Panel inquiries should be directed to the panel convenors named below.

Panel submissions must be made via the HEAT website: Abstract Management. The **closing date** for submissions is **13 January 2025.**

Panel No.	Panel title	Abstract
1	Anthropology of Viability: Sustaining Life in Uncertain Times Dr Nick Rahier nick.rahier@ugent.be	This panel introduces the idea of an "anthropology of viability," that explores how communities sustain life amidst the uncertainties of the Anthropocene. Rooted in the Latin viabilis, meaning "capable of life," an anthropology of viability examines the strategies and relationships that enable people to navigate rapid environmental and social changes, forging pathways toward more viable futures. Central to this discussion is the idea that the current global crisis is one of vitality and viability, necessitating context-specific responses. The panel considers questions of vitality and viability not as mere survival within existing frameworks, but as an active reconfiguration of relationships and networks to sustain life. This approach advocates for a shift from abstract and horizontal network thinking to an analysis of more grounded, active and localized efforts to forge networks that foster the capacity to sustain life. This incorporates a sense of verticality (which networks are empirically considered more viable?) and scale (how these networks are built, maintained, and contested across different levels of interaction and influence). By weaving together theoretical insights and empirical cases, this panel aims to deepen our understanding of the uncertainties and cultural logics that underpin questions of viability and vitality. We invite papers that explore how these dynamics manifest in different regions, where shared uncertainties about sustaining life reflect broader concerns about the viability of future networks.
2	The Configuration of Forest Fire Knowledge: European Perspectives Dr Istvan Praet istvan.praet@durham.ac.uk	This panel proposes to draw the contours of an environmental anthropology of forest fire management in Europe. In recent years, wildfires have proliferated from the Mediterranean to Scandinavia. Not only has their frequency and intensity increased, they also no longer seem to follow classical patterns. While climate change is no doubt a key factor — heat-boosted bark beetle infestations devastate pine monocultures and thus augment surface fuel, for instance — it does not fully explain what is currently unfolding. Often, a criminal element is involved: forensic investigations show that a large percentage of forest fires are started deliberately. Yet the actual motivations of arsonists remain a bit of an anthropological puzzle. The very term “wildfire,” it turns out, is a misnomer as the course of many fires is directly influenced by human interventions in the landscape and by historical legacies such as the presence of army ammunition depots in forested areas. An important consideration is that scientific fire knowledge is fragmented — universities have departments of earth sciences, but no equivalent for fire sciences — and that other experts, such as local foresters and fire brigade members, have always played a crucial role in the forecasting, handling, and analysis of forest fires. The panel’s central aim is to examine how “fire knowledge” is created and implemented at the rural/urban,

		non-academic/scientific, volunteer/professional and regional/international nexuses. We are looking for contributions from anthropologists with expertise in environmental issues, law, labour, governance, and knowledge & science, and from those with an interest in political/historical ecology.
3	Carcinogenesis, Toxicity and the Epidemic of Cancer Dr Nickolas Surawy Stepney nickolas.surawy_stepney@kcl.ac.uk	The climatic and environmental changes brought about by the forces of industrialisation, capitalism, empire, and global 'development' are becoming increasingly visible. But vital too are changes wrought that are less visible – the chemical alterations induced in water, soil, air, crops, animal and human bodies that are having profound effects on health and wellbeing. Responsibility and consequences are distributed in deeply unequal ways (Choy 2016). In this panel we focus specifically on the carcinogenic effects of this toxicity. While scientific investigation into links between industrial environmental contamination and carcinogenesis has been underdeveloped in favour of that which foregrounds personal agency and individual choice, a growing body of anthropological scholarship has begun to reorient this research agenda. Drawing on examples such as peanut production in Senegal (Tousignant 2022), open-pit mining in Spain (Fernández-Navarro et al., 2012), nuclear waste disposal in the USA (Cram 2023 & Masco 2021), and agricultural pesticide use in Kenya (Prince 2021), scholars have started to probe the connections between corporate and industrial interests and the 'epidemic' of cancer, in an effort to think through the relationship between the living and its milieu in novel ways (Canguilhem 2001). We invite papers that advance these analyses of 'carcinogenic accountability', and examine how risks of carcinogenic exposure are made visible and invisible, embraced and resisted, and studied. We are particularly interested in research which undertakes semiotic and material cultural analyses of the following concepts: 'exposed', 'toxic', 'safe', 'carcinogenic', and/or interrogate the ethical, epistemic, and regulatory conjunctures within which these categories operate.
