



## **University of KwaZulu-Natal April 8- 11.**

### **REDO Project Group, 16 participants:**

13 researchers:

Tony Balcomb, Gitte Buch-Hansen, Alexa Doeving, Marion Grau, Kjetil Hafstad, Graham Harvey, Ida Høeg, Michael Houseman, Morny Joy, Jens Kreinath, Sarah Pike, Sidsel Roalkvam and Jone Salomonsen

3PhD's: Greg Brzozowski, Lotte Danielsen, and Samuel Etikpah.

Meeting at UKZN Pietermaritzburg Campus  
Board Room - New Arts Bldg.

- Opening led by Sidsel Roalkvam
- Welcome of REDO by UKZN hosts Sarojini Nadar – *Dean of Research, College of the Humanities* and Simanga Kumalo – *Director of Research, School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics*
- Introduction to the project and goals for the workshop, by Jone Salomonsen

### **Session 1**

#### **Invited presentation:**

Gerald West: State construction of the role of religion in the public sphere and the return of people's theology.

What does it mean in post-apartheid SA to say “playing our part” – what is that part understood to be, by the state? West argued that theology in post-apartheid South Africa has become domesticated by the state and shaped as to not intrude on the political and economic. Therefore, West argued to move out of this domain in order to discover ‘people's theology’, and rather locate ourselves in the social movements of our time as for instance the organized social movement: Abahlali baseMjondolo (Shack Dwellers) which discursively moved the concepts of *ubuntu* out of the moral and into the economic domain.

#### **Invited responses:**

Dale Wallace argued against West's claim that the public figures of which he spoke (Jacob Zuma and Ramaphosa) do not know religions other than Christianity. She rested her argument on Rosalind Shaw's perspective on ‘the invention of African Religion’, and the problematic ways in which it has been treated in Religious Studies, arguing that the fact that it is not drawn on in the public speeches of Zuma and Ramaphosa belies its pervasive influence in both the public and the private sector. She argued that religion is a wider category than was applied in this paper/document; and that a deeper analysis of Jacob Zuma's conflation of African Religion and African culture will provide us with invaluable insights into the social, cultural and economic complexity of South African society today.

Rodrik brought up the concept and issue of power, and emphasized its importance for the topic about which West spoke. It is about maintaining power and domination. The various people integrate religion into their form of governance; so they dis-empower South Africans by using religion. When he stands waving the Bible, it has to be criticized. The role of missionary mis-energization: in terms of how the bible was read and how the people viewed themselves. How the Bible became a liberative tool, but also to enslave.

The people's model of transforming society is one thing. But what about when you sit around the table and you know the decision is going to be made somewhere else. He claimed that you can't deal with economics without dealing with race in South Africa. Rodrik missed analyses of the hidden script in state discourses; what is being communicated without being said.

#### **Response from REDO project:**

Morny Joy raised the issue of what are we going to have, if hearing from all these other forms of expression, referring to concepts such as decolonization. How do we bring back liberationist tradition with awareness of how they have been co-opted?

#### **Some questions that were raised during discussion:**

- How can we wisely separate between religion and government without falling into the trap that you here point out?
  - Interesting how the market has become something that should be left alone, even by the Christian community. It has become, paradoxically, a holy cow.
  - How do you decide who is doing ‘people's theology’? Why do you use the word theology for certain forms? Why do you privilege this label?
-

### **Invited presentation:**

Inus Daneel, Raviro Mutonga and Tony Balcomb: "The challenge of ritual responses to environmental crises."  
Case Study: "War of Trees" from Zimbabwe (w/Dvd)

Tony Balcomb presented a documentary movie "War of Trees" depicting the effort of reforestation of Zimbabwe as ecumenical religious struggle, involving indigenous traditions as well as African Christian churches. The trees are planted as a part of ritualistic ceremonies, therefore are less prone to be pulled down, as that would demand a permission of local chiefs and spirit mediums. The voice of prof. Inus Daneel was presented, comparing the planting of tree to Eucharyst - as both are a remembrance of the salvation given to all the people.

