The week-long celebration of the centenary of the UAI, in Paris November 22-30 2019, encompasses the activities of a representative range of the research projects associated with it, and also – especially on this day of plenary talks – takes note of its very significant role in promoting international understanding after World War I.

A further aim is to hear from scholars from a representative range of its global membership what they are thinking about the present status and future role of the humanities and social sciences. Several of the speakers have no direct tie to UAI projects or to its board, but nonetheless wish to honor its goals and achievements, and offer suggestions for the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13h30</td>
<td><strong>Accueil et mot de bienvenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didier Viviers, secrétaire général de l’UAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13h45</td>
<td><strong>Presidential Address: Excellence through collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel N.C. Lieu, président de l’UAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h15</td>
<td><strong>L’Union Académique Internationale, un laboratoire de la diplomatie scientifique de l’entre-deux-guerres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth Bertrams, professeur à l’Université libre de Bruxelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h45</td>
<td><strong>Strengthening the bonds: the role of digital humanities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte Roueché, professeur émérite, Digital Hellenic Studies, King’s College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h15</td>
<td><strong>Pause café</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h45</td>
<td><strong>d’où venons-nous / Que sommes-nous / Où allons-nous</strong>: Intellectual Cooperation and Disciplinary Diversity in a Changing World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table ronde présidée par Madeline Caviness, avec Pornsan Watanangura, Rachida Chapoutot-Remadi, Luiz Oosterbeek, et Adama Samassekou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17h00</td>
<td><strong>Archaeology in the time of the new challenges: perspectives and risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikolai Makarov, Académie des Sciences de Russie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17h30</td>
<td><strong>Closing keynote address – Repenser l’idée des « Œuvres complètes » à l’âge numérique : l’exemple de Voltaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Cronk, directeur de la Voltaire Foundation, professeur de Littérature française, Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h00</td>
<td><strong>Announcement of the winners of the Early Career Researcher Awards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel N.C. Lieu, président de l’UAI, et Didier Viviers, secrétaire général de l’UAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h15</td>
<td><strong>Réception dans le foyer de l’auditorium</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presidential Address: Excellence through collaboration

The Presidential Address examines the strength of Classical scholarship as a shared legacy among the delegates of the founding member academies to the Union Académique Internationale and charts the way in which this legacy influenced the kind of research projects the UAI sponsored during the first century of its existence. The address looks at the achievements of the UAI’s sponsorship system for collaborative projects in the world of learning and also calls for a critical examination of its relevance of this legacy for international scholarship a new century.

KENNETH BERTRAMS (Professeur à l’Université libre de Bruxelles)

L’Union Académique Internationale, un laboratoire de la diplomatie scientifique de l’entre-deux-guerres

La création de l’UAI en 1919 est marquée par une triple polarité qui est directement façonnée par le contexte de l’immédiat après-guerre. Un premier jeu de tensions oppose l’axe politique à l’axe scientifique, qui sont tous deux pôles d’envergure générale qui permettent de repérer les balises fondamentales qui vont contribuer à déterminer le fonctionnement de l’UAI et de ses activités durant ses deux premières décennies d’existence. Un second champ de polarité, qui se détache du premier couple tout en le prolongeant, concerne la dynamique nationalisme-internationalisme. Enfin, il ne faut pas perdre de vue que le projet porté par l’UAI s’inscrit dans une dialectique qui traverse de nombreuses organisations scientifiques de prétention internationale et qui se caractérise par la conjonction d’enjeux de coopération et de compétition. Loin de s’opposer, ces trois couples de tensions forment un champ à la fois structurant mais également très instable. En situant la genèse de l’UAI dans ce contexte mouvant – essentiellement politique –, on parvient à saisir les initiatives prises par les fondateurs, ainsi que les premières actions de cette association, par le prisme de la diplomatie scientifique. L’objectif de cette communication consiste précisément à arrimer l’histoire particulière de la fondation de l’UAI dans une réflexion de portée plus générale sur les enjeux proprement politiques de la coopération scientifique internationale et sur l’usage de canaux diplomatiques pour y parvenir.

CHARLOTTE ROUECHÉ (Professor Emerita of Digital Hellenic Studies, King’s College London)

Strengthening the bonds: the role of digital humanities

100 years ago the Paris Peace Conference brought together diplomats, politicians and intellectuals from all over the world to try to deal with the hideous damage of the First World War. The delegates spent many months in Paris, dealing with a range of concerns, and the
resultant interactions produced various social initiatives, to run in parallel with the political decisions. One of the most enduring of these was the Union Académique Internationale, brought to birth by a group of scholars who wished to rebuild the scholarly community. Then as now they were hosted by the French scholarly community; they met at the Bibliothèque Nationale from 15-18 October 1919, and my grandfather, William Buckler, was one of the delegates representing the learned Societies of the U.S.A.!