4	More-than-human health in an interdependent world Prof Wim Van Daele wim.van.daele@uia.no	The concepts of One Health, Planetary Health, and Eco-Health foreground the dependency of human health on the health of the environment. In scientific practice, these concepts tend to focus mostly on the scientific biological and tangible social aspects of the interdependencies between the human and non-human aspects of health, neglecting the role played by intangible and invisible other-than-human entities. Hence, we adopt the notion of "more-than-human health" to enhance attentiveness to different ontological and related (micro)biosocial practices of human and other-than-human health and well-being across the world. This panel invites contributions that explore complex interdependencies and entanglements between human beings and visible/tangible and invisible/intangible other-than human entities that in their entanglement shape more-than-human health. We invite interdisciplinary oriented papers that examine the (micro)biosocial connections between invisible and (scientifically made) visible aspects in the more-than-human interdependent practice of crafting health and wellbeing across different situations and ontologies. We welcome particularly papers that attest to the situated (micro)biosocialities within these ontological

		practices in more-than-human health. This can include, but is not limited to, papers exploring entanglements between: • Ritual practices and microbiomes • Cosmology, climate change, and changing health practices • Supernatural entities, animals, and microbiomes • epigenetics, stress and food environments • and more underexplored interdependencies
5	Living with Extremes: People, Place and Environmental Change in South Asia Dr Sohini Kar s.kar1@lse.ac.uk	From devastating floods and unprecedented rainfall to deadly heatwaves and glacial melt, the compounding effects of climatic changes with anthropogenic environmental degradation from extractive industries and infrastructures have become more pronounced across South Asia. Such extreme weather events are encountered by communities shaped by longstanding socio-cultural, economic, and political structures. In this context, environmental injustice is inseparable from existing forms of socio-cultural, economic, and political inequalities. This panel draws together scholarship on the ways in which environmental changes via heat, rains, floods, and other disasters are experienced and embodied, with ethnographic attention to political economy and structural inequalities. By examining how diverse environmental challenges intersect with racial capitalism, the papers in this panel discuss the different ways in which particular bodies in South Asia are seen as simultaneously disposable and indispensable to the functioning of the contemporary economy. We encourage submissions that build and expand on anthropological debates on environmental justice and racial capitalism to better take into account the particular ways in which caste and class may work similarly, but also differently, from accounts of racial capitalism so far. In efforts to decentre India from South Asian Studies, we further encourage submissions drawing on ethnographic fieldwork from Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, the Maldives, and Afghanistan.
6	Uneven Toxic Worlds: Rethinking Medical-Environmental Anthropology and Environmental Justice Dr Raffaele Ippolito raffaele.ippolito@ouce.ox.ac.uk	This panel explores the tensions between environmental justice in the context of industrially-produced toxic contamination and calls to avoid 'damage-centred research' via chemosocialities. By focusing on structural systems of oppression rooted in labour and class struggles, political ecology has been instrumental in addressing power dynamics and environmental inequalities (Martinez-Alier 2014; Nixon 2011). However, it has been critiqued for overlooking more-than-human interactions and affective ties formed through toxic exposure, underplaying the complex entanglements between humans, non-humans, and toxic environments (Bennett 2010; Tsing 2015). Recent ethnographies have shifted the focus from toxicity as purely harmful to considering how it shapes new social relations and ways of living (Kirksey 2020; Nading 2020; Murphy 2017; Povinelli 2017). Critics argue this misses the deeper political-economic structures perpetuating environmental injustice, calling for the need to remain focused on the material and systemic forces that sustain harm (Bond 2021; Gutierrez, Powell, and Pendergrast 2021). The challenge is balancing these

		understandings of toxic relations with addressing the systemic inequalities behind uneven toxic exposures. This panel invites papers that build on insights from medical and environmental anthropology on pollution, health and ecology to critically engage with these tensions and asks: how can we envision new environmental justices and political ecologies premised on emerging ideas of toxicity, while addressing enduring structures of inequality to toxic exposure and their bodily effects? By bridging these approaches, we seek to expand how we think about environmental justice in toxic worlds. Accepted panellists are expected to share a 2000-word draft two weeks prior.
