by European anthropologists (Martínez 2020: 11). Yet somehow it reproduced cleavages that Michal Buchowski (2004) assessed as the production of 'hierarchies of knowledge'. Of course, EASA's strong emphasis on East–West cleavages can be explained by the political climate of its founding period but must also be considered as based on the dominance of certain well-situated universities in Britain as well as in Central and Northern Europe. Moreover, the hegemonic production of knowledge, in which North–South differences within Europe were often sidelined, was shaped by the prevailing ideas of the production of the European Research Area. Particularly since the economic, financial and refugee crises beginning in 2008 and continuing into the present, the rifts have realigned and pushed EASA to launch a new round of discussions on differences and cooperation.

In recent years, EASA has engaged intensively in debates on Euro-anthropology and academic precarity (Forums 2015 and 2019) and is yet again seeking critical voices and transformation. The tensions between East and West have re-emerged in light of Russia's war against Ukraine and the atrocities in the Middle East. Different perceptions and expectations across generations increasingly amplify tensions. Representatives from various regions and the long-term commitment to combat precarity as well as the increasing presence of the Precanthro collective, a network of anthropologists combating precarity in academia, on the EASA Executive Committee thus continue to engage in the challenge of making Europe's professional union inclusive, transformative and creative. These debates to rediscover and secure the long-desired common ground have given new momentum to aspirations for the construction of a non-hierarchical platform. While intellectual differences among European anthropologies are fading away, political debates and tensions are spreading again, and with a newly emerging identity politics in multiple

European countries, new debates are rising. Two manifestations of these tensions within EASA were represented by debates around the *EASA Statement on the Russian War against Ukraine* and the *EASA Executive Statement on the Situation in Gaza*.[2] Recent transgenerational discussion forums on the future of Euro-anthropology (Green and Laviolette 2015a, b; Martínez et al. 2016; Laviolette, Green and Martínez 2019), the growing sense of self-censorship, and reinvigorated identity and decolonial debates also give rise to concerns about the very existence of the discipline (Signer 2022; see also Green and Laviolette 2015a, b; Martínez et al. 2016) but also hope for creative and critical insights.

Decolonial, anti-racist and queer approaches have recently sparked additional debates on hierarchies as well as critique on processes of marginalization at European universities. These debates are providing deep insights into continuities of epistemological, bodily and sexual violence, and will hopefully also contribute to a more detailed and complex understanding of inequalities and precarities in the European academic landscape. Radical(ized) claims for making diversity and the legacy of colonial dispossession a more genuine part of anthropological practice are related to a set of closely intertwined processes shaping the conditions under which anthropologists produce knowledge and secure their livelihoods. Precarity, as a further dimension of both the crisis-frame and individual experiences of what it means (and takes!) to commit oneself to being an anthropologist in/of Europe today, is a core political and epistemological concern (as initiatives and debates within EASA clearly show). Namely, the dynamics and effects of deepening inequalities and the rise of right-wing populist parties mobilizing fears and tensions need to be understood in conjunction with neoliberal transformations of the academic field, which have led to precarious working conditions – particularly under authoritarian governments and austerity politics (Strasser et al. 2019). Thus, the necessity to challenge and disclose ideologies and politics of dispossession, inequality and othering through anthropological theory and ethnography goes hand in hand with a tendency to continuously invent new forms of innovation, look for new 'others' and create ever more radical(ized) assessments of past epistemologies and methods. Along with academic survival practices of commodifying knowledge and academic selves, calls for new and more humane forms of research practices are emerging (such as 'patchwork ethnographies', Günel, Varma and Watanabe 2020).

Re-turns, Entanglements and Collaborations

We situate this volume in the midst of these multiple and entangled crises. It is positioned amidst debates about the responsibilities of anthropological knowledge production and the discipline's attempts to assess the 'overheated' (Eriksen 2016) issues of the times we are in. Instead of looking for polished academic articles that take stock of the past twenty years of anthropology, we wanted to test out what happens when anthropologists at different stages of their academic careers are encouraged to think and write collaboratively about some of the most complex issues this world is facing. They deploy three intersecting perspectives that we developed as conceptual metaphors allowing the authors and our readers to think about anthropology today in integrative, diverse and creative ways: re-turns, entanglements and collaborations. Like the eight guiding themes, these angles were neither imposed upon the authors nor are they used in a coherent manner throughout the book. Some authors found it more fruitful to read their empirical material through one lens, while others chose to deploy multiple perspectives.

