SOCIALINĖS ANTROPOLOGIJOS IR ETNOLOGIJOS STUDIJOS

LIETUVOS ETNOLOGIJA

10(19)
2010

LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY

STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS
LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

LII LEIDYKLA VILNIUS 2010

REDAKCINĖ KOLEGIJA

Vytis Čiubrinskas (vyriausiasis redaktorius)
Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas

Auksuolė Čepaitienė
Lietuvos istorijos institutas

Jonathan Friedman
École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales
Kalifornijos universitetas, San Diegas

Orvar Löfgren
Lundo universitetas

Jonas Mardosa
Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas

Žilvytis Šaknys
Lietuvos istorijos institutas

REDAKCINĖS KOLEGIJOS SEKRETORĖ

Danguolė Svidinskaitė
Lietuvos istorijos institutas

Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos – etnologijos ir socialinės/kultūrinės antropologijos mokslo žurnalas, nuo 2001 m. leidžiamas vietoj tęstinio monografijų ir studijų leidinio „Lietuvos etnologija“. Jame spausdinami moksliniai straipsniai, konferencijų pranešimai, knygų recenzijos ir apžvalgos, kurių temos pirmiausia apima Lietuvą ir Vidurio/Rytų Europą. Žurnalas siekia pristatyti mokslo aktualijas ir skatinti teorines bei metodines diskusijas. Tekstai skelbiami lietuvių arba anglų kalba.

Redakcijos adresas:
Lietuvos istorijos institutas
Kražių g. 5
LT-01108 Vilnius

Tel.: + 370 5 262 9410
Faks: + 370 5 261 1433
El. paštas: etnolog@istorija.lt
v.ciubrinskas@smf.vdu.lt

Žurnalas registruotas:
European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH)
EBSCO Publishing: Academic Search Complete, Humanities International Complete, SocINDEX with Full Text
Modern Language Association (MLA) International Bibliography

ISSN 1392-4028
© Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2010

TURINYS / CONTENTS

Recenzijos ir apžvalgos / Reviews

Konferencijos / Conferences

Sukaktys

Elites, Networks and the Anthropologies of Policy and Borders: Some Suggestions from Ireland

Thomas M. Wilson

The anthropology of borders has often focused over the last twenty years on issues of public policy, particularly on how public policies impinge if not dictate much that happens at all geopolitical boundaries. However, this focus on policy has not been particularly deep or wide.

Often, in the midst of the growing interest by anthropologists in the issues of identity, nation and state in borderlands, the policy dimensions to border life are presented rather unproblematically as self-evident forces that shape border experiences. With reference to field research in Ireland, this essay reviews past themes in applied and policy approaches in anthropology in order to suggest some fruitful ways forward in the anthropology of policy at borderlands.

Professor Thomas M. Wilson, Department of Anthropology, Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY 13902, USA, e-mail: twilson@binghamton.edu

The anthropology of borders and frontiers that has developed over the last twenty years has often focused on issues of public policy. Most of this focus has been at international borderlands, in regard to how public policies impinge if not dictate much that happens at all geopolitical boundaries. It is often the case, however, that the focus on policy in anthropological accounts of borderlands has not been particularly deep or wide. Often, in the midst of the growing interest by anthropologists in the issues of identity, nation and state in borderlands, the policy dimensions to border life are presented rather unproblematically, sometimes even as seemingly self-evident forces that frame or shape border experiences.

While it may seem odd that anthropologists investigating geopolitical borders tend to problematize issues of identity and culture more often than they problematize the policies and social and political institutions that so influence international borderlands, this relative dearth of policy analysis by scholars

LIETUVOS ETNOLOGIJA: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos. 2010, 10(19), 61–76.

who are clearly interested in issues of politics and power is perhaps not too surprising. After all, over the last generation of scholarship there has been a turn across the social sciences to theorizing culture and power as they relate to interpersonal power more so than as they relate to the organs and practices of the state and its agents. These theoretical interests in power reflect notions such as governmentality which tend to place emphasis on individuals, the body, and social process. They also complement other forms of theorizing, especially those that approach the phenomena of globalization with the assertion that the nation is no longer what it once was and that the nation-state is in decline.

Anthropologists of borderlands have not been entirely mute on the subject of policy and its relationship to state and other forms of political and economic integration. In fact, the anthropology of borders has had a great deal to say about policies and other aspects of institutional politics, all within various theoretical approaches (see, for example, Haller and Donnan 2000; Donnan and Haller 2000; Donnan and Wilson 1994; Donnan and Wilson 1999; Heyman 1994; Heyman and Cunningham 2004; Horstmann and Wadley 2006; Wilson and Donnan 1998; Wilson and Donnan 2005). For example, many of these scholars (such as Chalfin 2004; Cunningham 2004; Cunningham and Heyman 2004) have re-focused our collective attention on issues of mobility, movement and stasis at borders, in ways that see time-space compression (Harvey 1990) through the lens of border time and space punctuation (Smart and Smart 2008), much of which is made possible or impossible by national and local policies. However, overall these anthropologists are a minority of those who conduct ethnographic research on and theorize borders, boundaries and frontiers.