Raviro Mutonga stressed the crucial role of African women in the environmental projects. Previously largely deprived of self determination, African women are now looking for equal opportunities also in developmental issues. They are also the most affected by the environmental change as men move away from communities; women take care of wood for fire at home and safety of kids – planting gumtrees and fighting the soil erosion. They are more involved in time consuming activities such as planting gardens, as well as income producing ones: for instance starting small factories or introducing new ovens which demand less wood consumption.

Inus Daneel elaborated on the concept of "chimorenga" - war of trees, an environmental mission involving the spirits of ancestors (invoked by traditional religions' representatives) in the tree planting. He also went into greater details about the technique of involving the local 180 independent Christian churches in this effort - it demanded from him to refer to particular excerpts of The Scripture (e.g. substituting the biblical names of trees with the local names, or interpreting the fragment of Epistle to the Collosians "in Christ all things hold together", as meaning that Christ's salvation involves everybody, also the environment). The local chiefs, spirit mediums, and church representatives involved in the project also used to annually visit the oracle, previously condemned by Christians as wrong and satanic (Inus was however the first white person to see her in 1967).

### **Invited responses:**

Janet Trisk and Lilian Siwila raised the concern about the use of militant language utilized for the environmental project – e.g. the designation of the tree planters as soldiers which associates their effort with holy war.

This was answered by Inus explaining that Chimorenga was initially the name for a war of liberation; as some people chopped down the holy trees, many shared concerns with priests and decided that they want new chimorenga. The trees were planted by grass root society which overrode the militant aspect.

Another concern dealt with the patriarchal character of the ritual practice and Inus's designation as bishop Moses, which might reinforce it.

This was answered by Inus arguing that the ritual is not gendered and the current role division comes from the traditional role of women in society. Most spiritual mediums are women.

Inus also elaborated on the reasons for decline of the project – due to some human error, the case of one of the successors abusing the resources of the project. Sidsel contributed to the explanation saying that 2004 was a particular time in Zimbabwe, as all of the sudden most of the NGOs in Zimbabwe became corrupt due to macroeconomical turbulences and inflation.

### **Questions that were raised:**

- Did the movement manage to export ideas to other African countries? (it was- to Ghana)
- Why did they not bring some more men into it, would it not be good if the movement addressed their needs as well?

### **The response for REDO project:**

Graham Harvey: it is precious to see the whole lifestyle of the project, which moreover involved different human cultures coming together and human nature seeming to be working along the tree nature. Rituals are supposed to be inherited from the past - while here they are used in brand new ways. The creative approach can be opposed to the traditional approaches, seeing rituals as given.

### **Presentations on Assembly**

---

- Graham Harvey
- Lotte Danielsen
- Sidsel Roalkvam

For Latour, there is no such a thing as society. Pay attention to actors and how they relate within network. Ingold also thinks that relating is the path people move through complicated realities. Relating is finding a way through. Democracy is configuration of power relations and this takes place in concrete context. Post democracy asks the question what is exactly taking place on the ground. It invents and adopts new methodology, reframe the symbolic order and starts from the impossible – re-politicization.

What can ritual do? What is a break of the symbolic order? What is the new order? The break of the symbolic order might be objection to something. This can lead to reframing of responsibility or the recreation of a new order. Ritual changes the symbolic order. Ritual therefore can be transformative, embodying or re-skilling.

We are not often questioning democracy. Democracy is not enough, especially procedural democracy. Procedural democracy is not the same as the participatory.

### **Presentations on Ritual and performance theory**

---

Gitte Buch-Hansen: focused on Judith Butler's adjustment of Hannah Arendt's concept of political space and took it further: Where she speaks of supportive spaces she focused on human beings. Buch-Hansen introduced the concepts *extensions* of the body: it is not only architecture and design that support humans, but they also need human support. She stayed with Arendt's emphasis on the visual for the political, and the need to focus on *appearance*, but argued to also attend to the significance of other senses as well in the gathering of human bodies: touch, smell and taste.