Since then the Union has worked quietly and patiently to maintain and develop relationships between academies in the humanities and social sciences, through a century marked by further wars, both hot and cold. The current situation is less openly belligerent, but it is quite clear that we cannot be complacent and that this is a very good moment for the Union to be renewing its mission. The academic world is infinitely more complex; research activity has increased enormously and the volume of data has overwhelmed conventional media. Our first use of digital tools was simply to help us to cope with that volume, firstly to store materials and then to analyse them. Since the 1990s, however, we have come to use such tools not only for the internal analysis of data, but also, increasingly, to communicate both findings and the data themselves more widely than ever before. These new capacities are unsettling; the role of academic publishers in disseminating information, an industry which grew so dramatically during the twentieth century, is now being thrown into question, and debates over copyright are increasingly heated. Defining the ‘ownership’ of research data is a challenge for the humanities as well as for the hard sciences. There is a real need for an international forum for such discussions. We need to establish new norms for the open exchange of information about the cultures and societies which we study, since our commitment, in the humanities, is surely to increase understanding of all those cultures and societies. While research in the hard sciences will always tend to pursue particular questions, Academies in the humanities should undertake to provide the basic elements of knowledge, to be enriched by shared endeavour. The task of the UAI is more important than ever!

Round table discussion chaired by MADELINE CAVINESS, with PORNSAN WATANANGURA, LUIZ OOSTERBEEK, and ADAMA SAMASSEKOU


MADELINE H. CAVINESS

Introduction to the round-table « D’où Venons Nous / Que Sommes Nous / Où Allons Nous »: Intellectual Cooperation and Disciplinary Diversity in a Changing World”.

The title for this bi-lingual discussion is taken from the inscription that is integral to a large oil painting by Paul Gauguin that hangs in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston USA. If we take the “nous” to be the community of scholars in the humanities and social sciences who participate in the work of the UAI, the triple interrogation defines the themes and questions posed here today, and in the publications, conferences and events that make up the Centenary celebration of the Union Académique Internationale.
• D’ou venons nous? Archival and historical research has revealed much about the very distinguished 100-year history of the UAI.
• Où allons nous? And a centenary is a time to look forward, to reassess goals and estimate needs.
• But Que sommes nous? (what are we, not who are we) is a deeper question. Are the disciplinary definitions that prevailed into the second half of the twentieth century still relevant to the enrichment of human knowledge? What are our intellectual practices? Are they effective in upholding a just society? And the pursuit of peace? Are we continuing to foster the kinds of mutual respect and understanding that the founders hoped for, despite new shocks from neo-liberalism and racism?

We are lucky to have three eminent thinkers, speaking from a wide range of geographical and disciplinary perspectives, who have long reflected on these, and other broad issues. I am very sorry to say that a fourth speaker, Professor Emeritus Rachida Chapoutot-Remadi of the Tunisian Academy may not be able to join us because of health issues.

Before I turn over the podium to the speakers, I want to say something else about Gauguin’s painting, because it also has the capacity to speak in a more radical way. Born in France in 1848 of a family with connections in Peru, Gauguin spent many years outside the country. His family was able to return to France in 1870, and he worked with impressionists such as Camille Pissaro before forming his own style of painting. But he left again for good in 1891; commissioned by the French government to report on Pacific island cultures and beliefs, he lived first in Tahiti, and finally on Hiva Oa in the Marshall Islands, where he intended this as his last painting. Many art historians now regard his representations of Indonesian people, especially of female nudity, as a salient form of colonial exploitation. He even went so far as to create sculpted idols that these people supposedly worshipped. I happen to agree with those criticisms, yet I value his admission that he felt liberated by being uprooted from his European heritage – unsure of what he was. And if we hear the resonance in the French term: “déraciné” even his racial identity was in question. Whatever his personal experience in 1895, at our moment in time and place, the painting and its title seem to offer possibilities for a post-Eurocentric, post-racial world.

It is notable that each of the participants in this round table emphasizes the role of education in confronting current crises in knowledge communities. Our first speaker, Pornsan Watanangura, begins by alluding to different kinds of hybridism in the material culture of her homeland; her first example, the Grand Palace in Bangkok, is approximately contemporary with Gauguin’s canvas. Yet “western” culture was also enriched by exposure to Thai theater. And she goes on to make a very strong argument for the role of literary hermeneutics in easing the tensions and conflicts between discourses, and in enabling a way forward for different models of intellectual collaboration. Luiz Oosterbeek, an anthropologist by formation, speaks of the history and present state of the humanities and social sciences from his several years in the corridors of UNESCO, and now as Secretary General of one of its orphaned n.g.o’s, the International Council of Philosophy and Human Sciences. He traces the convoluted bi-furcations of the humanities and social sciences, concluding that they none the less belong to the same knowledge network, and can be empowered to deal with current crises. Adama Samassekou, renowned linguist and educationalist from Mali, will have the last word before I ask the speakers to respond to each other if they wish, and then open the floor to questions if there is still time. He reminds us how far we still have to go in opening our Eurocentric formulations of history and culture to more profoundly humanistic models that encompass African experiences and needs, and holds out hope for this eventual outcome; I would add that the World Humanities Conference that he organized in Liège in 2017 stands out as a pilot project toward this goal.
Intellectual Cooperation Global – A Paradox

The Royal Palace Chakri Mahaprasat functions as audience for state visits with its building in European style and traditional Thai roof as always seen at buddhist temples, is mostly considered as symbolic and categorical combination between European and Thai architecture: The palace was built in Bangkok Period the time of King Rama V. (King Chulalongkorn, reign 1868-1910) of the Chakri Dynasty. This intellectual exchange through art and architecture marks a transitional period from the ‘old’ world to the ‘modern’ world in Siam at the beginning of the European colonial politics in the 19th century.