In this essay I wish to examine some aspects of the changing anthropology of policy, with particular but brief reference to my anthropological research in the borderlands of Ireland. The Irish example is used to show how anthropology might approach various new forms of government and governance, and of policy and political practice. At one level the research on which this essay is based deals with the general problem of bifurcation in border studies: there is always a multi-locational character to such studies when one must work in two national political constituencies that face each other across the political divide between states. Border studies in anthropology and in other disciplines also demonstrate that the international boundary between states, for many intents and purposes, is rather arbitrary, and is often invisible to locals who live, work, socialize, intermarry and have various forms of *communitas* with others across the titular borderline.

Thus, in one sense all borderland ethnographic work is multi-sited. But there has been so much emphasis in anthropology in recent years on the gains suggested by multi-sited research, gains linked to the questions anthropologists

must ask and answer in a speeded-up globalized world of flows and challenged boundedness, that one fact often escapes anthropologists in this rush to adopt these relatively new approaches: the vast majority of people with whom anthropologists still live, study, and sustain relations live in groups characterized by various forms of local intimacy and local limits. The members of these groups have known each other long before the ethnographer arrived, and they often are in regular if not regularized forms of cooperation, dispute, contest, intercourse, and play, among many other behavioral practices that may give meaning and definition to a "group".

In short, the people who are the respondents to anthropological questioners often know each other, or know of each other, and have done so for some time. They have in fact been involved in complicated and often sophisticated forms of society, politics, economics and culture for quite some time – perhaps since or just after birth – most of which in one way or another will continue for quite some more time after the ethnographer departs. And no matter what anthropologists say about the lack of boundedness in culture and society, in a post-modern and globalized world of movement and mix, most people in the world, most of the time, and in most ways, recognize and value social and political groups and their related boundaries.

Anthropological efforts to find and theorize social permeability and cultural dissonance, to ask questions that need the researcher to move as well between field locations that do not constitute a solitary "site", may sometimes have little to do with the changing dimensions and bounded nature of culture and society, and more to do with the changing nature of professional ethnography. In these days of ethnographic conversation-making, where much that passes for scholarly reflexivity is little more than the recorded conversations with respondents, and where much ethnographic data can most kindly be labeled as culturally-sensitive interviewing, the focus of ethnography is reduced to that of the network of respondents that the researchers construct around themselves. In much ethnographic research and writing today (where for some scholars ethnography may be equated with its writing) the field of enquiry may be little more than meeting a few folks who fit your research design profile, sitting down with them over many and extended periods of time, to have them respond to increasingly sophisticated questions that reflect a deepening understanding of the information relayed over time in previous interviews. Much of this ethnographic vignette-collection comes peppered with moments of observation, often tentatively offered by the ethnographer keen to show that being there as a participant observer was not the point of the research, despite the longstanding reliance in anthropology on participant observation as the prime method. In many new forms of ethnography, being

there to observe, participate, compare and analyze is less important than being there to interview the people who are there, to give anthropological voice to local people's participation and observation.

While all ethnography since the days of Malinowski has been dependent on the networks of key informants that have been established by ethnographers, the balance in evidence and argument has shifted greatly over the last generation of anthropology in favor of ethnography that relies almost entirely on the spoken words of these key respondents, with little attention paid by the anthropologist to other forms of data, data collection and data analysis. As a result of this turn away from many other forms of empirical research beyond the interview, much multi-sited research is dependent on ethnographic network building. In each site, whether it be a single location (however that might be defined?) or one of a multiplicity of locations, anthropologists' hosts often know each other through their own networks, and invite anthropologists into the networks, or get to know each other through the network that has been created with the ethnographer at the center, or perhaps just with the ethnographer in an important node.

In this essay, however, I do not deal with these sorts of ethnographic limits, beyond these introductory comments, but rather focus my attention more on groups of people who know each other, live with or near each other, work together or were raised or educated together, and have similar or complementary roles in policy processes. Their relationship to each other is not often influenced to any great extent by their contact with the ethnographer, who, as often happens, stumbles onto the network, or seeks it out and is lucky to gain some form of admission or access to it. Janine Wedel (Wedel 2005) has termed some of these sorts of people with influence, power and important political role as "sovereign elites", but this sort of group, and various approaches to them, have a long pedigree in anthropology. Anthropologists need only go back in anthropological history to trace the importance in which applied and political anthropologists held the study of political and social elites[1], and many of our ancestors in political anthropology specifically utilized network analysis to chart the dimensions and the sweep, in terms of numbers and political influence, of these elites.