Jens Kreinath: expressed dissatisfaction with the notion of performance, how it is defined, and took a critical view as we relate to ritual and performance. He discussed how framing provides the context for interpretation. Rituals and performance are not separated. Framing can be used in 2 ways: 1. verbal framing in the media: how you are talking in a particular way. 2. Bateson and Goffman: how we make clear that something can be understood even though it is communicated non-verbally. Framing provides the context for interpretation. If there is a shift in meaning in an art performance; the concept is not easy but it could be used as a means to look for examples of a rupture of the social field. He raised the question of what kind of efficacy we are discussing: Is the efficacy of ritual something that is believed or is it something that is happening?

Samuel Etikpah: Discussed ritual negotiation. Negotiations are according to Husken and Neubert processes of interaction during which different positions are debated and/or acted out. They claim that ritual is a constitutive field for negotiations, and that ritual is embedded in negotiation processes. Etikpah emphasized the importance of the contextual of rituals, and hence as negotiations. Through ritual's dynamic elements, it opens up for negotiations. If ritual was static, stable and of universal meaning, it would not have a role in negotiations.

Greg Brzozowski: Discussed ritual and performance. According to Jeffrey Alexander performance is a constructed phenomenon: its analytical model emerges out of the fusion of few performative elements – actors, audience, mis-en-scene, background and foreground symbols, means of public production and social power. Alexander pays more attention to the iconic power of things and cultural scripts that are embedded in society. Erika Fischer-Lichte pays attention to how the body plays a role, and thus breathes some corporality into it, as an intrusion into the semiotics. However, she does not discuss how the bridging affects political structures.

#### Issues that came up during discussion:

- Question of benevolence of ritual: It was pointed out that there is nothing good in ritual in itself. It can be used for good or for bad. REDO need to think that it is not necessarily good.
- The role of imagination: Ritual is involved with imagination, in a phenomenological sense. It is pre-linguistic intentionality. It is capable of changing it as well.
- A debate evolved around hermeneutics/text/language and embodiment: Some feared a privileging of texts/language through a focus on concepts from semiotics (e.g. framing), while others claimed that hermeneutics are always embodied.
- Is ritual conservative or creative? What is the ritualistic component of repetition and difference?

- Dramatic events have the potential for starting from the impossible; they open some possibility, break the symbolic order. Is ritual a particular mode of practice, an exemplary type of involvement that can reframe the pre-existent order? On the other hand: is ritual as a repetition and reiteration of symbolic order opposing the protest?
- Question of conflict between the semiotic and embodied component can be discussed through such authors as:
  - Don Handelman
  - Richard Schechner
  - S.J. Tambiah
  - Roy Rappaport
  - Bruce Kapferer
  - Victor Turner
  - Clifford Geertz

Summary of concepts and aspects that came up during the discussion (summarized by Michael Houseman):

1. Meaning in action: Interpretation and bodily experience, discourse (or whatever).
2. Idea of framing, linked to idea of changing, having an effect on something, newness.
3. Interconnection: the emergence of a totality that is larger than the individuals involved. Has to do with place. Inter-corporality that emerge.
4. Imagination, interpretation and hermeneutics. Are the hermeneutic acts always embodied? Do we counter the focus on the domination of text and interpretation?
5. Connectedness with nature; could be framed semiotically. The question of interconnectedness within a ritual and the emergence of political totalities out of the involved individuals

Ritual is embedded in negotiation processes. Butler speaks of political space and she is dissatisfied with the relation of ritual to performance. She thinks the question should be how ritual relates to itself. Ritual re-establishes and renegotiates.

Framing can be a means to understand performance. Performance is a cultural construction of reality. Negotiation is a context for framing. And framing is how something can be understood nonverbally. Framing is a means for rapture from the symbolic meaning.