The process of intellectual exchange and learning from the Europeans as a paradigm of cultural transition encompasses various examples from Thai history and was remarkably evident in the reign of King Chulalongkorn. The modernization of Siam according to European model including the modern educational reform was carried out intensively after His Majesty’s first visit to Europe in 1897. Concentrating on learning European languages, English in the first place, as a “bridge” to transfer European science and technology to Siam, led to the idea of acquiring foreign languages as “instant knowledge” by importing concepts, methodologies from the western world without careful consideration of the heterogeneity of various factors.

In 1976, a Germanist in Hongkong had succeeded to motivate a Thai director to bring Brechts The Exception and the Rule (Die Ausnahme und die Regel) on stage in Bangkok. The play was directed in the style of Thai traditional theatre. Although the director followed Brechts instructions of the Epic theatre, and in spite of the conciliatory outcome of the play, the Thai version departed a great deal from Brecht’s Dramaturgy. The play was highly successful with its nationwide signal effect for the synchrony citizens’ movement which prevail upon a German director, Jürgen Flimm, to do a deep sign, that the future of Brecht is outside Germany. This intellectual incident illustrated the extend of socialist-communist idea worldwide and highlighted.

The cooperation between persons, nations or between two or multi-cultures confront naturally diversity of external as well as internal factors. Each one is principally captured in his cultural, social and political background, in his previous experiences, also prejudice, or, with terminology of Heidegger, in his “Faktizität”. And we cannot deny that the intellectual cooperation often proves to be a confrontation between different sciences and different methodologies as examples from Thai history. Another prime example was the debates between Humanities or liberal Arts and science, between “Literaturwissenschaft” and “Naturwissenschaft” in the movement of Positivism in the Early Modern Age in Europe.

Therefore, here at the boarder of diversity, we can generalize four observations:

1. The necessary of intellectual cooperation or an interdisciplinary research including the restructure of education system requires an overview of the whole phenomena. In spite of the necessity of the scientific methods which concentrate rather on small issues creating a specialist or “Fachmann”, in order to dispose problems, we principally need the methodology of literature, the hermeneutics, which offers possibility to be able to observe things in an overview.

2. Steven Muller, a former President of John Hopkins University once made a suggestion
to recognize and promote a new connection between humanities and technic or science, whereas one single discipline cannot be in charge of. An interdisciplinary research project demands a working team comprises of scholars or students from different subjects. This ingredient does not aim to achieve a convergence of different sciences. Much more fertile is to learn from different perspectives in their advantage and disadvantage. Also, to realize that disciplines with mature systematic and long tested regulations principally have origins in observation and practical needs. The collision of such different perspectives could lead to a decision to select a discipline which is the most competent in solving which problems. At the end, it is the question of priority and evaluation.

3. There is a trend in Thailand as national policy that research projects on practical needs of the country should take precedence over other research. The government insists upon training students for specific profession, whereas curriculum of all Thai universities aim to train students to be able to learn, analyze and think critically. At present, language courses for special purposes such as “English for hotels” are very popular among Thai students, while in other country, such as in Germany, it is widely known that the German industry long since prefers graduates with ability to think critically and act decently.

4. The fact that the way of life nowadays has been changed and is much influenced from electronic Information technics brings conflicts between self-realization and a share of responsibility in the pluralistic society. A struggle between humans and machines, between copy and original in everyday life, are sometimes, not recognized. But we realize, how happy one can be to listen to Beethoven’s Ode of Joy playing on electron.

It is an art and our duty, to balance those contradiction and paradox in the middle of the force of the change of life in this changing world.

---

LUIZ OOSTERBEEK (secrétaire général du CIPSH)

**Current state and future of scholarship in the humanities: threats and opportunities**

If we are to understand scholarship as emerging from a sociocultural wider approach to knowledge as a means to overcome needs, itself being a tool and not the aim, we should recognize that we experience, today, the coexistence of three main scholarly traditions.

The first, and older, is the focus on transformative enlightened fields of knowledge, through critical reasoning: this is the domain of reason, of comparison, of strategic reasoning, of rhetoric and of time. It encompasses what is known by “the humanities”, including all the philosophical chapters of other disciplines, such as the principles of Law, the foundations of logics or the ethics in science.