7	Anthropology in and out of the Comfort Zone: Microclimates of Exposure, Protection, and Sacrifice Dr Alex Nading amn242@cornell.edu	Architectural historian Daniel Barber (2019) recently suggested that our contemporary planetary epoch should be reframed as "the Comfortocene," arguing that the pursuit of comfort—particularly among those in the Global North who can afford to live their lives almost entirely in climate controlled spaces, or comfort zones,—is 'threatening to kill the planet.' In this panel, we draw on empirical examples from across the social sciences and humanities to center the comfort zone as an organizing device for a global economy in the era of climate crisis. In the context of rising global temperatures, technologies and materials that allow for the artificial regulation of human body temperatures, comfort is likely to remain unevenly distributed into the 21st century. The comfort zone is more than just a material space. It has come to denote a place of safety and ease, a settled state of being, a stable environment for living that demands little effort but also generates little change. Every comfort zone—whether the cool space of an office building or the serene space of a mind at ease—implies its own outside, a space of discomfort, sacrifice, and even death. How has this idea of the comfort zone evolved? And what does its application to new contexts tell us about the relationship between climate change, global health, and late capitalism? Possible points of ethnographic entry to these questions include the home, the prison, the data center, the refugee camp, the anxious mind, and the clinic.
8	Climate, Health, and the Remaking of the Ethnography Project Dr Catherine Trundle C.Trundle@latrobe.edu.au	How is the climate crisis altering the ethnographic project? From the mundane pragmatics of fieldwork to the theoretical, experimental, ethical, and creative dimensions of ethnography, this panel explores how ethnographers are adapting their practices to better understand and engage with an unstable climate. How are the embodied, relational, and sensorial dimensions of fieldwork being refigured? What technologies and techniques are we using to understand and describe forces or processes that are beyond our own or our participants' vision, senses, experiences, imagination, or desire to know? How are we constituting our field sites to incorporate an attention to emergent atmospheric flows, environmental cascades, health injustices, resources flows and enclosures, and the movement/displacement of people? How do the goals of ethnography change or remain the same when faced with environmental crisis? Do we get closer to or further from an ethnographic commitment to exploring the diverse ways we can be human? And who is the 'we'? What is happening to the care work of fieldwork? How do we look after ourselves, our families, our friends/research collaborators, and the environment during and through ethnographic practice? What are

		the connections between ethnographic care work, wellbeing, and justice? When does ethnography reach its limit as a way of engaging with the climate crisis and its effects on health? This panel invites reflections on the remaking of ethnography and the remaking of ethnographers within a transforming climate.