**Presentations on Embodiment and Gender**

---

- Michael Houseman
- Morny Joy

**Embodiment** is about the sensory body, not the physical. Different bodies see the world differently. Paying attention to people's emotions is important to understand what the dynamics of ritual is. Emotion is a way of knowledge.

**Gender** is a tool for cultural analysis. Gender is constructible. Gender as a mode of subversive disturbance. Gender is a process of constant negotiation between us and society. Gender is materially imposed. Gender as an encounter with or negotiation of gender identity. Is ritual gendered? Is nature gendered?

**Presentations on Environment**

---

- Marion Grau

**Environment** entails the natural, human and relationships. Environment: spatiality, space, context, embodiment, emplacement, performance. Environment is about human–nature relationship. Space is a relation.

**Presentations on Social movements, faith of the faithless or “faith versus religion”**

---

- Sarah Pike
- Kjetil Hafstad

**Butler** is interested in spaces of protest not the material spaces. Other bodies (rather than humans) appear in spaces. People bring memory of expressions to the spaces of protest. Alexander thinks that media and internet might help social movements to resist or hinder social movements to exist.

Every human is religious. Religion is sense and taste of the universe. Faith is organized socially. Friedrich Nietzsche argues that faith is a human construction. Both gender and theology are reflexive tools that can generate questions about environment and relationality. They are generative tools for ideas. Both gender and theology are to complicate the given. They are complicators of belief or faith. They are to breakdown categories. How does faith and belief impact on ritual performance?

## Wednesday 10 April

Facilitator Wednesday part 1: **Sidsel Roalkvam**

---

### Discussion of conceptual frame for project 1, 22 July

---

- Ida Marie Høeg
- Cora Alexa Døving
- Jone Salomonsen

**Ritual** has power to make political statement. Ritual mobilizes things.

What does improvisation do? Improvisation does something to us. It creates relationship too. Ritual has nothing good in itself. What are the kinds of ritual **efficacy**: meaning and action, framing (change or effectiveness) and interconnection (individual, places, network and realities). Ritual is involved in imagination. Ritual is a place we can perform imagination, interpretation, and intimacy with humans and nonhumans. **Embodiment** is about the sensory body, not the physical. Different bodies see the world differently. Paying attention to people's emotions is important to understand what the dynamics of ritual is. Emotion is a way of knowledge.

**Working definitions:** Ritual is a particular way of paying attention to what you are expressing or doing with others. Ritual is a way of participating in things. Ritual is a way people from different backgrounds negotiate new meanings and life realities. Ritual as a means of creating something new from the given. Ritual is doing things together. Key features of **democracy** are representative, systematic contradiction and equal rights. Systematic contradiction refers to opposite argument or opposition

### Intro and discussion of Charette as an innovative method for Project 1

---

- Alexa Døving
- Jone Salomonsen

#### **Logistics:**

---

Went through milestones, project development, research paper presentations and publication plan. See separate document for full overview. Dates for meetings were discussed, and the following decided:

#### Meetings (some dates are approximate):

- 2013: Oslo, from December 9 to 12
- 2015:
  1. Paris, either April 23 to 26 or April 30 to May 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  2. London (Camden), around September 23 to October 1 (either side of the weekend)
- 2016:
  1. Berkeley: In the week of March 14, around spring break.
  2. Oslo (final meeting): September 26-30.

#### About Oslo workshop in December:

Half day will be public (around 5 hours), with external invitees giving feedback. The rest will be for the project group only. During this workshop there will have to be some visibility of the project to the public. The REDO team has to present rather than that we invite external presenters. There should rather be external *feedback* to the project. It was suggested a format of for instance three papers presented by REDO, and three external responses to the presentations. It was suggested to invite around 20 people. The question remains what should be presented to the public, and who can present at this point. It was suggested that there should be feedback from a geographer as there are no geographers in the project group.

As to the content of the internal workshop, the following components were suggested:

1. Updates on projects
2. Methodology
3. Revisiting the concepts (ritual, democracy)

It was also agreed that there should be more time left for lunch breaks (1,5 hours) and that there should be more variation, e.g. to go for a walk while discussing.