Through the angle of re-turns, we want to address both the significance and potentially inflationary nature of 'turns' as one of the core elements of neoliberal knowledge regimes in academia resting on the constant demand and (personal) urge to create 'ground-breaking' and 'innovative' knowledge(s). Instead, the authors look closely at the complex genealogies of the themes and approaches they engage with in their texts, the knowledge–power dynamics these are embedded in and the sediments of insights forming fractured continuities and ruptures of knowledge in anthropology. The re-turns angle encouraged the authors to think beyond 'reclaiming' and 'dismissing' knowledge, instead thinking in a dialectical and relational manner.

The focus on entanglements has the aim of dissolving the tendency to 'frame' and represent themes as coherent, but to also actively think through intersections with other approaches and themes. This includes writing 'imaginative' histories of how certain themes and approaches might have looked like if written from the perspective of other thematic and epistemological angles. This dimension also implies a non-linear temporal perspective as it helps us consider (potential) histories, presents and futures of anthropological knowledge.

Finally, the prism of collaborations runs throughout the entire volume. It has allowed us to foreground a mode of working, thinking and writing in which scholars across generations jointly reflect on themes and approaches. We understand 'generation' not in terms of

age but in terms of relations to a particular research field. This includes the various currents of thought through which research fields and knowledge landscapes emerge and are critically assessed and reassessed. This angle foregrounds anthropology in and of Europe as a collaborative space where different people and collectives under radically different conditions of knowledge production and career trajectories come into conversation with one another. This involves considering how embodied conditions of knowledge production crucially frame what counts as 'valuable' knowledge in anthropology. The volume engages reflexively with the dominant canon, thereby also giving prominence to marginalized interventions.

Through the three dimensions foregrounded in this volume, we seek to propose a frame for thinking about anthropology today that relates to past struggles and debates but also envisions different anthropological futures. By treating these intersecting dimensions as a 'fragile frame' rather than as a rigid conceptual framework, we encouraged the authors to engage with topics and paradigms freely and creatively. Even though eclectic and 'messy' in certain ways, this frame allows for balancing a constructive reassessment of the past with future-oriented imaginations and experimentations without succumbing to the neoliberal logic of commodification and innovation. The three dimensions figure as invitations, and so each thematic chapter utilizes them in different ways. Building on recent contemplations about Euro-anthropology, the spirit of this volume thus lies in providing space for new forms of collaborations and narratives (Laviolette, Green and Martínez 2019: 245) across times (history of anthropology, academic generations and biographies) and spaces (Europe as a shifting translocal space of power). As mentioned above, this book primarily represents a collaborative and explorative project, and it took shape through a series of invitations and conversations we initiated. It emerged in close exchange with the eight chapter editors, who in turn invited other scholars to join the conversations. Through this process of 'nested' invitations, the volume took shape as an unforeseen collaborative space of ever-'partial connections' and incomplete representations, which could have looked otherwise with a different set of authors but is explicit and reflexive about the way it developed.

We thus see this book as emerging from an impetus but having developed a life trajectory and logic of its own, revealing some forms and manifestations of anthropology in and of Europe today. We think of the 'fragile frames' the volume offers as a space to collaboratively and experimentally think, without necessarily aiming for

ground-breaking, new or final insights and arguments. The volume implies and employs fragility as an intellectual strength in a discipline that acknowledges its repeated and constructive crises as a necessary aspect of its relations with the shattered and unequal world it aims to understand and theorize. The ever-partial and incomplete insights carried on by new questions and critique figure as shifting 'cracks' allowing for different aspects, explanations and issues to shine through and unfold. However, the potential manifestations of such a 'fragile', experimental and collaborative volume can, we believe, showcase the kind of issues, questions and conditions anthropologists who see themselves as working in and on Europe are struggling with and are trying to set themselves free from.

