Gert Dressel
(Wien, Austria)

PITFALLS AND OTHER TRAPS: A LONG WAY YET TO AN EQUAL EUROPEAN DIALOGUE IN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SCIENCES. AN EMPIRICAL REPORT

Abstract: This contribution has emerged from a conference at which Austrian and Bulgarian ethnologists, folklorists, and historical anthropologists discussed the perspectives of a European ethnology. One subject of the general discussion was the preconditions and chances of an equal ethnologic dialogue in Europe - meaning an equal dialogue between the exponents of the various "national" ethnologies (and folkores and historical anthropologies) of the "West" and "(South-)East".

Key words: pitfall, ethnology, historian anthropology, folkloristic,equal ethnologic dialogue

This contribution has emerged from a conference at which Austrian and Bulgarian ethnologists, folklorists, and historical anthropologists discussed the perspectives of a European ethnology. One subject of the general discussion was the preconditions and chances of an equal ethnologic dialogue in Europe - meaning an equal dialogue between the exponents of the various "national" ethnologies (and folkores and historical anthropologies) of the "West" and "(South-)East". But for the moment, we are still far from it, as I would put it.

It begins with language. We all know that publications in German (not to speak of English) rank much higher in academic reputation than, for instance, publications in Bulgarian, just as a sojourn of studies or research in the U. S. A. will give a better reputation than one in Sofia can. Of course, the necessity of an increased international orientation of science is much discussed, not least in Austria. But there is a hierarchy, seldom made explicit and hence all the more effective, of countries, regions, and languages. This hierarchy, having been formed and formulated in the main by exponents of the "West", expresses the cultural conceptions Western and Central Europeans have of South-Eastern Europe. And it reflects current patterns of political and economic power. Be it Schengen Europe, be it the blatant economic imbalance between Western and Eastern Europe: these things and the like severely constrain the chances of Bulgarian colleagues to participate in the western academic discourse. Whilst we Austrians can travel to various south-eastern European countries at will and without a visa, and in addition, use a nearly perfect infrastructure of communication, this is not true the other way round. For Bulgarian scientists, it is equally difficult to get the benefit of a visa to the Schengen countries without much expenditure and to communicate over long geographical distances. Faxes and letters to a Bulgarian destination are no financial problem to us, but the other way round, they are.

These structures, which are also power relations, of course, do not least reveal themselves in academic routine, in direct encounters and communications between Bulgarians and Austrians. Any encounter between a Bulgarian and an Austrian scientist or student will always be pre-structured even before it comes to a first contact. And, what is more, these encounters do not only reveal power relations, but also reproduce them time and again. But the structure generating character of all interpersonal encounters also holds a potential of change which should not be underrated. This is to say the way in which we approach an interaction, we could at least take the edge off these power relations. Reflecting and disclosing the joint workaday culture of Austrian and Bulgarian scientists could perhaps be a first step in the direction of an equal dialogue.

On the following pages, I want to elucidate the relevance of political and economic structures for the encounter of Austrian and Bulgarian scientists on the basis of my own experiences. In the centre of these I want to place an historical-anthropological seminar held every year in February, which is jointly organised by the sub-department for Historical Anthropology of the IFF in Vienna, the department for South-Eastern European History of the University of Graz, and the International Seminar for Balkan Studies of the University of Blagoevgrad. For one or two weeks a year, some twenty Austrian and

Bulgarian students, historians, folklorists, ethnologists etc. meet at Bansko at the foot of the Pirin mountains to discuss each year another historical-anthropological topic. In the sense of a "reflexive historical anthropology" as it is advanced especially at the IFF, making its own scientific practice an object of reflection, and sometimes of research as well, I will reflect my own, or the Austrian, encounters with Bulgarian colleagues.