The second is as old as the former, but became autonomous only from the renaissance, and focused on analytical reasoning, decomposing fields of research into problems, through the exercise of decontextualization and abstraction: this is the domain of problem-solving oriented studies, primarily grounded in experimentation and statistical validation. It includes what has been called “sciences”, including all the quantitative systematic treatment of
data in the field of the humanities, such as in demography, structural analysis or big data comparative studies.

These two main traditions are not contradictory: they are actually the two sides of a same, humanistic, approach to knowledge, differing not as much in their aims or object, but in their methods. Actually, the university education until the second world war was largely transversal to these two traditions, which allowed for the development of robust epistemologica frameworks which would not be limited to either of them.

A third tradition emerges in the last half century and corresponds to the growing autonomy of the technology fields. This generated a sort of reification of technology, which tends to undermine the humanistic traditions, both humanities and sciences, to the benefit of a business-oriented research: this is the domain of so-called “STEM” (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics), which is no longer focused on dilemmas or problems, but on market, competition and growth. Because it is market oriented, it is no longer anchored on needs (even if it may contribute for them) or values (even when it designs ethical concerns), and it generates growing inequality (in the access to knowledge but also to knowledge products). However, it undoubtedly has a stronger economic impact, thus contributing for societies’ expectations. Market oriented approaches were also relevant in past societies, but new information technologies created the possibility to educate, for the first time at a large scale, highly skilled workers and consumers.

Under this framework, in which scholarship in the humanities and even in sciences becomes residual, the immediate consequences are not so much in the scholarship possibilities but on the social dissemination of its contributions and, thus, its transformative capacity to build citizenship within democratic societies. Whereas humanities are driven by contradiction and reflection, and sciences are animated by social problems and solutions, technologies per se promote ranking and acritical consumption within growingly disaggregated and non-democratic societies.

There is a need to overcome the analytical disciplinary dispersal through a new integrative, robust, synthetic epistemological framework: humanities are not all studies on humans, but they also do not exclude non-human features – humanities are a humanistic approach to human interactions, understood through complex and deep space and time lenses.

Under this understanding, so-called social sciences are to be perceived as part of the humanities, in the sense they too are framed within such time-space lenses. However, once they depart from these to focus on short-term problems, they fall into the second scholarly tradition, of science, and then humanities should not consider any preference in the articulation between humanities and social sciences when compared to natural sciences or mathematics. This justifies, in a sense, the existence of two main knowledge networks: CIPSH for the humanities (under the definition above) and ISC for the sciences. There is no real need for a scholarly network for the third tradition, since this one is not driven primarily by cooperation but by the criterion of ranking, competition and business.

The core challenge is to understand the integrative dimension of the humanities, precisely due to their capacity to operate through different time and space scales, and also through multivariate processes.

There are several constraints to meet the above-mentioned needs and challenge. These include economic and political constraints (e.g. the financial inflationary model and the current economic depression, the crisis of established regimes, the geostrategic disruptions and the rise of authoritarianism and national prejudice, or the growing awareness of the relevance of the humanities and the need for a converging strategy), as well as cultural constraints (e.g. issues of identity and the contradictory implications of cultural heritage; relations between knowledge and belief systems, gender divides, late incorporation of young
scholars, early exclusion of senior researchers, alienation fostering the crisis of education, etc.) and institutional constraints (concerning competition among disciplines and between education and research, the generation renewal of difficulties and the crisis of academies, universities, research centers and applied research hubs).

Three avenues are at the core of the opportunities for a new path of the Humanities. First, their role in raising social awareness of complexity and dilemmas, equipping citizens to face them and make reasoned choices with a foresight capacity. Secondly the preparation of global and more enlightened leaderships, capable of bringing a humanities clear contribution to societal needs (health, mobility, territories, etc.). And, thirdly, to help generating a feasible global convergent agenda, for which ongoing projects of CIPSH (World Humanities Report, Global History of Humanity, CIPSH chairs, etc.) and those of its member organizations are already relevant contributions.

ADAMA SAMASSEKOU (ancien président du CIPSH, président de la Conférence Mondiale des Humanités)

Forum des Humanités Africaines : L’Afrique se raconte aux autres et à elle même

Le 10 avril 2019, pour la première fois dans l’histoire de l’humanité, des astronomes ont réussi à photographier un trou noir. Parmi les objets les plus fascinants de l’astrophysique, le trou noir est une matérialisation, si l’on peut le dire ainsi, de la théorie de la relativité énoncée par Albert Einstein depuis 1915. La presse a vite fait de qualifier la prouesse de « résultat d’une coopération de scientifiques du monde entier ». A y regarder de près, cette coopération bien que qualifiée d’internationale n’intégrait pas forcément l’Afrique et d’autres zones de notre monde.