The workshop spirit of the volume turned out to be a surprisingly inspiring mode for the process of collaboration and experimentation to unfold. The conversations about the emerging volume, which repeatedly took place online or in a hybrid setting at the EASA Conference in Belfast (and in smaller meetings between editors, chapter editors and authors) revealed the workshop mode as the most productive form of collaboration, often experienced as a refugium from the lecture, paper, funding application and conference as the most common formats of knowledge production and communication. The possibility to think out loud and playfully, as well as the repeated and personal encounters, were welcomed enthusiastically by the authors and chapter editors.

To sketch the contours of this book, in what follows we briefly introduce the eight entangled themes we have singled out in the course of our retrospective take on the EASA series volumes: Time(s), Europe(s), Im/mobilities, Power(s), Capitalism(s), Identities, Belief(s) and Ethnographies are spelled out in plural to highlight their complexities and multi-stranded approaches. We briefly outline the themes and the ways they have been dealt with in the respective thematic chapters along the core dimensions of this volume (re-turns, entanglements and collaborations).

Fragile Frames: Multiple Re-turns, Entangled Themes and Perspectives of Collaboration

The eight themes we have identified represent questions, debates and fields of knowledge that have been recurrent and enduring over the last twenty years of the EASA Book Series. They rest on our joint (yet of course still particular) reading of the EASA series' volumes.

The nested-collaborations mode, however, represents the entry point for other prominent themes in anthropology to unfold.

The themes form the basis for eight chapters, all of which address relevant issues in anthropology, challenge existing views on Europe and/or question anthropological practices. These chapters contribute to critically addressing and undermining the coloniality of the relationship between social anthropology and Europe, neoliberal high-risk and 'new turn' rhetoric as well as academic precarity. With this endeavour, we hope to respectfully return to impactful interventions in a collaborative manner while not overlooking transformative entanglements over time.

Re-turns

The authors in the volume deploy the angle of re-turns with various grades of explicitness. Some feel inspired to return to and comment on core paradigms while others think and discuss what kind of imaginaries of return, as well as which ideological re-turns, constitute Europe today. Returns figure as an implicit analytical move in the chapter on TIME(S). As the authors reconsider (and exchange) their own temporal analytics of exploring Europe ethnographically, they return to particular ways Europe is 'temporalized' (postcolonial, postsocialist, mid-pandemic, late liberal) and thus becomes constituted as an object of enquiry. The move of returning in this chapter goes beyond linear temporal framings of past–present–future and stresses the mutual constitution of time and space in Europe seen as an ever-shifting and elusive chronotope. The thematic chapter EUROPE(S), on the other hand, puts the notion of returns at the centre of the conversation about current reconfigurations of and in Europe. The chapter unfolds along ethnographic takes on how certain kinds of returns to and in Europe (ideological, material–infrastructural, historical, mobility-related, etc.) are claimed or dismissed and by whom. Different returns, imaginaries and experiences thereof reveal both attempts to hold Europe together as an entity and idea as well as ruptures in the sense of contested and (for some) unimaginable returns. In the chapter on IM/MOBILITIES, returns primarily figure as a lens to revisit different paradigms of thinking about mobility in anthropology in the last two decades as well as in terms of a critical assessment of the mobility turn itself. The dimension of returns in this chapter is closely intertwined with a decentring move of recapturing and rewriting anthropological engagements with (im)mobility beyond a Eurocentric perspective, implying a