What I found highly inspiring in this context was the reading of an ethno-psychoanalytic study by Maya Nadig. This research, putting the question of a specific culture of Indian women in a Mexican village, stands out as a result ot the impressing frankness of its author. We learn by far more than usual about the complex process of data collection, about the encounter between the European researcher and the Central American subjects of her research in field research and ethno-psychoanalytic interviews, about the socio-culturally formed perspective of the researcher, about the manner in which the ones researched perceived the act of research, and finally, about the different backgrounds of social experience, elements of transference and counter-transference, mutual role attributions, and about the relevance of all these phenomena to the very data. It becomes evident how much psycho-emotional phenomena are related to super-individual, social structures - on both sides of the research situation. And Nadig's report elucidates in an almost unparalleled manner the fact that the reflection of the self and of the person opposite, that the reflection of the mutual pictures, prejudices, emotions, and of their socio-cultural structuring is not self-serving, much less exhibitionism. On the contrary, such a reflexive approach is in fact a precondition of creating some common level of communication, and to hit upon levels of experience of the examined culture which otherwise would have remained concealed and unbeknown to the researcher. Thus practised reflexivity therefore invariably serves the purpose of gaining scientific knowledge.

Of course my Bulgarian colleagues are not the objects of my research, and we are not so foreign to each other, perhaps, as Nadig and the Indian women researched by her; let alone for me to be a trained ethno-psychoanalyst. However, from Nadig's study can be derived a series of potential ways of how to reflect the culture of the Austro-Bulgarian academic encounter. On the following pages, I will attempt to reflect my encounters, a couple of scenes with Bulgarian students and scientists, from the perspective of my own perception. This is to say, I will above all discuss my own role and the role my Bulgarian colleagues have for me; I will discuss my notions and ways of acting, and the fancies I have of the perception on the Bulgarian side. But I will constantly try to go beyond my individual level, making references to various kinds of social parameters. And, as I have said, it is an attempt - a first attempt, for however often we have met meanwhile, at Bansko and in other places in Bulgaria: we (Austrians and Bulgarians) actually do not know of each other what the others think about us and about themselves. As Nadig's intense reflection aims at gaining scientific knowledge, my disclosure strives at getting out of the way at least some of the obstacles which so impede an equal dialogue in the joint workaday historical-anthropological practice of Austrians and Bulgarians.

The first scene, a proto-scientific experience, so to speak: Sofia, main station, July 1992. I am setting foot on Bulgarian soil for the first time. Not for an academic conference, but because I have chosen Bulgaria for a holiday trip, together with my companion. The reason for our choice: we think that we know nothing about this country, and we want to explore it by railway. The first thing for us to do is to enter the exchange office at the station because we do not have any Lewa. My girl friend changes a thousand Austrian Shillings, so do I, we get a large bundle of Bulgarian banknotes in return - and have cleared out the exchange office. This was embarrassing, it was very unpleasant, and we did not even know at first where to put all that money - and this to happen in a railway station, of all places, with all those people around. But coupled with it was also, even if it did not come at once, but in the course of the following days, a sense of economic independence (or superiority, perhaps). Of course this was opposed to my existence in Vienna, in Austria, where - being in the final phase of my studies - I used to have little money, to barely stay the course. This emotional antagonism of feeling compunction on the one hand, yet on the other hand, the pleasant sentiment of not having to heed the money for once, has accompanied me through all these years with every one of my quite numerous stays in Bulgaria. And it has influenced my

perception of the country, the people, and the academic culture. It has also structured my encounters with Bulgarian colleagues, or the way I encounter them.

This was further intensified by my first participation in the Bansko seminar in February 1997. In that Bulgarian winter of disaster, the poverty, the shortage of food and heating material was incessantly palpable in everyday life. For the first time in my life, I saw people queuing up for bread in front of the bakeries; and with every day my money - my Dollars, my German Marks, my Austrian Shillings - even increased in value, because the Lewa went down day after day. To me and to many other Austrian participants, Bansko 1997 was not a cultural shock, but an economic otherness, which certainly influenced the culture of the Austro-Bulgarian encounters. On the one hand, because there was a manifest economic difference between myself as an Austrian and the majority of the Bulgarian colleagues. On the other hand, because this relation of difference had yet another dimension, namely a difference from or otherness unto myself, unto my predominant routine and life circumstances in Vienna. That for once I rank among the rich (which in a global context I always do, however), that I do not have to take heed of money, this is a situation entirely unwonted to me, which certainly holds a series of conveniences, but is also connected with inconvenience, or at least, bewilderment. For in this Bulgarian routine, I am directly confronted with a poverty that does not compare to my own scarcity in Vienna. And it was not a confrontation from a distance, as an indifferent observer, but a very personal one. Throughout this fortnight at Bansko in February 1997, it was my academic interlocutors, my colleagues - Bulgarian students as well as professors - who were massively affected, and endangered in their everyday existence, by economic deprivation. In a constellation such as this, uncertainties with regard to behaviour and roles on all sides involved are almost inevitable.

