



Workshop

Being Anthropologists in the Time of Disruption

Power, Weakness, and Representation

October 10-11, 2018
 'Normative Orders' Building
 Max-Horkheimer-Straße 2, Campus Westend
 Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany.

SFB
1095

Schwächediskurse
und Ressourcenregime



Max Planck Institute
for Social Anthropology

IFGI

Frankfurter
Forschungszentrum
Globaler Islam

NORMATIVE ORDERS
 Exzellenzcluster an der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main

GOETHE
 UNIVERSITÄT
 FRANKFURT AM MAIN



Being Anthropologists in the Time of Disruption: Power, Weakness, and Representation

In response to current social, political, and ecological ruptures, there is a sense of urgency for anthropologists to reflect upon their positionality and how they could engage with society as well as acknowledge the role of their interlocutors. As democratic formations, environmental sustainability, and socio-political security enter different phases of disruption, there is a call for anthropologists to not only identify societies' weaknesses, but also to seek out ways to make their research accessible and, in some cases, a public good, especially for the informants they deal with in the field. Although approaches of engaged, applied, and action anthropology date back to the early 20th century, against the background of current dramatic global tensions, engaged anthropology, participatory or collaborative research, and transdisciplinary approaches need to be revisited (Laidlaw 2014; Low and Merry 2010). These approaches bear the desire to de-colonize academic knowledge, to bring the role of interlocutors to the fore, to uphold social responsibility, and to gain insights into diverse epistemological and ontological worlds. Additionally, encounters and cooperation with interlocutors ought to be strengthened in the pursuit of transformative knowledge and to deal with 'real-world' problems. This workshop therefore marks an attempt to further understand the positioning between anthropologists and interlocutors through the dimensions of power and representation, encompassing all aspects of the research process.

Engaged, applied, and action anthropology intend to expand the impact of research and connect with broader audiences in order to actively engage in contemporary social issues. At the same time, proponents of action anthropology, development anthropology, and collaborative research seek to enhance the devolution of power to communities often in combination with the promotion of rights (Rylko-Bauer et al. 2006). These approaches share an intensive exchange between academic and non-academic participants, the acknowledgement of different forms of practices, epistemologies, and ontologies, and the utilization of critical dialogue, mutual reflection, and 'epistemic partnerships' (Marcus and Deeb 2011: 51). Engaged approaches also encompass all participants' socio-political motivations and joint commitment to common concerns, which could be channelled into political action. Power differences and inequalities between researchers and interlocutors or local partners shape their exchanges, acknowledgement, dialogues, mutuality and partnerships and manifest themselves in negotiations of the access to, control and dissemination of knowledge and information as well as mutual expectations. Reflections on power are not only relevant in terms of the individual relationship between anthropologists and interlocutors, but also regarding the interaction of researchers with oppressed as well as oppressive groups such as local elites.

Interpretive anthropology has provided the possibility for researchers to approach the veracity of practices through the lens of the actors' perspective. This intention is not merely an approach to present detailed practices, structures and dimensions of human interactions but is also influential in creating a path for how these interactions can be narrated (Barth et.al. 2005). Complications can arise as anthropologists are caught in ethical and spatio-temporal entanglements at least on two levels: first, in maintaining their distance from personal involvement, and, second, as capable actors who could have the agency to shape the historical path of those in the field (Laidlaw 2014, Caplan 2003). Thus, anthropologists

often face a phenomenological dilemma of representation behind the scene while writing as they could no longer speak *for* the interlocutors but *with* the interlocutor, and, at the same time, have to represent the genuine complexity of the field to acquire the most even-handed tone of a work. Such challenges become more obvious when the field research requires participant observations or membership, and where the anthropologist needs to encounter public engagement (see Pink and Abram 2015, Rappaport 1993). Explicit engagement in visual anthropology (Favero 2015), for example, has become a certain access point where the initial participation would establish the feedback received from the interlocutor and, therefore, how the anthropologist could continue his/her research narrative.

This workshop gathers eight speakers with rich case studies from around the globe, divided into four panels: collaborative activism, knowledge production and collaborative work, locating anthropologist, and crisis and power. The first panel discusses the challenges of 'collaborative activism' between anthropologists and their interlocutors. Working on the *Movimento dos Trabalhadores sem Teto* in Brazil, Alberto Fierro (Central European University, Hungary) raises the ontological issues of the representability of a movement and the possibilities for creating a common project that is advantageous for both the research community and activists. Reflecting on his experience in making a documentary video on the Innu's caribou hunting in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, Damián Castro (Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada) proposes that such a collaborative project not only shapes the anthropological work, but could also go further by creating a 'tangible intervention' against a certain regime.