teleological and occidentalist image of Europe as the unquestioned goal for mobility. In their revisiting of the anthropological explorations of power, the authors of the chapter on POWER(S) are most concerned with the question of European re-turns to authoritarianism, state violence and related forms of solidarity and resistance. The ethnographic focus is integrated with revisiting (colonial) legacies and memories of horrific pasts imagined as never to return. Apart from returning to and revisiting ideologies and practices of different economic transitions in Europe, the chapter on CAPITALISM(S) is also interested in which of these have been especially important and constitutive for an anthropological account of capitalism and why. The concepts of class, value and (uneven) development represent conceptual nodes of making sense of these returns. In their account of IDENTITIES, the authors of the following chapter revisit how this contested theoretical and vernacular term has been approached in anthropology. They are especially interested in how different critical returns to the dimensions of gender and race–ethnicity are currently entangled with an activist social-justice perspective, challenging the self-perception of anthropology in and of Europe. The authors of the chapter BELIEF(S) discuss Muslim positionalities and return to one of the key debates in the anthropology of Islam, the 'piety turn'. They align with the postcolonial take of this turn but take up current contradictions shaping this field of knowledge in Europe today. The question of who is eligible to speak and who is heard leads back to Spivak's (1988) seminal question about the subalterns' (self)-representation but situates this question in the heated debates on the self-representation of Muslims in the anthropological discourse on Islam. Even though primarily focusing on new forms of collaboration and experimentation, the chapter on ETHNOGRAPHIES implicitly returns to long-standing ethnographic practices and showcases new multimodal and digitalized forms of ethnographic fieldwork and more-than-text representation. In its forward-looking orientation, this chapter can also be seen as a manifestation of the perpetual return of the discipline to ethnography as a pillar of its very identity. As such, it also resonates with Peter Hervik's closing 'Notes' on the discipline's future, while imagining the returns to questions that might determine anthropology's engagement with AI.

Entanglements

Entanglements are manifold in this volume and have spatial, disciplinary, theoretical, ethnographic, conceptual and at times even

biographical dimensions. All of the book's chapters prefer cross-fertilization over clear coherence and work with intersections. The authors of the chapter TIME(S) collectively explore different temporal frameworks currently applied in ethnographies of an ever-changing Europe and aim at probing each other's divergent frames in their respective fields. Instead of using concepts to demarcate their own ethnographies, they think through and collectively scrutinize their colleagues' temporal tools to rewrite Europe's troubled past, contested present and perhaps (un)promising futures. The chapter EUROPE(S) also emphasizes ethnographic groundedness. Mainly in order to avoid generalizations and grand ambitions, coauthors depart from four situated and idiosyncratic perspectives and want to find out what they reiterate and share when they aim to understand possible futures. However, they see their shared frame in an alignment of their radically situated perspectives and locate entanglements in their ethnographies. From there, they scale their ideas up and down and generate complex local–global entanglements, discuss the world we want to live in and prompt relational beingness to transgress linear boundaries. They understand return as entangled with Europe, or produced within a Europe that only consists of entangled cross- and transborder practices. The authors of IM/MOBILITIES consider entanglements as disciplinary and situate their conversations, careers and collaborations across the North/South divide. They suggest that engaging with im/mobilities allowed anthropologists to deal with entangled complexities and connect various phenomena and disciplines. Im/mobilities for them are thus the gate opener for jointly analysing other entangled fields such as inequality and decoloniality or tourism and migration. In the chapter POWER(S), contributors share a focus on authoritarian regimes and show how the emergence of new forms of subjectivities is embedded in entangled histories and interconnected geographies of contemporary regimes in Europe. They consider entangled contradictions of dispossession, capitalist inequalities and responsibility. Throughout the EASA Book Series' volumes, capitalism is represented as an important but implicit theme. This makes it even more interesting to engage with a range of changing and possibly entangled central concepts of CAPITALISM(S). This chapter's authors find them in class value and uneven distributions, and explore them in different sites that imply personal, political and academic entanglements. The IDENTITIES chapter investigates the interconnected fields of race–ethnicity, gender, sexuality and queer studies, and the interwoven politics of difference within nation-states and Europe at large. The individual

contributions collectively deal with the entanglement of identity research and political engagement or the epistemological intersections of scholarship and activism. BELIEF(S), on the other hand, is engaged in coproduced knowledge on Islam that discusses the intersections and distinctions of public polemics and the anthropology of Islam. In this perspective, Muslims are not mere objects of study but coproducers of entangled postcolonial knowledge on Islam – thereby exploring its new forms of alliances and collaborations. While the previous chapters are linked through their different perspectives on Europe, that on ETHNOGRAPHIES stands out for its explorations into different modalities of representation. Destabilizing textual forms of knowledge production, its authors meet 'in the kitchen of contemporary ethnography' to rethink and share each others' work in entangled collaborations.