9	Influence of Changing Ecologies on Health and Human Adaptation at Local, National and Global level Prof Chandana Sarmah chandanasarmah@gauhati.ac.in	In Anthropology, research on interactions and the complex network of humans, health and environment started early with the cultural ecology theory and medical anthropology in the 1930s and 1960s respectively. The focus theme of these approaches had been adaptation including factors of genetics, physiology, culture and the approaches assumed that health is determined by environmental adaptation and that diseases arise from environmental imbalances. Further studies are required to understand the consumption patterns which are associated with health risks affecting human biology, ecology and the epidemiology of emerging and reemerging diseases. As researchers, the pressing question is the present scenario of regional, national and global affairs such as climate change, food insecurity, environmental health, demographic shifts, etc. Though there are ongoing consistent efforts to identify strategies and bring out solutions, yet, it requires extensive studies on ecological changes and the associated health disparities. With this backdrop, the panel invites papers/studies conducted within (but not limited to) South Asia to explore the cross-cultural impact of ecological changes on populations. It seeks to highlight health disparities arising from these changes and have an in-depth discussion on regional-specific health implications, as well as include trends in research methodology. The panel, in conclusion, will be addressing the 'Ecology-Human Adaptation Imbalance' and will try to identify the loopholes and bring out probable alternatives for region-specific populations.
10	Connecting Species Extinction and Disease Eradication Dr Rebecca Marsland r.marsland@ed.ac.uk	What it is that makes the threatened extinction of some species fill us with dread, while the eradication of others is considered desirable? Although the outcome of the processes of extinction and eradication are ultimately the same, in that both lead to the disappearance of a species, there are significant differences in the processes. On the one hand, the threat of extinction of valued species, from bees to orangutans to vultures, seems to take place at speed and often resists human action to prevent it. On the other, the desired eradication of vectors of disease – from millennia old bacteria to mosquitoes – seems extremely challenging. Studies tend to focus on either extinction or eradication, seldom addressing one another: this panel aims to address that lacuna, to consider how the different modes of praxis involved in each might inform anthropological understandings of both. This session invites contributions that reflect upon the moral and ideological questions that emerge out of thinking about extinction – conceived of as one of the central global challenges of our time – and eradication together. Through different fieldwork case studies we hope to explore how extinction and eradication unfold. Practices of eradication (of disease or 'alien/invasive' species that threaten the existence of 'native' species), and/or the processes that cause or prevent species extinction (eg conservation or industrial agriculture) are informed by and shape theory. Such theories are often rooted in western, colonial, ableist, and anthropocentric ways of thinking about human health and the natural world

		as something that can be ordered into normative forms of life that are valued or that can be eliminated as pathological, pestilent, or foreign. These orderings can be contradictory – indigenous peoples are colonized and subjected to violence, whilst indigenous species are protected from 'alien', invasive species (although both are contained in bounded territories). They raise ethical questions around which forms of life – human and other than human – are valued, killed, or permitted to disappear. Methods and technologies with their origins in colonial conquest and rule (and at the extreme, genocide), such as the production of maps and surveys, the use of pesticides, reproductive technologies such as sterilization, and hunting are deployed to promote life. Papers might address include care and its contradictions, the social relationships that are either bought into being or disappear with eradication and extinction, or the different technical meanings and ethical resonances within which eradication and extinction are both 'done' and thought about both disease control and conservation. How might accounts of how disease eradication is done and species extinction happens shape theories of how the erasure to zero of certain categories is possible or made thinkable? What critiques of the theories that shape praxis, and that are produced through praxis, arise from the experiences of communities where processes of eradication and extinction take place? How might thinking about eradication and extinction together lead to new understandings of the praxis that brings them about?
11	Climate change, island change, and wellbeing in small island communities Dr Eleni Kotsira helena.kotsira@gmail.com	Surrounded by sea, islands have long been seen as remote and isolated by necessity, though island life in practice involves movement both out of and back towards the island (Kohn, 2006; Nic Craith, 2020). Without enough attention being paid to the needs of island communities in decision- and policymaking affecting them, islands are also frequently associated with vulnerability (Kotsira, 2021), among others raising concerns about their sustainability and resilience (Ratter, 2017). If island life is already challenging as such, what is the further impact of climate change and climate-induced disasters on the mental health and wellbeing of islanders, particularly in small island communities? This panel invites papers discussing ethnographic examples and primary research covering aspects such as: • Local understandings of mental health and wellbeing, and whether/how they are impacted by the climate crisis and the ways islanders respond to changing circumstances. • Access to mental health services and service gaps to be addressed so small island populations facing the by-products of climate change are supported. • How preconceptions of remoteness and isolation, vulnerability, sustainability and resilience are challenged by the circumstances created by the climate crisis locally, and their impact on mental health and wellbeing. • The role of climate change in conceptualisations of the future on/of small islands, feelings of uncertainty, and their impact on islanders' mental health and wellbeing.