Collaboration, however, as Rano Turaeva's (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale, Germany) research with Russian Muslims exemplifies, always poses the problem of inequality: whose knowledge will justify what research questions are asked and what explanations are arrived at? In such dialogical processes, trust and mistrust between actors become a pivotal issue of representation as Courtney Dorroll (Wofford College, USA) reflects in her field research experience in Germany, Turkey, and Lebanon. She also problematizes the acceptance of the anthropological work, both socially and academically. Keeping research anthropological is an issue that also is raised by Catherine Sheer (Universität Heidelberg, Germany). Reflecting on her research in Cambodia, she explores how the closeness with the interlocutor could actually affect the anthropologist's critical stance.

Also working on Cambodia, Sina Emde (Universität Heidelberg) questions the legitimacy of gatekeeper knowledge as access to the field and the ethical reasoning that drives such access shape the research. With such complications in approaching and understanding the field, again, there is a demand to discuss the positionality of an anthropologist especially in a time of crisis, as the research by Margarita Lipatova (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale, Germany) —working on the migration crisis in Greece —and Kristina Großmann (University of Passau, Germany) — working on mining conflicts in Borneo, Indonesia—underscore.

We are honoured to host two distinguished researchers as our discussants. Maribeth Erb is a professor at the Department of Sociology at the National University of Singapore after leaving her position at the Department of Anthropology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. She works extensively on the people of Manggarai in Western Flores, Eastern Indonesia. When the villagers of one old village in Manggarai decided to rebuild their traditional house for tourism purposes, she was asked to help in researching the history and

symbolism of this house. Since then, she has been interested in the influence that growing tourism has had on Manggaraian culture and local people, particularly on how they have come to understand tourists and how they adapt and recreate their culture for the purposes of tourism. Her latest book (with Ong Chin Ee), *Theming Asia: Nature, Culture and Heritage in a Transforming Environment*, was published by Routledge in 2017.

Susanne Schröter is a professor of anthropology at Goethe University Frankfurt, member of the executive board of the Collaborative Research Centre Resource Regime and Discourses of Weaknesses, and the director of Frankfurt Research Centre for Global Islam. Her research covers various subjects including gender, women's rights, religion, and Islam. She has worked extensively on religion and social structure in Ngada, Eastern Indonesia, and currently conducting several research projects on Islam and Islamism in Southeast Asia and Germany, particularly in Wiesbaden. Her latest book publications are *Normenkonflikte in pluralistischen Gesellschaften* (in German; Normative Conflicts in Plural Societies) published with Campus Verlag in 2017 and *Gott näher als der eigenen Halsschlagader - Fromme Muslime in Deutschland* (in German; God closer as your artery – Pious Muslims in Germany) also with Campus Verlag in 2016.

As part of the workshop, we will have a documentary film screening of *Atiku Napeu* (The Caribou Man) directed by one of the participants, Damián Castro. The film, which took three years to make, provides a closer look at the struggle of the Innu in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, in keeping their traditional practice of caribou hunting practice while dealing with the state's policy on hunting prohibition. Beyond a documentary, such visual work of anthropology has transformed the narrative of practice into a form of indigenous people's agency to describe the complexity of 'Resource Culture', to apply a terminology from Hardenberg, Bartelheim, and Staecker Hardenberg (2017), to the state. As such, the documentary also provides an excellent example of an anthropological work that allows collaboration with interlocutors to produce a better representation of raised issues.

