

It is with great enthusiasm that we commence our term as new editors of the journal *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*. We look forward to working with our editorial team, which includes Jeanne Kormina (Higher School of Economics, St Petersburg) as Book Reviews Editor and Lukas Ley (University of Heidelberg) as Assistant Editor, as well as with the extensive International Editorial Board, who are too many to mention, and the production team at Wiley. This is also a particularly exciting moment for us all as the journal has just been accepted into the main Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and right off the bat received an Impact Factor of 1.942. This is very much an achievement of the previous Editorial Board (Sarah, Patrick, Anni and Franz), whom we would like to thank very much for their excellent work and invaluable help in ensuring a smooth transition of the journal to new hands. In our first editorial let us start with a brief statement on some of the intellectual concerns that we bring to bear on this role of editors. Then we introduce the articles of this issue.

Editorial statement

We are committed to this journal's foundational goal of publishing high-quality anthropological work grounded in ethnography and informed by a wide array of cutting-edge theoretical perspectives. We also approach this journal as providing a platform for debating urgent critical issues, such as precarity in academia, knowledge politics, and questions of access to knowledge that affect both the academic community of anthropologists and the wider public. As we are both affiliated with institutions in the European Union's borderlands in Russia and Finland, and we are connected through our research to Southern Europe and the former Soviet space, our vision for this flagship publication of the European Association of Social Anthropologists is intertwined with a wider anthropological project of questioning and destabilising 'Europe' as a category – starting with the question of what exactly is 'European' about European anthropology. Our aim is to encourage anthropological reflection on multiple and situated meanings of 'Europe', to expand the journal's global reach and scope, and to provide a space where different European (and other) voices can be heard and put into dialogue with one another.

The European continent is home to a diversity of anthropological schools and traditions, which too often have existed in isolation from one another. There are several reasons for this, not least the lack of institutions and common spaces (physical and virtual) that can create bridges between different conceptual approaches and languages. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* has consistently provided one such forum, but we believe there is still work to be done. During our term, we want to push forward this dialogue by encouraging articles 'from' scholars from so far under-represented regions, such as Southern and Eastern Europe, by supporting experimental writing genres that bridge research and art, by strengthening the debate section of the journal, and by inviting colleagues in other parts of the world to join our International Editorial Advisory Board. We hope all of this will result in a distinct and fresh vantage point from which to develop this journal further.

There are pressing concerns that seem particularly visible from the edges of Europe but which nonetheless resonate widely across locations, including (but not limited to): new modes of sovereignty, north/south and east/west divides, new forms of ‘cold’, ‘hot’ and ‘hybrid’ warfare, and new ways of creating and policing political borders. These relatively recent developments point to new political, religious, ecological and economic configurations worldwide. An anthropological understanding of these complex problems implies crossing all kinds of borders and boundaries, and focusing on connections outside our comfort zones. What is urgently needed is an exploration of the rising far-right, conservative and populist movements and ideological moods, and of those spaces where movements of protest and political resistance are visible as well as those where they are not. Equally important are ecological issues, including ethnographies of climate change and research into deep time, which throw into sharp relief practices such as resource extraction and waste disposal. Yet, our aim is not so much to anticipate and elicit specific research themes as to open the floor and welcome the submission of high-quality manuscripts from authors of diverse backgrounds as well as visions of what is cutting-edge and where anthropology is going. Our intent is to consolidate *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* not only as the key forum for the debate of current anthropology but also as a space where different voices can be heard and new kinds of questions raised.

EASA keynote lecture

We are delighted to include in our first issue the keynote lecture delivered by Shahram Khosravi at the EASA’s 15th biennial conference in the summer of 2018. In his contribution, Khosravi looks at the connections between wars, colonial extractions and modern borders as racialised projects of dispossession. Tracing the genealogy of steel planks deployed as military infrastructure since the Second World War and left behind as imperial debris in all corners of the globe, Khosravi takes us on a historical journey that reveals the connections between old imperial projects and modern border walls, from oil extraction in Iran to Trump’s US–Mexico border wall. The social life of these material objects demonstrates that contemporary border regimes are part of a much wider and older project of capital accumulation based on land dispossession, forced displacement and labour extraction. In this project, Khosravi argues, the power to control time and ‘steal’ it from others has been as important as the power to control space.

Special section: the anthropology of defrauding and faking

Trickery seems as old as the world. Levi-Strauss (1962) famously endowed the figure of the trickster with basic structural and evolutionary properties of the ‘savage mind’. For Scott (1998), the figure of cunning Odysseus is an epitome of *metis* – a primordial wisdom and context-dependent practical knowledge. Yet very recent phenomena that range from post-modern simulacra to post-truth prompt other kinds of questions and ethnographic concerns: namely, if today there is something novel or historically distinct about trickery and defrauding. What is certainly new is a systematic and comparative anthropological interest in these practices, as Jan Beek, Cassis Kilian and Matthias