This longstanding interest in elites and their networks, in the "quasi-group" and other associations, which must have been so startling to some scholars when first and perhaps best identified by Eric Wolf (Wolf 1966), is one way for

[1] I have been particularly influenced by the work of Jane and Peter Schneider and Edward C. Hansen on elites in Europe; see Schneider, Schneider and Hansen 1972, but here too I am mindful of the work done on elites by Eric Wolf, Joan Vincent, George Marcus, Jack Goody, Robert Paine, and Aidan Southall among many others.

anthropologists to temper our interests in theorizing something new, in favor of investigating things that are both new and old, and how they are changing. Anthropology has much to gain by seeking new ways to study disparate actors who are interlinked in transnational processes, rather than searching for those contained in geographically bounded place, but anthropologists also have an obligation to seek new ways, and to keep with some old ways that still work, in studying some not so disparate actors in their local, regional, national, and supranational contexts, within geographically bounded places.

One approach that is still effective, in tracing political and other elites who stay within or cross the bounds of locality, region, state and intergovernmental/supranational organization, is through some rather old-fashioned network analysis, which, after all, is perhaps the most important method in the overall methodology at the disposal of a participant observer ethnographer. Anthropologists use networks all the time, and are invariably delighted to both discover them in the field, or to successfully delineate them according to our research needs.

Thus, in this essay I would like to suggest that anthropologists re-visit the notions of networks and elites, in corporate, political and civic worlds (along the lines assessed for corporate networks in Scott 1991), as one way to recognize and understand the new and the old at work in the processes of globalization, neoliberalism, and neo- post- and supra-nationalisms. Many elites are quite localized, and others are spread over a continent, but they are part of networks that offer scholars various points of entry into the policy process, and the ways in which policy discourse, implementation, interpretation and effects frame how people and organizations are created and are interrelated.

This brings me back to the changing shape of the field of anthropology, and particularly the fields of applied and political anthropology, and the ways in which many past anthropologists theorized "social and political fields". These metaphors helped to shape political anthropology in the 1960s and 1970s, and aided anthropologists in their efforts to understand the formal and the informal natures of politics and power. As was so clearly demonstrated time and again in this period, institutions and organizations were unintelligible without reference to the various social sources and organizing principles of both politics and power, as well as to the various cultural forms through which political practices were made meaningful. The transformations in the anthropology of politics that were represented in two defining texts of the 1960s, *Local Level Politics* (edited by Marc Swartz, 1968) and *Political Anthropology* (edited by Swartz, Victor Turner and Arthur Tuden, 1966) helped to liberate anthropologists from some constraints of structure in favor of processual studies of politics, all of which had a focus on power. Studies of process and power are so much the

norm in anthropology today that many have suggested, Joan Vincent (Vincent 1990) foremost among them in my view, that there is no longer room or perhaps need for a separate "political anthropology".

Yet anthropologists still must consider ways they can reinvigorate an anthropology of policy, or perhaps invent some new approaches in an anthropology of policy, in answering the challenges of a new global awareness. In recognizing the continuing and new importance of policy, and new importance of some policies rather than others in a rapidly changing global scene, anthropologists must remember that an anthropology of policy is not a new field of anthropological inquiry and theory (contra Shore and Wright 1997). In fact, the history of applied anthropology in the United States and elsewhere is a history of policy studies, and of actions in support of or in opposition to policy. And the history of the anthropology of politics may also be approached from the vantage point of policy. Think only of James Mooney's research (Mooney 1896; see also van Willigen 1986: 145) on the Ghost Dance and other aspects of Native American life, and one can readily see the intersection of applied (or "practical anthropology" to Malinowski), political, and policy anthropology.

In one sense, then, in order to examine approaches to the anthropology of policy today, I return to what anthropologists *used to do* (at least in greater numbers and in more situations) more generally in their practical, applied and political anthropologies. I do so with a question. Can or should anthropologists do an anthropology of policy without continual if not constant reference to bounded places, spaces and groups, and political, legal and social institutions, framed within a locality, among many other real, bounded social and political units? This is not to deny that anthropologists also need to understand groups that cannot be easily bounded, by anthropologists or others, or who themselves seek to escape the boundaries imposed on them by anthropologists or by societies and polities alike. But anthropologists must remember that attempts in the 1960s to understand political fields were attempts to see how culture and society were twin concepts at the core of politics, and that all social and political institutions intersected in integral ways with the seemingly less concrete notions of symbol and meaning, of identity and identification, of being and belonging. And these intersections were the stuff of legitimacy, authority and conflict.

To examine the course of the Policy Process (here derived from van Willigen's *Applied Anthropology*, 1986: 144), which I proffer here as one way to show the historical depth to policy studies in anthropology, but also to demonstrate ways in which the anthropologies of policy, borders and governance might be seen to intersect, anthropologists should consider all of its related sub-processes.