Convenors:

Dr. Ario Seto	Dr. Kristina Großmann	Dr. Dominik Müller
Goethe University Frankfurt	University of Passau	Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle

PROGRAMME

Wednesday, October 10, 2018

- 13.30 – 13.45 **Opening Remarks**
 Susanne Schröter
 Collaborative Research Centre 'Resource Regimes and Discourse of Weaknesses',
 Frankfurter Forschungszentrum Globaler Islam, Goethe University Frankfurt.
- Panel 1: Collaborative Activism
 Chair: Ario Seto, Goethe University Frankfurt.
- 13.45 – 14.05 **Social Movements in the Global South and the Academic Researcher from the Global North: parting ways and common political projects.**
 Alberto Fierro, Central European University, Hungary.
- 14.05 - 14.25 **Atiku Napeu Documentary: Indigenous activism in the social media era.**
 Damián Castro, Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.
- 14.25 – 15.00 Q&A
- 15.00 – 15.15 Coffee Break
- Panel 2: Knowledge Production and Collaborative Works
 Chair: Dominik Müller, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle
- 15.15 – 15.35 **Whose Knowledge in Which Form:
 Anthropologist and research partners work.**
 Rano Turaeva, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale, Germany.
- 15.35 – 15.55 **Is She a Spy? Is She an Activist? On trust and mistrust in the field.**
 Courtney Dorroll, Wofford College, USA.
- 15.55 – 16.30 Q&A
- 16.30 – 17.45 Documentary Film Screening: **Atiku Napeu**
 Q&A with Filmmaker: Damián Castro, Memorial University of Newfoundland,
 Canada.

Thursday, October 11, 2018

- Panel 3: Locating the Anthropologist
 Chair: Kristina Großmann, University of Passau
- 9.30 – 9.50 **How to Speak about Indigenous Movements (as a Non-Indigenous Anthropologist)? Between engaged reification and distant critique.**
 Catherine Sheer, Universität Heidelberg, Germany.
- 9.50 – 10.10 **Access, Knowledge and Power in the Context of the Khmer Rouge Tribunal in Cambodia.**
 Sina Emde, Institut für Ethnologie, Universität Heidelberg.
- 10.10 – 10.45 Q&A
- 10.45 – 11.00 Coffee Break
- Panel 4: Crisis and Power
 Chair: Dominik Müller, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle
- 11.00 – 11.20 **Migration Crisis in Greece and Researcher's Multiple Roles.**
 Margarita Lipatova, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale,
 Germany.
- 11.20 -11.40 **Power, Roles and Impacts: Reflections on the initial phase of a participative research project in Indonesia.**
 Kristina Großmann, University of Passau, Germany.
- 12.00 Q&A
- Discussant Commentaries**
- 12.00 – 13.00 Maribeth Erb, National University of Singapore.
- 12.30 – 13.00 Susanne Schröter, Goethe University Frankfurt.

Social Movements in the Global South and the Academic Researcher from the Global North: parting ways and common political projects.

Alberto Fierro

School of Political Science, Public Policy and International Relations,
Central European University, Hungary.

As Jewishness and Zionism in Judith Butler's provocative book (Butler 2012), the ways of radical social movements and academic researchers seem parting. The problem is as simple as inescapable: the researcher's positionality is deeply entrenched in a structure of inequality and domination. Despite the goodwill of the scholar, his/her position is problematic in (at least) two respects: on the one hand, without global inequalities the social struggle in the South would not exist and therefore the very object of the inquiry would disappear (Otto and Terhorst 2011). On the other hand, as underlined by Veissire (2010), the position of the 'gringo ethnographer is necessarily exploitative' because s/he is 'also making a living and a career from writing about the suffering of others' (p. 29).

Drawing on my ongoing ethnographic research with the Brazilian *Movimento dos Trabalhadores sem Teto* (MTST) —Homeless Workers' Movement—the present paper aims at exploring the political problems of Western academics doing engaged research with social movements in the Global South. MTST is a national social movement that struggles for housing and pro-poor public policies. Through the practice of occupying unused lands and building shacks in the periphery of São Paulo, the movement triggers the city's institutions to build housing at affordable prices. Yet, MTST is not primarily a housing movement: the main political objective is to organize low income citizens in order to radically transform Brazilian economy and society.

Mirroring the duality of the MTST's strategy, the present paper suggests two problems for engaged research. The first problem concerns the representability of the popular movement itself: as influentially argued by Gayatri Spivak (1988), the voice of the subaltern is necessarily conditioned on the structural dominant discourse. Therefore, in order to effectively represent the social movement, the researcher must also to engage in a challenge of the academic discourse. The second problem concerns the possibilities of developing a political project common to a researcher community and the social movement itself. The scholar reflects on the outcomes of his/her own research.

Atiku Napeu Documentary: Indigenous activism in the social media era.