		• How the mental health and wellbeing of researchers are affected while doing research on small islands impacted by the climate crisis, including coping mechanisms and research strategies.
12	Reframing Anthropology for Planetary Health: engaging new thinking on the matter, processes and dynamics of health-environment relations Prof Ciara Kierans c.kierans@liverpool.ac.uk	As the world becomes hotter and more polluted, the relations between human health and environmental harms reframe anthropological ways of thinking and doing, bringing the domains of medical and environmental anthropology into alignment. From the mounting burdens of difficult-to-notice chemical exposures to the increased risk of extreme weather events, the environmental conditions of health, wellness, and liveability is shifting empirical, conceptual and methodological attentions for anthropology (Brown and Nading 2019; Kirksey 2014; Seeberg et al. 2020) with increasing concern for contaminant flows (Ballestero 2019; Bond 2021; Krause 2017; Liboiron 2021) and their consequences for environmental care and remediation (Green 2024; Papadopoulos et al. 2023). Despite advances, anthropologists remain divided on whether their entry or endpoints are ailing human bodies or ailing ecologies, thus we ask, how can we attend to the kinds of phenomena, activities and processes that pull body-ecology relations into relief? While the matter of bodies (human and other-than-human) still remain at the nexus of changing environments and climates, what gains can we make from turning attention to the actually existing processes which mediate bodies and environments e.g. metabolism, kinetics, thermodynamics and more? What kinds of methodological and conceptual traction do they provide? Anchored in anthropological commitments to non-reductionist noticing of human and other-than-human worlds (Bubandt et al. 2024), this panel invites new thinking, experimentation and exploration of mediating *processes* as distinct from *matter*, substance and bodies. Our aim is to explore the current methodological and empirical shifts upon which anthropologists are staging interrogations of health-environment relations.
13	Air and Health Dr Jessica Barnes jebarnes@mailbox.sc.edu	The Covid-19 pandemic brought global attention to the dangers hidden in the air. Air is vital to health. But it may also carry things that impair health, from heat and pollutants to mold spores and viruses. In many cases, these things are not visible to the human eye, generating questions about knowledge and uncertainty, and the measurements and metrics through which we come to know that which we cannot see. Slippery in its material nature, air challenges spatial categories – indoor/outdoors, urban/rural, local/national/global – linking sometimes far-removed times and spaces. Medical and environmental anthropologists are well poised to contribute to this area of work, their ethnographic insights furthering understandings of both the mutual imbrication of societies and their aerial environments and the link between air, the body, and broader social structures of health provision. This panel brings together anthropologists working at the intersections of air and health. We are particularly interested in papers that foreground lived experience. Paper topics might include, but are not limited to, indoor air quality issues like mold; outdoor air pollution and everyday

		engagements with dominant pollutant sources like traffic; sensor technologies, including citizen science; inequalities in air-related health impacts and environmental justice; everyday behaviors and domestic practices around air and health; sensorial ways of knowing the air; bodily responses to heat; and the practice of breath.
14	Political ecologies of health (or Airs, Waters, and Places revisited) Dr Jed Stevenson jed.stevenson@durham.ac.uk	The concerns of medicine have long been environmental – among the earliest medical treatises is Hippocrates' 'Airs, Waters, and Places' – but the modern emphasis on germs and cures caused the environment to slip out of focus. Climate change and re/emerging infectious disease have recently pushed it back up the agenda. One response has been the championing of Planetary Health as a movement (or subfield or umbrella) to put health problems in their proper context; another set of responses has comprised analyses that are premised on the social determinants or developmental origins of health and disease, or which invoke processes of structural / slow / ecological violence. In this panel we ask: What is missing in these formulations? What would it mean to take airs, waters, and places seriously as conditions for health and disease? The panel invites engagements with efforts to protect air, water, or place/s and/or to pursue environmental justice, especially but not only those framed in terms of health and disease. We especially encourage contributions that use long-term and ethnographic methods to explore air / water / health / livelihood relationships in particular places and ecologies.