These sub-processes are integral to the determination, delivery and reception of policy, and each of them is worthy of anthropological attention in any attempt by anthropologists to reconsider their approaches to policy, politics and power:

- Awareness of need
- formulation of [alternative or dependent] solutions
- evaluation of [alternative or dependent] solutions
- formulation of policy
- implementation of policy
- evaluation of policy [in design and implementation]

The logic of this policy process indicates that no matter how anthropologists choose to identify and study policy, they each in their turn will deal with *policy formation*, including efforts to influence the type and direction of policy, then *policy implementation*, then *policy reception*, then how the reception affects *policy reformation* (and so it goes). But these processes, in their interaction and in their component parts, present certain methodological problems, among others, when the difficulties presented by physical distances between actors are compounded by the obstacles of many national and other cultural differences, and by the creation and reproduction of a new form of polity, such as in a supranational European Union. New forms of governance and power are transforming polities and their policies, and are transforming the boundaries which frame them, particularly at international borders.

European Integration and Policy in Northern Ireland

For anthropologists and other ethnographers interested in European societies, there have been professional, theoretical and methodological constraints which have hindered the development of a wider focus on Europe and European integration. It is often difficult to utilize participant observation and other tried and true ethnographic methods in efforts to understand the roles of Europeanization and European integration in quotidian life in small communities, most of which are far from the halls of national and European policy-making. An anthropology of the European Union must actively tease out the threads of "European" policy and practice in each national constituency, then also discern which threads connect the nation and the state to subnational regions and localities. This is difficult to do in certain forms of ethnography, when one adopts a methodology which largely fixes you in place, and constrains in terms of time. Nevertheless, an anthropology which seeks to relate locality, nation, state and Europe is growing. Two of its principal themes are the processes of European identification and Europeanization.

I have done research intermittently in South Armagh in Northern Ireland since 1991 on the effects in the region of the completion of the EU Single European Market on cross-border economic co-operation (Wilson 1993; Wilson 1995; Wilson 2000). One of the clear conclusions reached in this research has been that although the EU program to establish a true common market in its member states created many new cross-border realities, overall it had a relatively negligible effect on local borderland attitudes towards closer political, social and cultural integration, both between the two communities of the province, and between Northern Ireland and its neighbours. The resistance in South Armagh to EU attempts to do anything beyond the strictly economic is significant in terms of EU efforts to foster an affective dimension to its Europe-building, and may have much to tell anthropologists of the role which nationalism and strong national identities may play within the wider processes of Europeanization in Western Europe, in a EU which recently expanded to twenty-seven members.

The EU has created funding initiatives for its poorest regions, in a renewed effort to use its policy frameworks to remove regional disparities, as one way to create a sense of its legitimacy in the lives of its citizens. Three of these Initiatives, INTERREG (Cross-border co-operation), LEADER (rural development), and the Northern Ireland Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (a cross-community initiative designed solely for Northern Ireland), have been targeted at South Armagh (among other areas in Northern Ireland), and finished their first two full rounds of funding in (in 2005). The overall effects of this funding are still being felt, not least in policy and local government circles where the new rounds of funding have become principal arenas of contest. These effects influence the strategies which local and regional actors employ to acquire funding in the current EU funding cycle (2006–2012).

The community in which I have been investigating the intersection of European and national policies, and wider notions of Europeanization, is "Whitehill"[2], which is situated midway between the towns of Newry and Crossmaglen, about 6 kilometres from the Irish border. It has a population of approximately 3000 (850 households) within the limits of its parish, which covers both the village and outlying farms. All but a few people identify themselves as Catholic and Irish. Support for Irish nationalism, including republicanism, is high.

The community is also known locally for its success in attracting European funding. Three projects in particular represent the confluence of culture and nationalism which mark local economic development projects, particularly in

[2] In order to preserve the anonymity of my hosts and informants, I have used fictitious names for the village, its environs, and its development, tourism and funding projects.

regard to tourism, sport and education. The Whitehill Trekking Centre, the Ring of Cooley Culture Centre, and the Whitehill Folk Museum have used combinations of international funding and state support to both attract international tourists and to establish cultural links across the Irish border, in attempts to create forms of cultural integration which have not existed in this border region for generations. While there is considerable overlap of personnel and leadership among these three centres, my research in this area indicates that the leadership of each cultural centre demonstrates divergent views of European integration and policy, as influenced by such factors as kinship, language, education, class, and national identity. A detailed review of the origin, structures, aims and objectives of the three European policies which have had a direct impact on Irish border communities is beyond the scope of this essay. However, some roughly drawn conclusions can be made about the impact and perception of these direct sources of funding in localities in this borderland.