Damián Castro

Department of Anthropology

Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada

Anthropological production about Labrador, Canada, was traditionally characterized by a high level of advocacy for indigenous peoples in the area. During my doctoral research, I was also inclined to follow such an activist tradition and, even if my thesis might inform the improvement of government policies, I should complement it with more tangible actions. The opportunity came when the provincial government of Newfoundland and Labrador unilaterally decreed a hunting ban on caribou in January 2013. The Innu Nation government decided to defy the ban and organized a protest hunt. Given that I have some previous video-making experience, the Innu Nation government asked me and a friend and community member to video-document the hunt. That put me in the line of fire, doing my documenting job as government helicopters flew over the hunting group. The final product was a 48-min documentary called *Atiku Napeu* (Canada, 2016). The documentary features the feast

and its preparation, the harassment by government authorities, and several interviews with elders that state their position on caribou and the relationship Innu and their colonizers. Further, as it was shared on social networks among the Innu and their allies, it also became a material component of pro-Innu advocacy. The documentary is also part of the evidence of the continuity of past and present practices that Innu Nation presented to the courts prosecuting the hunt. This documentary also shows the possibility of anthropologists working collaboratively with community leaders and members to produce a tangible intervention that have an active impact community's struggles against colonialism.

Panel 2: Knowledge Production and Collaborative Work

Whose Knowledge in Which Form: Anthropologist and research partners work.

Rano Turaeva

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale, Germany.

The contribution is based on the research work and collaboration with research partners in the field in the context of research on Islam and Migration in Russia where I have closely worked and still work with a lawyer, Muslim, migrant and human rights activist at the same time who is based in Moscow in Russia. The man with whom I started to work since 2016 has been serving as a research assistant for several researchers from Germany mainly working on different topics such as Djihad and Central Asian migrants joining IS, migration and other topics on Central Asian migration to Russia. In the course of our close collaboration, I first encountered such a dilemma as power and authority of representation which went beyond the scope of 'writing culture' tradition. The questions I confronted myself were what kind of knowledge my local partner has and what kind of knowledge I would like to gain from this close collaboration and in which form I would like to present it and how is the knowledge formed together is going to be processed. In the past, I worked with some limited student assistance where I was training students to do some interviews and was asking for support in administrative work. This last collaboration with a well-established human rights activist, a lawyer and a dedicated Muslim who was not only supporting my research but rather shaping my research and continuously giving me feedback on my fieldwork, I had to rethink my partnership in the field and think more about the representation, use of data, and reflecting on how to choose a right way for further research collaboration with those in the field who have a much better understanding of the daily issues that I came to study and much more reflection about certain aspects of the problems I came to understand.

After a year of working together I decided to continue working with my local partner as a colleague and at the same time a mentor and continuously changing our roles, such as, he is a mentor and a colleague in daily issues in the field and in the writing process I am a mentor and a colleague for academic writing for the western audience. We participate in conferences together and we write also together. He gives me his feedback on my writing and I give feedback on my writing. It is slow but productive. The inequality of our situation is still there and cannot be changed and the difference in our academic training is also there, and the power of representation and authority of knowledge production exists and cannot be ignored. The questions of those who will contribute to our writings are open and the problems our respondents face in the field cannot be quickly changed. The questions majority of respondents in the field ask 'why do we need to study our problems? Can you then solve them?', 'does it help me', and 'what do I get from this research?' are always asked and will be asked but remain unanswered. I could successfully help out one of my respondents during my fieldwork and some others do make me feel better but those still do not answer those questions I am being asked continuously when I approach my respondents in the field.

The contribution will be reflecting upon the experiences I had during my field research in Moscow (Islam and Migration in Russia) in order to contribute to the rethinking on the work of

anthropologists and revisiting the purpose and goals of anthropological works which had a completely different agenda at the very beginning of the anthropological era of fieldwork and studying the exotic other.

Is She a Spy? Is She an Activist? On trust and mistrust in the field.

Courtney Dorroll (co-authored with Jedidiah Anderson, Furman University)

Middle Eastern and North African Studies

Wofford College, USA

We will explore the issue of trust and mistrust in the field. Drawing from work done by Helena Flam and Monique Scheer, pioneers in analyzing emotions in ethnography, our paper will discuss how this process of trust and mistrust shapes the knowledge production produced in ethnographic methods and the measures an ethnographer must go through in order to protect data and keep trust with the state they do research in, the interlocutor and their own academic circles.