Krings point out in their introduction to this issue's special section on this theme. One of its contributions, by Zhipeng Gao and Katherine Bischoping, focuses on stories about revolutionary soldier Lei Feng, whom Chairman Mao singled out in 1963 for the status of national hero for doing countless selfless deeds. These stories glorify him but also raise doubts about their authenticity. As Gao and Bischoping point out, the goal of their article is not to ascertain if the Lei Feng narratives are in themselves true or false but to explore how epistemologies of authentication are embedded in and constitutive of culturally specific understandings of legitimate governance. In turn, Jan Beek's contribution looks at transnational network marketing in Nairobi, Kenya. His point is that while these companies make money by pyramid-scheme-like constant recruitment of new members, they work not just by the appeal of quick gain but also through the discourses on suspicions of fraud. Ann Cassiman's ethnography of Ghanaian cyber tricksters explores layered moral debates about faking that structure and transform these tricksters' and their victims' social networks, wealth distribution and identities, including gender roles. Michael Bürge examines how rapid socio-economic transformations in Sierra Leone simultaneously lead to a visible quantitative and qualitative increase of cash and consumer goods and to a proliferation of so-called 'money doublers' who promise literally to multiply their customers' banknotes.

It is important to note that all these cases are transnational. Narratives about Lei Feng circulate in China as well as in the USA (Gao and Bischoping). Ghanaian cyber and gender tricksters are 'spiders in the world-wide web' (Cassiman). Money doublers in Sierra Leone engage in their practices as local currency is inflated and circulates increasingly in tandem with US dollars (Bürge). Network marketing companies operate in Kenya but originate in the USA and Asian countries (Beek). In his contribution, Stefan Le Courant looks at how the flow of migrants from Mali to France takes place in the context of increasingly complex identification technologies and equally complex multiplicities of personal documents and identities. Le Courant's case in point is the transnational journey of Malian Masséré Sissoko and his paperwork 'double' Mahamadou Diarra. All this material is very different in scope and context from the one that underpins Levi-Strauss's theory of the origins of the trickster. This special section is about global modernity invested with the relations of truth and power. Its contributors approach truth not as a matter of diffusion of scientific discourses, as in scholarship inspired by Michel Foucault, but as that of ubiquitous and culturally diverse grey zones where it is difficult to differentiate between falsity and truth, the fraudulent and the trustworthy, fake and genuine. As Beek, Kilian and Krings sum up this perspective, rather than viewing certain practices as fraudulent, this set of papers draws attention to how and by whom the very distinction between what is fraudulent and what is honest is drawn. If doubt and suspicion have been demonstrated to be central to belief systems (Pelkmans 2013), they also appear crucial for the working of everyday economic rationalities, cultural politics and governance.

Original articles

Synnøve Bendixsen's contribution explores the relationship between healthcare, borders and the management of migrants in Norway. Bendixsen introduces the concept of 'intimate borders' to describe the encounters between migrants and frontline bureaucrats in the context of healthcare. Bendixsen finds that irregular migrants in Norway

are underutilising healthcare services for fear of mistreatment and deportation. Her case study shows how irregular migrants become part of the migration governance apparatus themselves by internalising experiences of being constructed as undeserving or 'illegal'. In this way, the deportability regime produces subjectivities that themselves contribute to the everyday reproduction of the border regime.

Laura Eramian's paper presents an ethnographic account of how peace-building organisations evaluate reconciliation two decades after the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. Typically, reconciliation evaluations are based on testimonies collected from genocide survivors and perpetrators that are processed as data to generate 'objective' numerical indicators of success. Eramian argues that while evaluation is generally perceived as an objective bureaucratic practice, explanations of how they arrive at these numbers are often imprecise. Based on her fieldwork with staff members of different organisations, she considers how this 'scientific' method can help us understand the relationship between subjectivity and objectivity as potential sources of legitimacy and authority. How is 'reconciliation' construed in the political terrain? What kind of interpretive work is at stake in the process of producing policy-oriented 'deliverables' to measure and assess reconciliation initiatives? What is the role of intuition and subjective judgement in these practices of evaluation? These are some of the questions Eramian seeks to answer in her paper.

In his review article, Stephen Campbell examines three major recent works in the anthropology of capitalism, namely Kar (2018), Millar (2018) and Rosenbaum (2017). In his reading of these texts, Campbell identifies a shift away from old binary positions theorising capitalism as either a material or a symbolic process and towards a 'dialectical middle ground' that sees capitalism as both materially and culturally constituted. The books reviewed, he argues, show that theories of subjectivity, affect and desire can go hand in hand with a critical political economic approach.

LAIA SOTO BERMANT

University of Helsinki

NIKOLAI SSORIN-CHAIKOV 

University of St Petersburg

References

- Kar, S. 2018. *Financializing poverty: labor and risk in Indian microfinance*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, C. 1962. *The savage mind [La persee sauvage]*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Millar, K. 2018. *Reclaiming the discarded: life and labor on Rio's garbage dump*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pelkmans, M. (ed.) 2013. *Ethnographies of doubt: faith and uncertainty in contemporary societies*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Rosenbaum, S. 2017. *Domestic economies: women, work, and the American dream in Los Angeles*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human conditions have failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.