INTERREG, the main EU fund specifically geared to cross-border and border region economic development, has had a rather unsuccessful time in this region (as outlined in Wilson 2000), due in large part to the centralization and bureaucratization of the programme in both Dublin and Belfast (which are 90 and 50 miles away respectively, but more socially and administratively distant than this geography implies). While communities like Whitehill have received substantial subvention from INTERREG, funds received must always be matched to other sources of capital, and are for large-scale, high-profile enterprises (like the Ring of Cooley Irish heritage and culture centre in Whitehill).

LEADER, the rural development initiative, has 15 local intermediary agencies in Northern Ireland, termed "local action groups" (LAGs). These groups are a partnership of public and private bodies which jointly devise and implement a strategy and a series of innovative measures for the development of a coherent rural area. This is in aid of avoiding some of the problems which beset INTERREG; as a result LEADER II (funding round 1994–1999) was intended to be an area-based approach (rather than national or regional), a bottom-up approach (rather than a governmental or administrative top-down one), which entailed co-operation among local organizations in the public and private sectors in order to develop a coherent rural development plan with local, regional, national and trans-national networking. The LAG in South Armagh is the South Down South Armagh Local Action Group, which had an operational budget of £1 million in the last cycle. Most of this money was spent on seed grants, capital investments, and locally based rural development schemes, particularly in aid of farm pluriactivity, tourism, cross-border networking and sharing of resources, and international marketing. The farmers of South Armagh have clearly experienced the impact of LEADER on their lives, and it has had ripple effects in all borderland communities.

The Northern Ireland Programme for Peace and Reconciliation was designed specifically by the European Commission for Northern Ireland, but its relative success there has led the EU to consider it as a blueprint for other such special funding initiatives elsewhere in Europe. It was conceived as a truly bottom-up approach to addressing, if not solving, the problems of cross-community (i.e., Catholic-Protestant, or Irish-British) relations, in a way which makes concrete the aims of the EU principle of "subsidiarity". However, it has such a complex "system" of interlocking local and intermediate funding providers, including each of the local government district councils, that yet again the local and national politics of Northern Ireland act as severe buffers to the realization of the programme, either from the perspective of the EU or from the standpoint of local actors. Nevertheless, the Programme has injected almost a million pounds of capital into the South Armagh region, and has been the most publicized and most warmly received of all the programmes, precisely because it has been projected as a Northern Ireland only scheme, targeted at local community social and economic welfare.

These programmes have had various effects in terms of their implementation in the Armagh borderlands. While they have all supported local initiatives in tourism, agricultural efficiency and marketing, local community cultural programmes, and local, regional and transnational networking, it must also be suggested that they have done little to foster an awareness of political identification beyond the nation and state. They also have done very little to engender or enhance "Europeanization", whether defined as a process of adapting to the EU in ways more than economic, or as a process of transnational cultural integration allied to parallel processes of deterritorialization, globalization and regionalization. In South Armagh "European identity" is all but non-existent, at least in the public arenas of government and funding, and is seldom an aspect of everyday life and banter. On the contrary, local social, cultural, economic and political agendas are mainly about supporting or subverting the local economy and the nation and state. In my research in many locales in Ireland this relative absence of identification with Europe has even been growing among farmers, who have long been held to be among the most pro-European groups in both the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland.

The relative absence of a European identity as an important alternative or complement to national identity fits in with studies of European identity elsewhere in the continent, but in the Irish context it is perhaps surprising in two ways. One of the sectors of the Irish economy, North and South, that has shown the strongest support for European integration has been agriculture, and there has been at least modest evidence that this support reflected some change in the parameters of farmer identification with nation, state and Europe

(Wilson 1989; Wilson 1990). Yet in the borderlands of Northern Ireland, due mainly perhaps to the nationalist conflict there, farmers show little sign of any affective ties to "Europe". Moreover, there they also show little tendency to adopt any sort of "creolised" or "hybrid" identity. This latter situation offers little support to proposals by some scholars, most notably Kohli (Kohli 2000), that border peoples will be among the first and best supporters of European identity within the European integration processes, precisely because of their years of mixing of national and other identities, at the frontiers of their nations and states. In the Northern Ireland borderlands, despite many years of development policies aimed at benefiting farmers and borderlanders, there has been little to note on the impact of such policies in creating a stronger affective identification of local people with the Europe of the EU.

Simply put, while most farmers and local professionals are certainly aware of a wider political and economic world of which they are part beyond Ireland, and which might usefully be regarded as "Europe", many do not own up to being or feeling European. Let one point in this regard be clear. Whitehill residents know that they are meant to be "more European", and that others expect them to identify more and more with the EU and integration, but even when pressed on the point in their own sitting rooms, they resist the notion that "Europe" means anything more to them than another level of governance and funding, which to them are not matters of affective identification.