To put it as a question: How to behave in a situation such as this as an Austrian in a mechana, a Bulgarian wine-tavern, frequented in the company of Bulgarian colleagues (which was our habit), drinking wine and rakia together, eating together, but the prices being very high for Bulgarian notions? And who is going to pay at the end of a wonderful evening? If we Austrians do not pay all, then this could be regarded by the Bulgarians as an attempt to not overly demonstrate our economic superiority, or perhaps on the contrary: it could be interpreted as miserliness, as an augmentation of the imbalance, as our refusing to see, our tabooing this uneven distribution of economic resources. But then, what if we pay? This is likewise ambiguous: it could, on the one hand, be understood as an act of justice. Or, on the other hand, as a patronage of sorts, the patronising air once more confirming and perpetuating the imbalance in an everyday action. Most of the time, we did pay. And perhaps this had always something patronising to it, and it was certainly always motivated in part - not only in me, I think - by soothing our bad conscience, the bad conscience we had on account of the uneven economic situation.

The situation is so delicate not least because it is also conceived in a culprit-victim-polarity. I often see the Bulgarians, my Bulgarian colleagues, as victims. And it often seems that in my encounters and conversations with Bulgarians (and other South-Eastern Europeans), I seek to find this black-and-white thinking confirmed: I invariably ask about both their individual and the general economic situation, although I actually know the answers in advance. But I want my views to be confirmed, so that I may show my concern, despite feeling rather powerless myself, or perhaps because of it, and because at the same time as an exponent of a rich country of the European Union, I feel responsible, and through my concern I think I can meet with my responsibility, or get rid of it, and ease myself and the others. Surely I am not like that businessman, I think he was Swiss, who in a Bansko tavern treated his Bulgarian business partners with utter arrogance, explaining to them what capitalism is. But then, if some Bulgarians do not seem to fit in with my picture of the victim, I disapprove of them, as I did, for instance, with a group who at our Bansko seminar of 1999 openly demonstrated their being comparatively wealthy, and in addition, dodged the structures of the seminar - which had been constructed mainly by us Austrians. To put it polemically: In my spontaneous perception and judgement, good, sympathetic Bulgarians are those who largely match with my victim concept, meaning that they are helpless in some way or other, that they need our help (whatever that may be). In other words: "good" are those who basically put up with our paternalistic attitude.

Another scene: again Bansko, February 1997. The subject of our historical-anthropological seminar was "Gift and Treasure", and in the main there were presented and discussed historical and cultural practices of giving and receiving (actually pretty relevant in this Bulgarian winter of disaster of 1997). The Austrian group, some fifteen students and scientists, had decided on the occasion of the subject of the seminar and the precarious situation in Bulgaria to bring gifts. So, one evening at the beginning of the seminar we performed a great book-giving. Each Austrian gave a book to one of the Bulgarians, and in addition, the International Seminar for Balkan Studies of Blagoevgrad, our co-operation partner, received a veritable load of books. We had been well aware beforehand of the problematic situation; so we pre-arranged the proceeding with a few Bulgarian colleagues, in that subsequent to the handing over of the books, the Bulgarians would have the opportunity to present a gift in return, which in this case was an invitation to wine. Although I still believe the ritual to have succeeded tolerably well (the more so since with the wine, the situation became pretty sociable), at the same time I am uncertain whether perhaps on the Bulgarian side the handing over of the books might have been perceived in a very discordant way: that it not only demonstrated our economic superiority, but in addition, emphasised an alleged academic superiority on our part. For in the course of our performance, we made quite a display of the symbols of knowledge, the very materialisation of knowledge, which is, books. And in part, those presenting the books were at the same time the authors of them, and the majority of books were in German - a language which, as it turned out, most of the Bulgarian colleagues had no command of. Now, why present people who do not understand German with German-language scientific books?

From whatever angle we may look at it from, our performance, albeit meant as an act of friendship, emphasises the fact that economic superiority can easily go hand in hand with an alleged academic superiority. We all know that the conditions for the production of scientific books in Austria are incomparably better than those in Bulgaria. This hints at another problematic side of the paternalism mentioned above. The latter first manifests itself in perceiving the person opposite as a victim to economic conditions, and thus as powerless in the face of them. And if in the sequel this paternalism is transferred to the academic field (or if an action is thus perceived), then it takes on a very much discriminating dimension, because for a scientist to encounter another scientist out of a paternalistic perspective means denying the other his or her every scientific competence. Then all of a sudden the victims become pupils, and the culprits their teachers.