Task for all: We all need to think about what (theory vs projects) we should present, and who will be ready to present to the public at this point.

**Thursday April 11**

Facilitator Jone Salomonsen

---

### **Methods for project**

#### **Joint fieldwork and filmmaking**

- Michael Houseman
- Graham Harvey

#### Film as possible research method

- Camera as a visual notebook; dropbox can become a sharing space
- Is camera against the methodology of participant observer? Camera is present, but not embodied - or - should camera become a part of the performance, e.g. by following the ritual leader?
- Should film be a research tool or a product? Films as a part of ethnography – shall be the topic of a workshop on filmmaking in Oslo

**Research ethics** for all NFR projects.

#### **Special challenges** for REDO

---

Jone Salomonsen

#### **The GUIDELINES:**

- Goal of the researcher is to seek the truth (a contextual, not an eternal one); there might be a conflict between the integrity of one's own research and the field
- CASE STUDY: a sociologist conducting research among Neonazis in Oslo - those who planned bomb attack; after getting the knowledge of planning of illegal acts, the researcher withdrew, reported on it, though lost the field
- When one encounters illegal activities - we make a pre-agreement about communicating this within the group
- When there is a disagreement about ethical issues within groups - we keep on discussing it within the group
- The necessity for an informed consent - a difficulties come with: children, those who do not own themselves or those expecting something from the researcher (eg. in conditions of economic inequality)
- The other should know who is funding, what for and how it will be used.
- Anyone whom one study has right to withdraw at any moment
- There is no need to ask about consent e.g. for pictures in all public spaces: route, church, pilgrimage. (but it does not work this way in England according to Graham)
- Can one take out camera and take pictures in the public space? Being, observing and listening and asking (without revealing oneself) is allowed only in public spaces. As soon as it is not public, one has to ask.
- What is the form of it? Formal or verbal? There is no form demand, but the consent should be in writing in all interviews always. "The consent is given to x for the project..."
- According to Michael: There is not always an obligation to take a formal consent but to tell people who one is. One cannot be a spy.
- CASE STUDY: while researching New Age Sufi forms - the majority of people in the class don't care, but the leader should express the consent if the group wants to set up the interview. When the tape recorder is taken - one needs a consent, and a descriptions of how one destroys the material afterwards; it is all about protecting identity.

#### **QUESTION OF PLAGIARISM**

What if we share resources? Do we own the ideas developed next to project?

Whatever individual writes belongs to author. One's resource belongs to one, only when we JOINT the projects - it changes. As we are sharing ideas generously, the joint projects are possible, if the author needs help and asks for it or one is offering own help with addressing the things for free. There are no additional funds for it from the budget. There are more possibilities possibility of synergy by applying for additional money.

---

## Discussion of Methods within the three subprojects:

### Subproject 1:

National identity group, with focus on 22nd July. We highlight cases relevant for Norway - for sake of funders; the whole set of cases matters as different expressions of nationalism.

**Leader: Jone** (Graham helps)

Members:

- Graham Harvey
- Jone Salomonsen
- Alexa Døving
- Ida Marie Høeg
- Kjetil Hafstad
- Gitte Buch-Hansen
- Greg Brzozowski

#### Key questions:

How does collective, public ritual action beyond faith communities become a response to terror, questions of financial and social security and environmental democracy from below?

Focus on understanding 22nd of July: A new ritual competence was manifested. What it does to politics?

Investigating the issues of national identity and the way the church of Norway played a ceremonial role in it. Why religious sites served as popular venues in public situations; beyond communities of separation? What role women and kids play in it? What is the role of other institutions? What is the political potential of the demand for sacred space beyond the church?

Methods: film analysis, fieldwork, archive. New, unorthodox methodologies.

Necessity to attract and recruit a PhD contributing to project on a multicultural ritual.

#### Roles of individual participants:

Kjetil: Sees theological underpinnings of it. Nationalism as another form of community: inclusive or not. Focus on the evil of Nazi regime and theological responses to it.