Despite some real and important developments in local political economy, wherein more tourists come to Northern Ireland from across the border, and the new Northern Ireland Assembly has statutory "North-South" bodies in common with the Irish Republic's parliament, these are not perceived in local terms to be major aspects of either Europeanization or European integration. While they may very well appear as major forces of local change to social scientists, Europeanization and transnationalism are often unrecognized as socially or politically significant by the actors themselves. This is an example of how our important social science models may be useful tools to us but not very useful to people we study, including those in policy sectors. In fact, one concern that anthropologists should seriously consider – and it is a concern expressed to me by many people I have interviewed in Ireland – is that anthropologists and other researchers must be wary of enticements to impose theoretical order on others' social and cultural reality, among people who will have little truck with what anthropologist academics wish to see in evidence, and perhaps wish into existence, in order to support their scholarly arguments.

However, one aspect of the European project that has been very successful has been the facilitation and in some ways the creation of cross-border funding networks. Because so much European funding in Northern Ireland and in the

Republic of Ireland has been about the establishment of partnership, across sectarian and national lines, across the international borderline, and across political party lines, Europeanization has resulted in new policy networks and elites. District Councils in Northern Ireland and County Councils in the Republic have created new forms of governmental cross-border cooperation, matching the North South Ministerial Councils that were created in the Belfast Good Friday Agreement and are composed of national politicians often meeting in the borderlands. While much of this cooperation is in relatively safe policy areas, such as culture, which will not ignite nationalist tensions or raise the constitutional question of the future of Northern Ireland, the mere fact of their existence has opened up new policy dimensions for the borderlands.

Another elite and network that has resulted from EU policy implementation in the borderlands has been that of consultants, those professional economic and political advisors who have offered their expertise to all manner of applicants for European funding. Many of these consultants, who had worked in local and national government or administration, are seen by many local business people and community groups as preferable alternatives to civil servants, who have been tasked with offering the same service, at no cost and as a right to citizens. This preference to pay for such services is largely the result of two factors: the distrust of sharing economic data with the government in any circumstance, as it may find its way to the taxmen; and the fact that local government agencies are often competing for the same European funds that they advise their constituents to seek! Thus private legal, accounting and political affairs firms provide confidentiality, as well as the promise of insider knowledge, due to the networks which it is often presumed that former government ministers and bureaucrats created when they were in public service.

Thus, in these Irish borderlands, it is clear that any study of policy formation, implementation and reception must minimally consider the continuing roles of economic and political networks, some of which may be old or new elites, who in various ways affect policy. Moreover, as presented here, this Irish borderlands case is but a capsule suggestion of the complexities to be found in studying European and national policy as aspects of European integration and Europeanization. This research vignette is not intended to be anything more than suggestive of the value in approaching an anthropology of policy through the means offered us through decades of applied anthropology.

In fact, it has been the goal of this short essay to assert if not examine how policy is an extremely useful optic through which to study many processes of economic, social, political and cultural change, where government is but one form of governance, and where governments compete, co-operate, and collude in supporting or subverting policy aims, at local, regional, national and supra-

national levels. An attention to policy continues to be an important entry point into any study of local to global change. However, in a world with some new and many shifting parameters of power and order, and with many continuing structures of governance in and beyond the state, an anthropology of policy is much more than a good entry and exit strategy in the study of political process. An anthropology of policy continues to be the point field where theory and action are realized, and where our subjects and our objects of research come face to face with the subjectivities and objectives of the people with whom anthropologists live and work.

References

Chalfin Brenda. 2004. Border Scans: Sovereignty, Surveillance and the Customs Service in Ghana, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 11(3): 397–416.

Cunningham Hilary. 2004. Nations Rebound? Crossing Borders in a Gated Globe, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 11(3): 329–350.

Cunningham Hilary and Josiah McC. Heyman. 2004. Introduction: Mobilities and Enclosures at Borders, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 11(3): 289–302.

Donnan Hastings and Dieter Haller. 2000. Liminal no More: the Relevance of Borderland Studies, *Ethnologia Europea* 30(2): 7–22.

Donnan Hastings and Thomas M. Wilson (eds.). 1994. *Border Approaches: Anthropological Perspectives on Frontiers*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Donnan Hastings and Thomas M. Wilson. 1999. *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State*. Oxford: Berg.

Haller Dieter and Hastings Donnan (eds.). 2000. *Borders and Borderlands: an Anthropological Perspective*. Special issue of *Ethnologia Europea* 30(2).

Harvey David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: an Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Heyman Josiah McC. 1994. The Mexico-United States Border in Anthropology: a Critique and Reformulation, *Journal of Political Ecology* 1: 43–65. <http://www.library.arizona.edu/ej/jpe/volume_1/HEYMAN.PDF> [accessed on 07 07 2009].

Heyman Josiah McC. and Hilary Cunningham (eds.). 2004. *Movement on the Margins: Mobilities and Enclosures at Borders*. Special issue of *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 11(3).

Horstmann Alexander and Reed L. Wadley (eds.). 2006. *Centering the Margin: Agency and Narrative in Southeast Asian Borderlands*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Kohli Martin. 2000. The Battlegrounds of European Identity, *European Societies* 2(2): 113–137.