A third scene: Sofia again, this time in the summer of 1998 at the university, or more precisely, in the rooms of the Austrian Library. Shortly before, the Bulgarian translation of my book on "Historical Anthropology" has been officially presented. Now many Bulgarian colleagues, hitherto unknown to me, queue up to chat with me, exchanging addresses, etc. Another otherness, and once again an otherness unto myself, unto my usual routine. When would I ever have experienced such a thing in Austria or elsewhere: colleagues to queue up for me because they take an interest in me, and to such an extent. If Bulgaria to me is the country where in an economic sense I can live a life of ease, it is also a place where I have experienced academic recognition. This book presentation in Sofia was good for my vanity, as I frankly admit, but it was also bewildering, because I did not, after all, so entirely trust in the situation, because here again the power differentials in academic routine between "West" and "East" or "South-East" took effect. And I think that these power differentials, which have much to do with the mentioned paternalistic relations and with economic - though not only economic - parameters, are constantly confirmed and reproduced by the way of acting of both sides, Austrian and Bulgarian.

Let us return to Bansko in this context. It had been a habit of old that in the course of the historical-anthropological seminar it was mainly the Austrians, and above all the Austrian teachers, who presented their papers, but not the Bulgarians, or only a few. The latter may have participated in the discussion, asked questions, and addressed the Austrian teachers, but always in the role of students. The role of the Bulgarian university teachers was, and largely still is, that of translators and organisers. This structure of the seminar, in which the Austrians are the ones who give academic development aid, has been upheld, in the last analysis, by both the Austrian and the Bulgarian side, albeit for different reasons.

I think that we, the Austrians, experience it as a compensation that for once we are in the role of the knowing, the authorities. In the context of western academic routine, it is more often than not the other way round: we often feel to be taken not quite seriously by Germans or others. From the Bulgarian perspective, on the other hand, the motivations for upholding uneven encounters might be the following: perhaps it is held that this very attitude of docility will secure important contacts, for in global academic practice, it is important to have contacts to the West. This is where funds and other resources necessary for research work and translations can be found, this is where the power of definition of science lies, this is where you can acquire academic reputation. And it is known all too well that only with great difficulties can Bulgarians and other South-Eastern and Eastern Europeans travel to Schengenland, and not for financial reasons alone. The current scandalous politics of the European Union also make it necessary, if one desires to keep regular contact with more than half a handful of western scientists, to induce European Unionists to travel to Bulgaria, which at times is not altogether easy. And how often it was that at Bansko the Austrians were thanked for having come, for having spared the time for it. As if we had nothing to thank for. But, and I am sorry to say so, apparently the relations between Austrians and Bulgarians at Bansko are in part also of the sort depending upon the favour and disfavour of the mightier, which is, the Austrians. Such togetherness has nothing much to do with an equal dialogue, of course. On the contrary, it perpetuates all types of power relations between the "West" and "South-East": the economic ones, those of academic policy, and the political ones. And it reinforces the pictures of "the Balkans" we have adopted in adolescence, and which, as Maria Todorova has shown, sometimes South-Eastern Europeans have of themselves as well: a picture of backwardness in many respects.

A fourth scene: this time it is Bansko 1999, and the general subject, "Youth and University". Within the scope of the seminar we had visited the University of Blagoevgrad and a students' hostel, which excursion had above all made plain under what economic predicament the Bulgarian scientific and university routine had to suffer. Several days later, when presenting a paper on the connections between scientific practice and society, I referred to our visit, meaning to explain by this example how economic parameters certainly influence the ways and the contents of scientific practice. Now, that was obviously dropping a huge brick, at least with some of the Bulgarian colleagues. Some inferred that what I was saying was that the economic predicament enabled only an inferior science. Hours later, I learned that among some of the Bulgarian colleagues, mostly older ones, it had been discussed how much I must be paid as an Austrian scientist, and what arrogance I must possess, that I could say such a thing.