Collaborations

Collaborative perspectives allow participants to emphasize the significance and transformative power of sharing, mutual stimulation and joint writing. Starting from the authors' ethnographic experience of cocreativity we asked them to make visible how collaboration influenced their ethnographic and theoretical writing practices and how it allowed them to develop fragile frames for their entangled narration and expected re-turns. In dialogues and trialogues, in interviews and experiments, in ethnographic essays and collaboratively written creative texts, the contributors to this volume present their themes and explicitly address the strategies of cocreating their chapters. All the contributors write from the vantage point of their own ethnographic research sites, and many address ethnographic experiences across the North/South and insider/outsider divides. The formats they chose to do so are different, leading to a book in which every chapter is characterized by a unique approach. Some chapters foregrounded the importance of conversation, not just as a method of knowledge production but as a writing technique. In this vein, the chapter on TIME(S) grew from an experimental trialogue between Felix Ringel, Kristín Loftsdóttir and Dace Dzenovska. It features their ongoing conversations about the current temporal analytics of Europe. Rather than providing the reader with individual takes on this issue, the texts make visible the back-and-forth movements between each others' ideas. Similarly, the authors of EUROPE(S) produce a deliberately partial and incomplete text. The composition of authors represented in this chapter was carefully chosen to

test out what happens when differently positioned agents speak to each other about Europe. Through an approach characterized by continuous rediscussion, revision and redesigning, they created four distinct yet entangled perspectives that shed light on the complexities and contradictions encapsulated in the notion of Europe(s). Other chapters chose to experiment with a range of writing approaches to highlight the exciting forms of knowledge production collaborations can harbour. The authors of IM/MOBILITIES chose to present three modes of conversation emerging from their larger collaborative efforts: a cowritten piece in which Paolo Gaibazzi, Michael Stasik and Bruno Riccio reflect on the different generational angles that led them to engage with im/mobilities at different points in time is followed by a thought piece written by members of the EASA Anthropology and Mobility Network and a dialogue between two scholars who let the readers participate in their ongoing exchange about issues of im/mobility across the North/South divide. The chapter on POWER(S) collaborated by collectively contributing to the overall theme and developed research questions on authoritarianism. It discusses emanations of power in relation to different forms of violence and develops a shared interest in reflection on biographical-epistemological trajectories. The contributions of the chapter on CAPITALISM(S) emerged from an initial provocation put forward by the chapter editor, Katharina Bodirsky. She deliberately chose to work with two authors who represent different spatio-temporal generations of anthropological thinking on capitalism. Responding to her initial proposal, each of them looks back at different historical moments of their work and the various regions in Europe they worked in. This approach allows them to make visible how living through particular historical moments in specific places shaped their thoughts on capitalism. Similarly, the contributors of the chapter BELIEF(S) chose to make visible their conversations about the shifting role of Islam in anthropology by organizing their texts around the commonly shared problem of translation. In doing so, they try to address not only the question of how to establish a commonly shared language between anthropologist and research participant but also how anthropologists can speak to one another about often contentious issues. The chapter IDENTITIES presents a conversation of three anthropologists trying to navigate the space between anthropological scholarship and activism at different points in time and in different highly politicized spaces, including anti-racism, gender and queer advocacy. Contributors to the chapter ETHNOGRAPHIES organized it around a series of conversations from what they describe

as the 'kitchen of contemporary ethnography'. Treating the kitchen as a cross-cultural space that allows for informal conversations and creative experiments, they develop a conversational (and at times even confessional) mode of writing that reflects on their ethnographic practices and how multimodal approaches might lead the way into new, difficult-to-reach areas of anthropological enquiry. The volume ends with notes on a radically different form of collaboration: between an anthropologist and AI.

Jelena Tošić is Titular Professor for Migration Studies at the University of St Gallen. Her research interests include (forced) migration, borders, inequality, education, mobility and dance. She is coeditor of 'Common Sense, Knowledge and Social Practice: Gramscian Perspectives in Contemporary Ethnography' (Special Issue), *Dialectical Anthropology* 46(4) (2022) and *Ethnographies of Deservingness: Unpacking Ideologies of Distribution and Inequality* (Berghahn 2022).

Sabine Strasser is a professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Bern, Switzerland. Her research focuses on morality, affect and solidarity within the contexts of migration, border and gender studies, with a regional emphasis on Turkey and Europe. She recently coedited the special issue 'The Affective Economy of Removal' in the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (JEMS 2024) and coedited 'The Politics of Precarity: Neoliberal Academia under Austerity Measures and Authoritarian Threat' in *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* (2019).