Mooney James. 1896. *The Ghost Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890*. Washington, DC: Bureau of American Ethnology.

Schneider Jane, Peter Schneider and Edward Hansen. 1972. Modernization and Development: the Role of Regional Elites and Noncorporate Groups in the European Mediterranean, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 14(3): 328–350.

Scott John. 1991. Networks of Corporate Power: a Comparative Assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology* 17: 181–203.

Shore Cris and Susan Wright. 1997. Policy: a New Field of Anthropology, Shore C. and S. Wright (eds.). *Anthropology of Policy*: 3–39. Routledge: London.

Smart Alan and Josephine Smart. 2008. Time-space Punctuation: Hong Kong's Border Regime and Limits on Mobility, *Pacific Affairs* 81(2): 175–193.

Swartz Marc (ed.). 1968. *Local Level Politics*. Chicago: Aldine.

Swartz Marc, Victor Turner and Arthur Tuden (eds.). 1966. *Political Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine.

Van Willigen John. 1986. *Applied Anthropology: an Introduction*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Vincent Joan. 1990. *Anthropology and Politics*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Wedel Janine. 2005. The Role of Sovereign Cliques in the Derailing of Democracy, *Anthropology News* 46(8): 28–30.

Wilson Thomas M. 1989. Large Farms, Local Politics, and the International Arena: the Irish Tax Dispute of 1979, *Human Organization* 48(1): 60–70.

Wilson Thomas M. 1990. Ethnography and Political Science: Agricultural Politics in Eire, *Politics* 10(1): 9–16.

Wilson Thomas M. 1993. Frontiers Go but Boundaries Remain: the Irish Border as a Cultural Divide, Wilson T. M. and M. E. Smith (eds.). *Cultural Change and the New Europe: Perspectives on the European Community*: 167–187. Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press.

Wilson Thomas M. 1995. Blurred Borders: Local and Global Consumer Culture in Northern Ireland, Costa J. A. and G. J. Bamossy (eds.). *Marketing in a Multicultural World: Ethnicity, Nationalism and Cultural Identity*: 231–256. London: Sage.

Wilson Thomas M. 2000. The Obstacles to European Union Regional Policy in the Northern Ireland Borderlands, *Human Organization* 59(1): 1–10.

Wilson Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan (eds.). 1998. *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan (eds.). 2005. *Culture and Power at the Edges of the State: National Support and Subversion in European Border Regions*. Münster: LIT Verlag.

Wolf Eric. 1966. Kinship, Friendship and Patron-client Relations in Complex Societies, Banton M. (ed.). *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*: 1–22. London: Tavistock.

Elitas, socialiniai tinklai bei viešosios politikos ir paribio antropologijos: keletas pasiūlymų iš Airijos

Thomas M. Wilson

Santrauka

Per paskutiniuosius dvidešimt metų susiformavusios paribio ir sienų antropologijos dėmesio centre dažnai buvo viešosios politikos problemos. Tačiau daugiausia domėtasi skirtingų valstybių pasienyje esančiomis sritimis, kaip viešoji politika daro įtaką daug kam, gal net diktuoja tai, kas ten vyksta. Nežiūrint to, antropologiniuose pasienio sričių tyrinėjimuose nesulaukta labai gilaus ir plataus susidomėjimo minėta politika. Didėjant antropologų susidomėjimui tapatumo, tautos ir valstybės problemomis pasienio srityse, su gyvenimu paribyje susijusios viešosios politikos dimensijos dažnai pateiktos gana neproblemiškai, kartais net kaip tariamai akivaizdūs veiksniai, struktūruojantys paribio patirtis ar suteikiantys joms pavidalą.

Pasienio sritis tyrinėjantys antropologai nebuvo ir nėra visiškai nebylūs viešosios politikos ir jos santykio su valstybe bei kitomis politinės ir ekonominės integracijos formomis tema. Iš tikrųjų paribio antropologija turėjo daug ką pasakyti apie viešąją politiką ir kitus institucinės politikos aspektus, pateikdama įvairius teorinius požiūrius (žr., pavyzdžiui, Haller and Donnan 2000; Heyman and Cunningham 2004; Horstmann and Wadley 2006; Wilson and Donnan 1998; Wilson and Donnan 2005). Tačiau apskritai šie autoriai sudaro mažumą tarp antropologų, atliekančių etnografinius tyrimus ir teorizuojančių paribio, ribų bei sienų tema.