Yet I had chosen this example not least because I am well aware of the connection of economy and scientific practice from my own experience, from the experience of the situation of my generation of cultural scientists in Austria: it is a rare case for me and my peers to be regularly employed; we usually work in short-time, mostly ill-paid projects. We always have to think about how to survive the following year. Of course this has an influence upon the contents of our scientific work. But it needs not be a loss in quality. I rather think that it has made my generation more sensitive to economic and political imbalances within and between societies, since shortage of means whatsoever is part of our own biographic experience. But of this I did not want to talk, since I did not mean to make myself a victim in the face of a Bulgarian science the situation of which is so much more precarious. And so, all of a sudden I was nothing but an exponent of the rich and arrogant West.

But these misunderstandings and frictions are also due to the teacher-pupil kind of relation between Austrian and Bulgarian colleagues at Bansko. Someday the thankfulness needs must topple and give way to resistance, however unjustly treated I may personally feel. And it is a consequence of the fact that any fairly open discussion of the things people are really concerned with, of the structures dividing Austrians and Bulgarians, and of assumed differences is next to impossible. This, however, is almost immanent to any teacher-pupil relation or relation of favour and disfavour. Neither side is much inclined to such discussion: the Austrians because it would undermine their own powerful position, and the Bulgarians because they fear the disfavour of the Austrians. And so, the differences are constantly there, hovering in the background, coming forth in little conversations, to be learned but underhand, but nonetheless always influencing the everyday relationship and the pictures one has of each other, the mutual role attributions.

It is amazing how for instance during the Bansko seminar of 1997, when the subject was about giving and receiving, it was never discussed in public how apropos this subject was then and there, and how much it affected our very Austro-Bulgarian encounters. Instead, there emerged hot discussions within the Austrian group about our own way of acting, the impression it might give the Bulgarians, etc. Afterwards I learned that the Bulgarian participants had had hot discussions as well. It would have helped a lot to take the edge off the situation and to become a little more clear about what happened in the heads and stomachs of the others if the relevance of the subject had been discussed between Bulgarians and Austrians as part of the seminar, and in a structured, organised form.

Just so, the question of "Europe" has never been openly referred to at the Bansko meetings hitherto. And yet this field of conflict keeps us permanent company, for instance in that the Austrian side rather emphasises the (historical) differences between Western and South-Eastern Europe, whilst the Bulgarians rather underline the affinities. The many connotations of both these views as well as their current acute relevance would urgently require to be discussed, or talked about, in the semi-public of the seminar. Much to my satisfaction, a more open discussion of this difficult subject has already begun. A few months ago, a Bulgarian colleague from Blagoevgrad published his annoyance at some Austrian positions in a scientific journal in Bulgaria (under the motto: "henchmen of Schengen"!), and one of the attacked Austrian scientists has in the meantime replied to it. Hurtful though such discussion may be at this stage, carrying the whole burden of all that has hitherto remained unsaid: in the long run, a continued tabooing would be even more hurtful and more separating. But what is most eloquent of the difficulties also showing at Bansko is that it was not until he had left for a long stay in China that the Bulgarian colleague published his article. So he will not have to face his opponents at Bansko. That he should choose this way of acting ought to set us thinking about our, the Austrians', role. And this very way of acting is actually part of the problem we ought to jointly reflect.

And now I come to the perspectives, chances, and preconditions of an equal European dialogue in the anthropologically oriented sciences. I have largely moved on the everyday level so far, on the level of encounters and communications between Austrian and Bulgarian scientists. For therein lies, to my mind, an immense potential of change, and it is directly in our power. On this level, we could somewhat strip the powerful political and economic structures of their austerity. Even if we cannot change the "great" politics, for instance that of the European Union, what we can do is transform the scientific policy, academic routine, and academic culture. And that would be pretty much for a beginning.

What I regard as an imperative precondition of such dialogue is a reflection of the structures and power relations in which we communicate and encounter each other, a reflection of the stereotypes, pictures, and prejudices we have of or against each other, and the hence resulting role attributions. Of course: this reflection requires a structure, or structures, and perhaps uncommon ones. Grown-up people, and scientists in particular, always think that they can simply get together and talk about the matter and settle it. This I hold to be a dire and false estimation, and an overestimation of our own capacities. Not only is the usual form of academic argument insufficient in this matter: moreover, if uniquely applied, it perpetuates the very things we actually want to change. This was in fact the reason for me to have placed my personal experience of Austro-Bulgarian academic workaday culture in the centre of this essay, perhaps somewhat breaking the rules of academic custom in doing so. I have deliberately emphasised the problems and difficulties (and not the many positive and unforgettably wonderful experiences), sometimes in a polemic manner even, and tried to discuss the role attributions, actual roles, and assumed roles, in order to make these obstacles to an equal dialogue publicly known from my perspective.