Our paper explores the politics of ethnography in sites of protest and shows first hand examples of ethnographer as insider/activist and ethnographer as outsider/non-activist. The role of the state is also explored when considering the politics revolving around ethnographic fieldwork. We will discuss academic activism and ethnography. When is it helpful to one's position in the field and in their academic career and when is that positionality at odds or in tension? Therefore, we have a paradox for the ethnographer doing work on social movements: whether to build trust with their interlocutors and try to become a 'insider' as the activist-scholar or trying to create the since of distance as just the ethnographer. When is this socially/academically acceptable or not socially/academically acceptable? When does mistrust result in interlocutors viewing the ethnographer as spy? We will draw from my own experiences in the field working on researching devote Muslims enrolled in an Islamic Theology Centre in Germany, Turkish Gezi park activists in Istanbul, Turkey, and Helem LGBTIQ activists in Lebanon.

Panel 3: Locating the Anthropologist

How to Speak about Indigenous Movements (as a Non-Indigenous Anthropologist)? Between Engaged Reification and Distant Critique

Catherine Sheer

Institut für Ethnologie, Universität Heidelberg, Germany

In 2009, when I started my research with the Bunong inhabitants of a commune in the Cambodian highlands, they were confronting two rubber companies which were bulldozing down their fields and forests. The language of indigenous peoples' rights, channelled through various NGOs, rapidly gained traction in the commune and groups formed to reclaim 'indigenous community titles' for what was left of their land. However, this did not happen without challenges and ambiguities. The image of 'indigenous minorities', as it has taken shape in Cambodia through the influence of state policies and international organizations, emphasized these peoples' role as guardians of traditional culture and as environmental stewards. War, Christian missionaries and economic pressure have left their traces though, making it difficult for Bunong activists to conform to images imposed from the outside. How then to deal as an anthropologist with claims of indigeneity that appear problematic but might be crucial for one's interlocutors as they fight for their rights?

Reflecting upon this question, I realized that in the field, I largely accepted the task of documenting indigenous 'traditions' that my Bunong interlocutors had passed on to me, and rarely discussed occurrences of 'strategic essentialism'. I also found it difficult to appropriately respond to the rubber plantation director when he accused the Bunong of cutting trees in their own 'sacred forests'. Off the field, however, I wrote about the ways in which trying to be a proper 'indigenous' person affected the Bunong activists I talked to. If this more critical stance felt problematic, it was partly because it appeared to contrast my previous approach. This apparent contrast made me rethink these two moments in an anthropologist's metier by looking for continuities. What I found and would like to further explore were occurrences of 'subversive equivocation,' where homonymic concepts were not only invested with differing meanings (Viveiros de Castro 2004), but where difference also came to question the universalistic pretences of dominant understandings.

Access, Knowledge and Power in the Context of the Khmer Rouge Tribunal in Cambodia.

Sina Emde, Institut für Ethnologie, Universität Heidelberg.

Collaborations with non-governmental organisations are at the forefront of engaged anthropology. Many of these collaborations are based on the assumption that NGOs are part of social movements working towards social change. This certainly holds true, yet we must acknowledge that NGOs and civil societies do have specific histories and developments in different parts of the world. In Cambodia, non-governmental organisations only came into being in the 1990s when the country opened to the West and was flooded by an enormous amount of aid. NGOs were a necessity to access that aid, and from the beginning were as much funding and employment opportunities as social movements. A similar process was set in motion when the Victim Support Section of the Khmer Rouge Tribunal as well as international aid allocated major funding to the civil transitional justice process in Cambodia. These dynamics bring certain predicaments of engagement and activism.

This paper reflects upon my research on forms and practices of remembering the violence of almost thirty years of war and political terror in Cambodia, and on the emotive dimensions that surround these processes. The research was undertaken in close collaboration with the German Civil Peace Service and a Cambodian Youth Organization. The multi-sited research took place five months in Phnom Penh and five months in a village at a mass grave site. Access to the village came through the NGO. While I was very grateful to be given the opportunity to work in this village, the collaboration with the organization had several implications I am still working through.