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama kintanti viešosios politikos antropologija, remiantis, nors ir glaustai, mano konkrečiu antropologiniu tyrimu Airijos pasienio srityse. Pasinaudota Airijos pavyzdžiu siekiant parodyti, kaip antropologija galėtų traktuoti įvairias naujas valdžios, valdymo, viešosios politikos bei politinės praktikos formas. Tyrimas, kuriuo paremtas šis straipsnis, tam tikru požiūriu nagrinėja bendrąją bifurkacijos problemą paribio tyrinėjimuose. Šiems tyrinėjimams visuomet būdinga tai, kad apsigyvenama (įsikuriama) daugelyje vietų, nes privaloma dirbti dviejose nacionalinėse politinėse srityse, kurios yra viena priešais kitą abipus valstybes politiškai padalijančios ribos. Paribio tyrinėjimai antropologijoje ir kitose disciplinose taip pat parodo, kad tarptautinė riba tarp valstybių daugeliu atžvilgių yra gana sutartinė ir dažnai nepastebima vietiniams gyventojams, kurie gyvena, dirba, bendrauja, tuokiasi ir sudaro įvairias *communitas* formas vieni su kitais, nepaisydami nustatytos valstybinės sienos. Daugelis šių pasienio sričių gyventojų pažinojo vienas kitą ilgą laiką prieš atvykstant etnografui; be daugelio kitų elgesio praktikų, jiems

dažnai būdingos įprastos kooperacijos, disputo, ginčo, bendravimo, žaidimo formos, galinčios „grupei“ suteikti prasmę ir ją apibrėžti.

Trumpai tariant, antropologų tyrėjų respondentais esantys gyventojai dažnai jau kurį laiką pažįsta vienas kitą arba žino apie vienas kitą. Iš tikrųjų jie daug laiko yra įtraukti į painias ir dažnai įmantrias visuomenės, politikos, ekonomikos ir kultūros formas, daugelis šių formų vienu ar kitu būdu gyvuos dar ilgesnį laiką išvykus etnografui. Ir nesvarbu, ką antropologai kalba apie apibrėžtumo (*boundedness*) kultūroje ir visuomenėje trūkumą pomoderniame ir globalizuotame judėjimo bei „maišymosi“ pasaulyje, dauguma žmonių pasaulyje didžiąją laiko dalį ir daugeliu atvejų pripažįsta ir vertina socialines ir politines grupes bei su jomis susijusias ribas.

Šio straipsnio dėmesio centre yra grupės žmonių, kurie, nepaisydami sienų, vienas su kitu susiję darbo, giminystės ir laisvalaikio ryšiais. Kai kurie iš šių žmonių yra pasienio sričių elitas dėl jų įtakingų, galią turinčių ryšių bei svarbaus politinio vaidmens. Tokio elito tyrinėjimai antropologijoje prasidėjo seniai. Antropologams reikia tik sugrįžti atgal į antropologijos istoriją, kad pamatytų taikomosios ir politinės antropologijos srityje dirbusių antropologų skirtą dėmesį politinio ir socialinio elito tyrinėjimams. Daugelis praeityje dirbusių antropologų taikė socialinio tinklo analizę, kad pateiktų dimensijas diagramomis ir taip skaičių bei politinės įtakos kalba apibrėžtų šį elitą.

Ieškodama naujų būdų skirtingiems transnacionaliniuose procesuose tarpusavyje susijusiems dalyviams tyrinėti antropologija turėtų daugiau laimėti nei kad jų ieškodama geografiškai apribotoje vietoje. Bet antropologams taip pat privalu išlaikyti kai kuriuos senuosius būdus, kurie dar tinkami kai kuriems ne tokiems skirtingiems dalyviams tyrinėti jų vietiniame, regioniniame, nacionaliniame ir supranacionaliniame kontekstuose, esant geografiškai apribotoms vietoms.

Vienas būdas, kuris yra vis dar veiksmingas tam tikros vietovės, regiono, valstybės ir tarpvyriausybinės / supranacionalinės organizacijos politiniam ir kitam elitui ar elitui, peržengiančiam minėtas ribas, tirti, yra socialinio tinklo analizė, kurią kai kurie galėtų pavadinti „senamadiška“. Galų gale tai yra galbūt apskritai svarbiausias metodologijos metodas, kurį savo žinioje turi stebėjimą dalyvaujant atliekantis etnografas. Taigi šiame straipsnyje siūloma antropologams iš naujo peržiūrėti socialinių tinklų ir elito, politinio ir pilietinio pasaulio sąvokas. Tai yra būdas pažinti ir suprasti, kaip veikia nauja ir sena globalizacijos, neoliberalizmo bei neo-, po- ir supranacionalizmų procesuose. Didelė elito dalis yra gana lokalizuota, kita dalis išsimėčiusi po visą žemyną. Bet jis priklauso socialiniams tinklams, siūlantiems antropologams įvairius būdus, kaip patekti į viešosios politikos procesą, ir būdus, kuriais viešosios politikos diskursas, jos įgyvendinimas, interpretacija ir rezultatai struktūruoja, kaip žmonės ir organizacijos daro įtaką vieni kitiems ir kaip jie susiję tarpusavyje.

Gauta 2010 m. gegužės mėn.