Cette situation, transposée aux Sciences Humaines et Sociales, est une parfaite illustration de l’européo-occidentalo-centrisme que nous définissons comme une approche maintenant l’Europe et l’Occident au cœur des échanges scientifiques, au détriment des autres continents et partant, des autres cultures du monde, ainsi reléguées à la périphérie de la dynamique de réflexion et de production intellectuelles. Cet européo-occidentalo-centrisme se manifeste dans plusieurs domaines (la culture, les langues, l’éducation, la religion, le modèle politique et administratif, la recherche etc.) et tend à uniformiser les zones du monde ayant connu le joug de la colonisation sur la base du modèle de développement et de pensée de la civilisation « salvatrice » occidentalo-centrée.

Ce modèle de développement néolibéral, fondé sur ce que nous appelons la culture de « l’avoir », du profit, a montré ses limites et la crise actuelle consacre sa faillite. Les dernières décennies du XXème siècle furent marquées par la conviction que le développement économique, selon le système capitaliste, était le premier impératif des sociétés modernes. De ce fait, le Nord a connu un développement exponentiel de l’industrie, de la science, des technologies mais n’a pu éviter qu’une crise financière et économique bouleverse le monde, conduisant à une véritable crise sociéale. En effet, nous assistons sans doute à la faillite du modèle dominant néolibéral et occidentalo-centrique de développement, entraînant une véritable perte de sens, renforcée par la tendance à l’uniformisation des cultures du monde induite par une mondialisation accélérée des marchés, conduisant à une véritable déshumanisation des relations entre les individus, les peuples, les Etats.
Face à cette donne, il est impératif que la communauté des chercheurs investisse davantage l’humain et le social afin de contribuer à l’intelligibilité des multiples perspectives sociales, culturelles, humaines tout simplement, qui structurent et façonnent le monde, en lieu et place d’un universalisme abstrait et superficiel. Les savants, les chercheurs, les femmes et hommes de science ont aujourd’hui obligation d’être aussi des éducateurs engagés, qui devraient aider l’humanité à retrouver du sens !

Pour y arriver, nous préconisons la réhabilitation et la refondation des sciences humaines, pour un changement de paradigme permettant de réinventer un monde fondé sur le respect de sa riche diversité culturelle et linguistique et qui nous permettra de substituer aux relations conflictuelles de compétition une véritable solidarité universelle, seule susceptible d’aider à relever les défis de notre planète en transition.

C’est dans ce cadre qu’au sortir de la Conférence Africaine des Humanités (CAH) de juin-juillet 2017, en prélude à la Conférence Mondiale des Humanités (CMH), qui s’est tenue à Liège du 6 au 12 août 2017, il a été fortement recommandé l’organisation d’un Forum des Humanités Africaines (FHA).

Le Forum des Humanités Africaines (FHA) a pour objectif de refonder les humanités en Afrique, dans la Diaspora et partout dans le monde, dans la perspective de développer et de promouvoir les humanités africaines, afin de contribuer au mieux à la construction de « l’Afrique que nous voulons » : une Afrique véritablement intégrée, dont les humanités seront le socle de la prospérité et de l’unité, et l’humanitude le moteur des interactions avec le monde globalisé. Dans cette perspective, le FHA s’engagera résolument dans un processus de déconstruction des concepts coloniaux, en valorisant les langues et cultures africaines : il n’y a pas d’humanités africaines sans langues africaines !

Le concept de forum a été choisi pour marquer la volonté d’impliquer toutes les sensibilités du Continent et de la Diaspora dans le processus de construction et de développement des humanités africaines. Il est le lieu approprié pour adopter un changement d’attitude à l’égard des savoirs endogènes africains, en proposant des ponts entre professionnels des humanités disciplinaires, praticiens des savoirs endogènes, organisations politiques, sociales, et acteurs socioculturels référents. En effet, l’enjeu du forum et de la revalorisation des humanités est également de sortir les acquis de la production des connaissances des enclosures universitaires et d’en faire la terre fertile des futurs africains.

Dans un contexte de nouvelle mondialisation, l’impératif d’invention d’un vivre ensemble plus convivial, à partir d’acceptions plus larges que celles relevant d’un utilitarisme économique ou d’une conception exclusivement individualiste, anthropocentrique, marchande des relations des humains vis-à-vis de leur écosystème, exige notre plus grande attention.

Notre rêve, qui rejoint sans doute les objectifs de l’UAI, est d’avoir un monde où les savants et académiciens auront pris conscience de leur rôle éminemment important d’éducateurs de la société et construiront des passerelles entre leurs espaces sécurisés de recherche et les multiples lieux d’exploitation des résultats de leurs travaux.

Notre rêve est d’avoir un monde où la reconnaissance de la diversité culturelle et linguistique fécondante permettra le développement d’humanités ouvertes susceptibles de garantir des relations pacifiques entre les peuples du monde, de développer un esprit de partenariat véritable et, à terme, de créer les conditions de l’émergence d’une gouvernance partenariale mondiale.