Gitte: The ritualised food and national identity; Eucharist as a ritualised meal and the rules of exclusions. Question of different cultural forms of meals.

Greg: Polish Woodstock festival - modern festival pluralisation and inclusiveness without excessive polarisation.

Graham: Indigenous annual communal assemblage in Maori - London UK. Questions of indigenous performance and identity creation in multicultural setting.

Jone: a nationalist aspect in Breivik act; deeper roots of Norwegian culture (Breivik claims he is indigenous), the question of women inclusiveness; national identity and gender

Countering the Protestant assumption of an interior belief; belief is rather a ritualised practice (differing from culture to culture). When we look for belief, we often ask to look for something in the souls of the interviewed, but believing is about confessing, baptizing, reciting texts, dancing, singing etc. Women are often central to organising the performance groups; it is not just male speakers, performers.

### Subproject 2:

Social activity - intentional ritual activity

**Leader: Sidsel** (Sarah helps)

Members:

- Sidsel Roalkvam
- Paul-Francois Tremlett
- Jens Kreinath
- Sarah Pike
- Lotte Danielsen

Focus on: ritual and social movements, notions of the event and performance. Other key themes: negotiated citizenship (including trees and animals), radicalisation, the way the social groups shape the public sphere, points



of tension and contestation. Analysing the movements for new forms of democracy, working on political goals while using rituals; One of the cases: the Occupy movement.

### **Subproject 3:**

Land Based Rituals - meditative, renewing yourself, stressing contact to the land.

**Leader: Michael** (Marion helps)

Members:

- Marion Grau
- Tony Balcomb
- Samuel Etikpah
- Michael Houseman
- Morny Joy

Focus on: ritual, ecology and renewal of identity. How does the relationship between nature and people contribute to the renewal of identities? One of the cases: the tree planting rituals.

## **Methodology Discussion**

### **1. The Methodology of Participant Observation**

Key Question:

The tool of research is your own person. How does one reflect on using himself/herself as a tool?

Graham:

- There is a falsely sharp distinction in anthropology between participation and observation. In order to understand the people I need to participate - as classic ethnography began with it. To which extent however one is insider or outsider? When one is among the people - don't they notice it? When one goes home back to his study, is the observation really over? It is false sharp duality - there is always flow between the two.
- Graham's observations from studying guesthood among Maori: when he is there joining the ceremony, it is never the same as two Maori doing it. Their environment is built around possibility of meeting the strangers; becoming a guest makes one a full participant. Hanging out with Maori not necessarily demands however reminding them that one is a researcher. If it is possible - it needs rather eating and camping with them, becoming as immersed as possible
- We need to remember about the wider cultural context of rituals, e.g. the eucharist might not be the centre of ritual process; it is a mistake to focus on just ceremony, as it is a part of wider cultural/social context.

Michael:

- Ethnographic fieldwork demands spending TIME with people and taking NOTES, writing down all the time while you don't know what can be significant. There are different noting techniques if one wants to demonstrate validity of intuition; e.g. adding notes in the evening about own feelings.
- One's readiness to make judgements is an additional tool for understanding other people; it only works when one is there as a person, bringing his own biases and being aware of it. For instance: why am I going there?
- FIELDWORK is different from the ANALYSIS which is following; the process of digesting the data, the analysis based only on the notes
- After 3-4 months of fieldwork there is a CRISIS; one can feel like insulting other people, going into argument; the observer position is not tenable. It is good to undermine the rapture immediately by posing yourself on the line; opening your personal stories, as the people reciprocate to your openness.

### **2. Anthropology by the Native**

Key Questions:

What is the methodology of a native studying his own community, a challenge of doing fieldwork in one's own hometown, with a sufficient knowledge. What are the new things one wants to find - while one needs to be strategic and innovative at the same time? How does one write about his personal history within the community?

How to represent the community - as at some point one needs to make decisions, stand on something, e.g. how to write on secrets?