I should like now to hear reports by Bulgarian colleagues on their perceptions and experiences, their interpretations of community and antagonism, their pictures and role attributions. This would have to come to pass in a protected yet public area, like at Bansko for instance, or in a publication such as this. Protected yet public because publicity would give more weight to what is said; a public setting would emphasise the relevance of what has hitherto been discussed only in private, if though frequently enough: the relevance of social structuring, of prejudices etc. for scientific practice, and would give it its due significance. In a first step, it would not be a matter of discussing, or exchanging arguments. A hurried

discussion always involves the danger of hurried self-justification and defence. Rather, it would mean to be attentive, to listen. To make an attempt to comprehend the other. From another level of strained relations in academic routine, namely the ones between humane, cultural, and social scientists on the one hand and natural scientists on the other hand, I know that it is wise to be cautious with arguments, and that listening and sympathetic understanding can lead to more calm in the interaction. More calm, that means above all, to be less busy with imputing things to the person opposite, and with interpreting the other side back and forth. And this is finally the precondition of any productive scientific communication and potential co-operation. In other words, it is the phases of listening that finally enable a productive scientific discussion.

I think that such an uncommon form of scientific communication - which does not, after all, rule out the other, usual form, but on the contrary, makes it even more feasible - would meet with good conditions particularly at Bansko: the intenseness of the contacts, which in the meantime have often turned into friendships, would be an excellent basis for it. As for the structure of the yearly seminar, things have begun to change already, in that we have begun to find something like an equal dialogue by giving the structures a more equal shape.

I finally come to a few additional perspectives or necessities of an equal dialogue, reaching beyond immediate reflection within a limited scope. We now try at Bansko to reach an equilibrium of papers presented by Austrian and Bulgarian participants, by university teachers and students, and more than ever the entire programme of the seminar is managed in Austro-Bulgarian co-operation. This sounds so banal, almost cynical, and yet it is part of a conscious learning process on both sides, in the course of which the Austrians gradually slip off their former role of technical advisers, and the positions and results of the Bulgarian colleagues win more recognition, which is always a gain for the Austrians as well. Because only this way can the immense potentials of many Bulgarian colleagues come to the fore. They can show particularly at Bansko, because here, German and Bulgarian are languages on equal terms, everything being translated from one language into the other and vice versa. In this respect, at Bansko the language hierarchy of academic routine does not take effect, and those who have but little command of western languages (while speaking, for instance, excellent Russian) can make themselves heard with all their scientific competence.

It ought to be a task for all us Austrians to have Bulgarian ethnological or historical-anthropological studies translated into German and published here, and to a larger extent than hitherto. Of course this will not change in principle the language hierarchy of academic practice. But it would integrate Bulgarian colleagues into the German-language scientific discourse. In the meantime there are a couple of periodicals coming out in English, in which also Bulgarians publish, as far as I am informed they all have the Balkans or South-Eastern Europe and the like in their titles. And however important this is - for South-Eastern Europeans to finally participate in the definition of what is the "Balkans" or "South-Eastern Europe" -, it would be as important to integrate Bulgarian colleagues into a context of scientific communication in which not only aspects of the Balkans are discussed. Austrian scientists would not like to only publish under the label of "Ethnologia Austriaca" either. Especially in discourses on theories, methods, and topics, which is, discourses not immediately relating to a regional context, Bulgarian researches are likewise relevant. Only an integration of Bulgarian colleagues into such contexts of discussion as reach beyond a limited geographic area would be what we might call an equal dialogue. And full equality, particularly in an ethnological, anthropological, or historical-anthropological context, cannot be reached until - and here I am once more returning to regional aspects - not only Austrians or other Central and Western Europeans would go to Bulgaria for field research, but also Bulgarians would do field research for instance in an Austrian village or municipal quarter. Which would for once make us the object of the others. And in some way or other, it should be feasible to organise and finance such a thing from our funds, meagre though they may be.

Translated from German by Gudrun Hopf