Annika Lems is a senior lecturer in Anthropology at the Australian National University in Canberra, Australia and a research partner at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle, Germany. Her research broadly focuses on questions of belonging, alienation and place (making) in an accelerated global world order. She is the author of two monographs, *Being-Here: Placemaking in a World of Movement* (Berghahn 2018) and *Frontiers of Belonging: The Education of Unaccompanied Refugee Youth* (Indiana University Press 2022).

Notes

1. For his own reflections on his contribution, see Van Wolputte in this volume.
2. https://easaonline.org/outputs/support/ukraine0222.shtml; https://easa online.org/outputs/support/gaza1023.shtml.

References

Asad, Talal (ed.). 1973. *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.

Buchowski, Michal. 2004. 'Hierarchies of Knowledge in Central-Eastern European Anthropology', *The Anthropology of East Europe Review* 22(2004): 5–14.

Comaroff, John. 2010. 'The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline', *American Anthropologist* 112(4): 524–38. https://doi .org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2010.01273.x.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2016. 'Overheating: The World since 1991', *History and Anthropology* 27(5): 469–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/027572 06.2016.1218865.

Fabian, Johannes. 2014 [1983]. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press. https://doi .org/10.7312/fabi16926.

Green, Sarah, and Patrick Laviolette. 2015a. 'Forum Rethinking Euro-Anthropology', *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale* 23(3): 330–64.

Green, Sarah, and Patrick Laviolette. 2015b. 'Forum Rethinking Euro-Anthropology: Part Two', *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale* 23(4): 492–509.

Günel, Gökçe, Saiba Varma, and Chika Watanabe. 2020. 'A Manifesto for Patchwork Ethnography', Member Voices, *Fieldsights*, 9 June. Retrieved 13 April 2024 from https://culanth.org/fieldsights/a-manifesto-for-patch work-ethnography.

Hannerz, Ulf. 2008. 'Afterworld: Anthropology's Global Ecumene', in Aleksandar Boskovic (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Kohl, Karl-Heinz. 2010. 'The End of Anthropology – an Endless Debate', *Paideuma: Mitteilungen Zur Kulturkunde* 56: 87–98.

Laviolette, Patrick, Sarah Green, and Francisco Martínez. 2019. 'Locating European Anthropology', *Anuac* 8: 245–54. https://doi.org/10.7340/AN UAC2239-625X-3931.

Lems, Annika, Kathrin Oester, and Sabine Strasser. 2019. 'Children of the Crisis: Ethnographic Perspectives on Unaccompanied Refugee Youth in and En Route to Europe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46(2), 315–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1584697.

Loftsdóttir, Kristín, Andrea L. Smith, and Brigitte Hipfl (eds). 2018. *Messy Europe: Crisis, Race, and Nation-State in a Postcolonial World*, 1st edn. New York: Berghahn Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvw04hj9.

Martínez, Francisco, Mariya Ivancheva, Valerio Simoni, Martin Demant Frederiksen, Livia Jiménez, Laura Hirvi, Kacper Pobłocki, et al. 2016. 'Rethinking Euro-Anthropology: Part Three. Early Career Scholars Forum', *Social Anthropology* 24(3): 353–79. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12327.

Martínez, Omar Damiàn. 2020. 'Between Boundary-Work and Cosmopolitan Aspiration. A Historical Genealogy of EASA (and European Anthropology)', *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 29(2): 11–30. https://doi.org/10.3167/ajec.2020.290202.

Signer, David. 2022. 'Die Wissenschaft leidet, wenn sie «woke» sein soll' [Scholarship is Suffering When Expected to Be 'Woke'], *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 18 December.

Spivak, Gayatri, Ch. 1988. 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan.

Strasser, Sabine, Georgeta Stoica, David Loher (eds). 2019. 'On Politics and Precarity in Academia', *Social Anthropology* 27(S2). https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12695.

Strathern, Marilyn. 2006. 'A Community of Critics? Thoughts on New Knowledge', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12(1): 191–209. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3803925.