Michael:

- Being a native sometimes one focuses falsely on what he/she expects to be the most important part - e.g. falsely seeing burying as the most important part of islamic funeral.
- The challenge is not to know what is already known, but to question what people generally know, e.g. how specific kinds of people respond to it; what are the specific meanings, responses and reactions.

Samuel:

- I involve myself in certain events, new roles, willing to be a participant and observer at the same time rather than withdrawing from certain rituals. One should not claim to be a tabula rasa; benefits of being a native are in getting network and access to community.

### 3. The Contextual Theology

Question:

What is the contextual theology?

Kjetil:

- It is a soft method developed by network of contextual theologians in nordic countries in 1992 as a search for argumentative deliberation in theology. As classical theology has been didactic in teachings of church, this perspective takes into considerations what people know otherwise, outside of the church; it focuses on a constructive deliberation and interpretation, people of local traditions. It is an intercontextual theology.

Marion:

- Contextualizing the theology means going to the place, immersion to the field. E.g. what happens to the question of salvation in postcolonial context? Let's take three cases for analysing missionary-locals encounters and apply different methodologies in each case, for instance: New Zealand, Alaska, South Africa.

Question:

Does it go along with the notion of CONSTRUCTION THEOLOGY (which is always political as has to do with liberation theology)?

- Construction theology is not a method but a political way of organising theology. It started as movement to combine with liberation theology but also went into other directions; methodological attempt to connect theological reflection with local community.
- Constructive approach means: one is situated in the research situation with the idea of creating new theology. It is still not treated as an ethnographic field, as a researcher is not systematising what is given to him/her.
- Contextual theology means to speak to specific situations - it is not just a spatial but also a temporal thing; like Paul Tillich's Kairos speaking to a political situation. Construction of a theology means taking into consideration folk theologies to understand what the local is.
- Anthropology and theologians: both groups use methodology of ethnography (or fieldwork), which stands for interest in people and bringing some questions. In our case we bring the question of ritual and democracy.

### Blog and Internet Communication

Apart from website we are expected to have a blog and need a twitter - use of social media to keep the public interest. Marion will be in charge of uploading.

- Marion prepares **editorial outline** with dates
- some pictures and writing are expected from all the participants; once a month someone can write **300 words with picture**
- is there necessary **consent for the pictures?** - oral permission is enough
- need for a **Facebook** group
- emailing within group: **all emails start with headlines "REDO"**

- **press release** is missing
- all the informations about the following workshops are given to press media; it is work of each local coordinator in respective workshop place

### Print Publication Plan

- **Sarah and Graham and Jens** added to this group
- we need to come up with a book plan as the contracted editing houses want the fully written out pieces
- respective working groups later shall work on coherency of publications - it is too early for it yet

So far ideas about the publishers:

- Brill? publishing in paperbacks too
- Oxford Ritual Series
- Preferable to have all volumes with one publisher, a long term deal with it
- We should go with 3 books, as this is promised in the grant
- Since 2016 final conference will take place in Oslo and it should be in Norwegian, we also need something to be published in Norwegian on the way

### Final Remarks on Oslo Meeting

#### 1. PRESENTATIONS

- Graham
- Jens
- Sarah

#### 2. ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM WORKSHOP

Everyone wants to have workshop on ethnographic film; that demands coming one day earlier

#### 3. STRUCTURE:

- Public event / workshop
- work within conceptual groups; having presentations for each other; each group meets separately first in the morning - and notes for subgroup are prepared in advance
- more focus on theoretical conceptual work

#### 4. SCHEDULE:

- Half a day - public
- Half a day - group work
- Full day ethnographic filmmaking
- One day altogether for a collective discussion
- Half day for seeing something in Oslo; eg. boat cruise (in winter?)

+

One day full activity for skiers (the following weekend?)

#### 5. OTHER REMARKS

- Rector of university of Oslo is coming
  - Collective willingness for 1,5 hour lunch breaks (eating was slightly too hectic this time)
  - The same place to stay as last year
-