Notre rêve, enfin, est d’avoir un Forum des Humanités Africaines (FHA), futur temple des savoirs endogènes africains et future matrice des productions philosophiques, linguistiques, littéraires, historiques, anthropologiques, artistiques… qui irrigueront nos systèmes éducatifs et capcariteront notre jeunesse, pour lui permettre d’être à la fois profondément ancrée dans ses valeurs sociétales, pétée des savoir-faire populaires et capable de maitriser la science et les technologies les plus modernes, au service du développement du Continent.
Among the contemporary fields in humanities, as well as in the public eye, a special place belongs to archaeology. It has preserved the charm of a secret art, which searches for and reveals the tangible traces of the past, and provides a living contact with bygone eras by means of their material remains. For those working at a dig, excavation provides personal experience of getting exposed to the past. On the other hand, in the latter half of the 20th century, archaeology has consolidated its position as a fundamental field responsible for preserving a large part of world cultural heritage. It has been established as a science which brings together the history of mankind from the rise of the genus Homo to the start of the Middle Ages — the progress of this history, its global events and early transformations. Archaeology assumed responsibility for providing a complete and authentic picture of ancient and medieval history. The latter half of the past century was the time when archaeology took a colossal stride across the world. Excavations have turned more expansive, a treasure trove of new materials was accumulated and studied, new methods of analyzing and dating ancient finds were developed, and previously unknown periods of mankind's early history discovered. At the same time, came new rules of preserving archaeological heritage — the rules which limited contemporary territorial development and economic activity in historical landscapes, so that physical destruction of monuments of antiquity should be at all costs avoided, or the monument meticulously documented in the course of a “rescue dig”. These limitations rest on the firm conviction that archaeological discoveries is the only source of new information about the past which cannot be in any way sacrificed for the sake of transient economic convenience. The scholarly ideas formulated by academic archaeology have thus proved a big influence on both cultural policies and the current practices of territorial development and improvement.

The new century is gradually modifying the role of archaeology in the academic world and the society at large, changing the expectations, the content and the structural setup of archaeological studies. Ostentatious display of respect for its achievements now goes hand-in-hand with calls to reassess its basic assumptions. Equally challenged are the practical and the intellectual aspects of archaeological work.

It is evident that the contemporary society has a higher demand for authoritative knowledge of the past obtained by means of archaeology, and for preserving its authentic material heritage even under the ongoing technological transformation of the historical environment. However, the declared interests of contemporary economy increasingly push towards a revision of the earlier commitments. Practices of preserving antiquities and rules of fieldwork are often seen as too rigid, not fitting the new realities and excessive for the task of historical and cultural reconstructions based on the already existing archaeological data. The achievements of academic archaeology in the 20th century have provide a strong impetus for the rise of preserving and managing archaeological heritage as a separate field — a field which now distances itself from the academic platform, deprioritizes research goals and often imposes its own ideas on how to preserve and present the past on the society. These ideas and approaches are not based on the conceptual foundations of academic archaeology. While information technologies have made the outcomes of archaeological studies and the retrieved artifacts more open to the general public, they have also facilitated illegal digs and reinvigorated the black market of antiquities. Symbolic value of these
artifacts, originally set forth and explained by academic archaeology, now makes this heritage increasingly vulnerable in the course of «memory wars» and military conflicts.

Latest achievements in studying the past have been largely brought about by the joint effort of archaeology and natural science, including the improved radiocarbon dating and isotope analysis, as well as advances in palaeogenetics. Interdisciplinary studies have significantly expanded the horizons of historical studies, and our knowledge of dynamics of global transformations during the ancient and medieval eras. It is within this sphere that hopes for future «breakthroughs» lie. However, there are also a number of hazards associated with interdisciplinary work. Archaeology does not have its own methods of verifying data obtained by scientific studies and thus can prove over-credulous about them. The notion of limitless powers of natural science is still more dangerous in that it makes archaeologists little inclined to reassess their own research methodologies and make full use of their field’s capabilities.

In the 21st century, there will be no new life for archaeology if it does not realize its identity as one of the humanities. Archaeology should address its original roots as a field which discovers previously unknown cultures and artistic treasures of the past, transplanting them into the contemporary cultural environment, and following the material traces of key historical events we know about from written sources. This traditional mission, so evident at archaeology’s birth in the 18th century, is as urgent as ever, albeit takes new forms. The way post-processual school in archaeology addresses ancient monuments as symbols, “texts”, self-sufficient objects, products of artistic self-expression – and even shockingly compares them to objects of contemporary art – reflects a lot more that postmodern exercises in art. Beyond it, we see a more profound demand to have the humanitarian aspect in archaeology restored. It is accompanied by parting ways with over-sophisticated algorithms of analyzing archaeological materials – a methodology which impedes, rather than facilitates, our understanding of these materials. It is evident that such revitalization of archaeology implies, among other things, structuring of the primary data underpinning every attempt at historical reconstruction, overcoming fragmentation of our picture of the past (while the volume of empirical data keeps soaring), and the search for a simple and laconic language, capable of explaining the gist of new findings in archaeology to other humanities.