I do believe that the NGO wants to build sustainable peace in Cambodia. But as many of their projects were funded in the context of the tribunal it is also part of the dynamics described above. The NGO expanded rapidly and many of their young activists were under 25. They did not know much about the Khmer Rouge time. Their intergenerational work on dealing with the past focussed on the masternarrative in Cambodia of work, starvation and death. They did not address specific local experiences. Two weeks into my fieldwork I realised that the village I worked in was a base people's village, bystanders, where all men had been Khmer Rouge soldiers. The NGO did not know about this, and addressed villagers as victims not as perpetrators. In fact, the NGO's application of the masternarrative, emphasizing victimhood, played a key role in giving them access to the place. Yet for many villagers the boundaries between victims and perpetrators were blurred. These findings could have led to exciting work for both the NGO and the anthropologist, but it was not something the NGO or the funding agencies were interested in. In this paper, I reflect upon the ethical questions that emerged as well as the difficulties to adequately write about this.

Migration Crisis in Greece and Researcher's Multiple Roles.

Margarita Lipatova

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Halle Saale, Germany

2015 marked the emergence of a highly mediatised 'European refugee crisis' narrative. Receiving the unprecedented influx of people on the move, Greece has become one of the main sites and spectacles of the European border regime. Now, three years later, the notions of crisis or of emergency continue to be appealed to here in order to describe the dynamics of 'management' of the arriving people. Taking the situation on the Greek shores as the situation 'in the time of disruption', when the order of migration control is in turbulence, and the constructs of 'borders', 'refugees' and 'migrants' are in transition depending on larger political forces as well as the dominating course of the moral economies, I draw on my own research experience as the example of engaged anthropology.

I aim to raise several points with my presentation, starting from the very fundamental question of the positionality of the researcher. Like in many other examples of anthropological research, the access to my field site, the refugee camp in Chios, can be only granted through an association with a humanitarian organization. Furthermore, as the core of my research addresses political mobilisation, and strategies of recognition taken by the camp population against the border regime, I am to manoeuvre between the roles of the researcher, the humanitarian worker, and the activist. How does the ambiguity of the entanglement of those multiple identities influence my relation to the field, the research and foremost, the interlocutors? What expectations and ethical dilemmas emerge out of it?

Additionally, I would like to address the power effects (Burawoy 1998) inherent in my research, especially domination and objectification. Those have multiple forms, e.g., my privileged position of being a holder of a European visa, or the struggles to avoid reinforcing the border regime through appealing to categories like 'refugees' or 'migrants'. Attempting to minimize the power effects, I designed a research model of collaborative methods with art work and visual self-representation. The latter includes a production of a narrative about the living in border spaces by the people on the move and its correspondence with the circulating narratives about Chios in media, NGO discourses, etc. What could be the potential of such forms of doing anthropology?

Power, Roles and Impacts: Reflections on the initial phase of a participative research project in Indonesia.

Kristina Großmann

Comparative Development and Cultural Studies

University of Passau, Germany

In participative research, reflexivity as critical (self-)evaluation is essential in order to disclose power relations, the roles of researchers and impacts on social change and scientific gain. I reflect on the initial phase of the transdisciplinary participative research project FuturEN, in which I aim to mitigate conflicts as well as to generate transformation knowledge in correspondence with extra-scientific actors on the issue of mining conflicts in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. In regards to the coproduction and integration of knowledge, the initial future workshop provided a space for critical reflection and networking but had little impact on policy-making processes. Due to the lack of integration of powerful actors and my sudden involvement as mediator in mining conflicts, I will change the planned research process. To raise problem awareness amongst relevant actors who are excluded so far and to address newly revealed lines of conflict amongst villagers as well as between

villagers and an indigenous peoples' rights organization will be the aims for further future workshops. Thus, as the course of participatory research is hard to predict, knowledge of the issues at stake, flexibility and the expertise in a wide range of methods are a prerequisite.

Film Screening

Becoming an Anthropologist, Resource Regime and Discourse of Weakness

Atiku Napeu (2016)

Filmmaker/Anthropologist:

Alexander Andrew and Damián Castro

Duration: 48 Minute

Description from the Filmmaker:

Hunting, following proper protocol and celebrating the *mukushan* is the Innu way to honor Atiku Napeu, the caribou man, the master of all caribou and other land animals. As long as he is honored, Atiku Napeu will keep giving caribou and bless the Innu so that they and their culture can survive. But now, the government of Newfoundland and Labrador has imposed a total ban on caribou hunting. The Innu have rejected the ban. This film is about Innu survival and struggle to keep honoring Atiku Napeu, their holy resource and the centre of social life.

Source: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt6394358/>