The cutting-edge experience of studying and preserving the archaeological heritage of Northern Eurasia is a crucial factor in understanding the current state of affairs in the theory and practice of archaeology. An in-depth look at some contemporary field discoveries and large-scale projects of protecting heritage in redeveloped areas provides a number of examples which, in their turn, reveal the complexity of current archaeological work, as well as its successes and failures.

—

NICHOLAS CRONK (Director of the Voltaire Foundation, Professor of French Literature, Oxford University)

Closing keynote address - Repenser l’idée des ‘Œuvres complètes’ à l’âge numérique : l’exemple de Voltaire

A l’occasion de la célébration du centenaire de l’Union Académique Internationale qui nous rassemble, le nom de Voltaire s’impose. Avant même de devenir membre de l’Aca-
démie française, l’auteur avait été élu fellow de la Royal Society à Londres, et il était éga-
lement membre de plusieurs académies italiennes. L’appui des académies française, an-
glaise et italiennes fut de la plus grande importance pour la carrière de Voltaire: on pourrait
dire sans exagération que Voltaire constituait, à lui tout seul, une union académique inter-
nationale.

Voltaire n’est pas simplement un grand auteur. Les valeurs qu’il représente, et en premier
lieu la liberté d’expression et la tolérance religieuse, sont au cœur de notre culture euro-
péenne. C’est pourquoi il est essentiel d’avoir accès à l’ensemble de son œuvre, et pas
seulement aux quelques contes qui font sa notoriété, si remarquables soient-ils. A Oxford, la
Voltaire Foundation publie la toute première édition scientifique de la totalité de ses écrits,
en français bien sûr. Cette édition définitive des Œuvres complètes de Voltaire comptera
quelque 200 volumes et sera achevée en 2020.

Mais n’oublions pas que la notion des opera omnia, qui nous est si familière aujourd’hui,
n’est pas toujours allée de soi. Au XVIIIe siècle, les auteurs choisissaient les œuvres qu’ils sou-
haitaient faire passer à la postérité. Et en construisant de son vivant différentes éditions dites
« complètes » de ses œuvres, Voltaire pensait avant tout à sa place dans la république des
lettres de l’époque; il réunit donc les grands textes, les genres nobles, et laissa de côté une
bonne partie des écrits soi-disant « mineurs », comme la poésie de circonstance ou les ar-
ticles de journaux. Tout changea après sa mort. Au XIXe siècle, les éditeurs préférèrent offrir
au public des éditions plus étoffées, et aujourd’hui encore le corpus continue de s’amplifier
au fur et à mesure de nos découvertes d’éditions et de manuscrits jusqu’ici inconnus. Les
œuvres de Voltaire sont donc vouées à l’incomplétude, mais il y a pour cela des raisons qui
relèvent aussi des singularités de l’écriture voltairienne.

En effet, Voltaire cultive une écriture en mouvement, et nombreux sont ses textes qui
évoluent et changent de titre au cours des années. Cette écriture toujours mouvante que
pratique Voltaire exploite l’autocitation, et ainsi les frontières entre œuvres distinctes sont-
telles loin d’être étanches. Il faut également tenir compte de la façon dont le philosophe
se construit comme auteur: Voltaire (dont le vrai nom est François Arouet) ne signe pas la
plupart de ses publications, et il est passé maître dans l’art de manipuler les pseudonymes,
dont certains sont plus transparents que d’autres. Réunir tous les écrits de François Arouet
relève donc du défi...

La prochaine étape – une fois achevée l’édition papier des Œuvres complètes publiée
par nos soins – consiste bien évidemment à réfléchir aux contours de l’édition numérique
qui suivra, et dans ce contexte il est essentiel de faire la distinction entre édition numérisée
(ou scannée) et édition numérique. La révolution que nous vivons actuellement avec l’avè-
nement du livre numérique constitue le bouleversement le plus radical de nos pratiques de
lecture depuis que le codex remplaça le rouleau à partir du IVe siècle. Notre culture huma-
niste est fondée sur le livre en tant qu’objet culturel et matériel, or nous voici soudain obligés
de repenser la notion même de livre. D’où ma question: dans quelle mesure le concept de
œuvres complètes » doit-il être repensé à l’ère numérique? Comme imaginer autrement
les œuvres complètes de Voltaire dans une perspective digitale?

Certsains avantages de l’édition numérique apparaissent d’emblée évidents, notam-
ment en termes d’accessibilité et de mises à jour régulières. Reste la question fondamen-
tale, qui est celle du lectorat. Tout livre imprimé détermine à l’avance, par son format et
par son prix, le lectorat ciblé; avec une édition numérique, en revanche, nous sommes à
même d’imaginer des lectorats différents, et même d’adapter le contenu de l’édition selon
les goûts et les besoins de chacun. Les 200 livres imprimés qui constituent les Œuvres com-
plètes de Voltaire sont certes un magnifique monument éditorial, mais l’édition numérique
qui suivra nous offrira la possibilité d’ouvrir les portes à un Voltaire véritablement global, pro-
jet inconcevable dans le monde de l’édition imprimée. C’est donc un nouveau champ de recherches qui s’ouvre devant nous, et tous les participants auront besoin des académies ici présentes pour les accompagner dans leurs travaux.

L’édition des Œuvres complètes de Voltaire fut un chantier de longue haleine, appuyé par plusieurs académies: l’Académie française, l’Académie royale de Belgique, la British Academy, et bien sûr l’Union académique internationale. La priorité pour nous tous est maintenant de réfléchir aux meilleurs moyens de réaliser un Voltaire numérique, une édition digitale innovante qui sera à la hauteur de ce que nous avons déjà accompli sur papier. Dans une lettre qu’il adresse en 1772 à Duvernet, son futur biographe, Voltaire emploie une jolie formule: « M’imprime qui veut, et me lit qui peut ». C’est un manifeste pour la diffusion des Lumières: le philosophe Voltaire cherche à libérer l’accès à ses écrits. Le geste est très moderne; et la révolution numérique que nous vivons actuellement va nous permettre, enfin, de réaliser ce rêve voltairien.

—

Announcement of the winners of the Early Career Researcher Awards

KWANG SOO LIM PRIZE : Ronika Power (Macquarie University, Australia)

Project : The Sentinels of Ħal Saflieni, Malta: Science Facts versus Science Fiction

The UNESCO World Heritage site of the Ħal Saflieni Hypogeum is the jewel in the crown of Maltese archaeology and is considered to be one of the most significant and valuable sites of human prehistory. It is an elaborate, three-level, multi-roomed, interconnected, labyrinthine Neolithic (~4,000–2,500 BC) mortuary complex, extending almost 11 metres below the surface and estimated to have once held the remains of approximately 7,000 people. The site also contains the oldest and only prehistoric paintings preserved on the Maltese islands, in the form of intricate red ochre spirals and honeycomb cells, as well as carefully-executed geometric patterns resembling black-and-white chequered squares. Despite the lauding of Ħal Saflieni’s innovations in technology, art and architecture, an enormous component of the site’s story is shrouded in silence, mystery and mythology. At its heart, Ħal Saflieni is a monument of its people, yet the people of Ħal Saflieni are absent from archaeological narratives. We know almost nothing about the few surviving human remains from Ħal Saflieni: a small assemblage of crania and other skeletal elements, representing less than 20 individuals out of the original thousands of interments. This project will work in close collaboration with local Maltese heritage agencies – namely, Heritage Malta and the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage – to carry out the first-ever interdisciplinary analyses of the remains and afford these globally significant individuals the detailed attention they deserve. By combining traditional archaeological, historical and archival research with cutting-edge scientific analyses, this project will investigate all aspects of the lived experiences of these silent sentinels of Ħal Saflieni, including their health, disease, lifestyle, diet and ancestry profiles. Finally, the world will be introduced to the inhabitants of the prehistoric island of Malta, and through them, the people that created this globally unique monument.

—
BREPOLS PRIZE: Ioannis Chalozonitis (F.R.S-FNRS – Université libre de Bruxelles)

Project: Legacy of the Riverland Heroes: Elite Graves and their Significance as a Focus of Social Cohesion in Archaic Communities of the Strymon River Plain

My project focuses on the study of Archaic (7th- and 6th-century BC) funerary practices on the Strymon river plain, in modern-day eastern Macedonia. I seek to determine the extent and manner in which ‘elite’ identities and ‘heroic’ ideologies were made manifest in burial sites of the region. My project also explores how the expression of this ideology in relation to the ancestral dead may have contributed to the forming of a collective identity in Greek and Thracian communities.

Funerary contexts will be studied along three main axes. The first step will involve GIS analysis: Archaic cemeteries of the Strymon river plain will be examined in the context of their environment and landscape, as visible or discreet landmarks, with emphasis placed on their spatial relation to nearby settlements and communities.

Secondly, individual graves will be approached as distinct assemblages, with priority given to establishing a typological reference for grave goods, identifying potential indicators of an ‘elite’ / ‘heroic’ ideology (e.g. weaponry, high-quality imports) and determining whether standardised ‘sets’ comprising specific types of grave goods are regularly encountered. This stage of the study will focus on archaeological reports from Archaic cemetery sites and on two (as yet unpublished) case studies: the ‘flat’ cemetery of ancient Tragilos and the tumulus of Mesolakkia.

A third step will examine funerary space as a place of ritual, collective activity. Evidence of subsequent activity in or near Archaic burial sites will be reviewed and compared with confirmed cases of collective ancestral worship in the wider Aegean region. The final narrative of the project, addressing the main research questions and contextualising the funerary practices of the Strymon river plain in relation to the developing ‘elite’ political ideologies of the Archaic Greek world, will be formed throughout the course of the project, as a synthesis of my observations and conclusions.