15	Scaling toxic exposure; intergenerational responsibility, care and planetary health Dr Emilie Glazer emilie.glazer.11@ucl.ac.uk	Chemical exposure and their potential toxic arrangements are intergenerational, crossing lines of kinship and connecting relations to molecules, multiple bodies, ecologies and social spaces through non-linear temporalities. This presents significant challenges for ethnographic research confronting scales of exposure in the context of planetary health, escalating climate and ecological crises, profound inequality, and ongoing colonial formations. In military campaigns devastating lives, genocide brings ecocide. There is a need to examine the novel configurations of intergenerational responsibility, justice and care which arise at these junctures, as they index possibilities for other ways of life. This requires creative orientations to method, concepts and theory to address the complex temporal and spatial scales of toxic exposure. Our panel seeks contributions from those engaging with chemical exposures and questions of intergenerational time and social relations within anthropology and/or in dialogue with other disciplines and those addressing the methodological challenges and conceptual approaches related to these themes. Our panel is guided but not limited to the following questions: • How can intergenerational chemical exposure be examined given that temporality of toxicity is not linear? • What are the possibilities for action - for ourselves as researchers, for our research communities, and for wider groups entangled in these landscapes - if conventional mechanisms of causality do not apply?

		• If the materiality and latency of chemical exposure articulates an absence in the present how can we examine the pervasive and elusiveness of toxicity? What kinds of ethnographic (re)orientations are required to critically orient to the multiple temporalities of chemical toxicity? • What can the work of comparison facilitate in examining scales of toxic exposure?
16	Heath(care) derivatives as hazardous waste: New understandings of chemical infrastructures and disease control paradigms in (global) health Prof Helen Lambert h.lambert@bristol.ac.uk	We increasingly understand our world as flooded with toxic substances, particles and effluents that pollute ecosystems and contaminate environments formerly thought of as pristine. These also engender consequences for human and environmental health that are often uncertain and possibly incalculable. Climate change variously exacerbates environmental chemical concentrations through drought-creating heat or spreads hazardous waste through flooding. Paradoxically, health-damaging environmental contamination is frequently a consequence of attempts to limit human health harms (Nading 2017). Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (1962) drew attention to environmental harms from a human intervention to limit disease – pesticide contamination from indiscriminate spraying for malaria control. DDT use came under regulatory oversight but new forms of environmental contamination created in the name of protecting health, from antibiotic effluents produced during pharmaceutical manufacturing to single-use plastic healthcare products, insecticides administered to prevent dengue and disinfectant sprays used during COVID-19, continually expand the list of hazardous waste. Regulations to limit exposure - based on designating maximum concentrations of single specified chemical substances with known toxicity - cannot keep up (Boudia and Jas 2013).What difference does it make to conceptualise dynamic chemical infrastructures as inherent to global health? Might reframing our understanding of individual and collective health harms help to build considerations of latency and disposal into the development of new healthcare and disease prevention technologies? This panel seeks contributions that explore the processes and consequences associated with the environmental presence of hazardous substances created to protect human health. Ethnographic case studies and theoretical reflections are welcome.
17	Elemental Temporalities: Living in the emergent afterlives of contamination in the Global South Dr Thembi Luckett nothemba.k.luckett@durham.ac.uk	Framings of extractivism, its politics, geographies, and technologies are often framed through a processual lens. This panel reads the contamination of water, air, and soil more generally through a temporal lens. By drawing linkages to both histories and contemporary practices of environmental contamination and exploitation, current articulations of "more than human" relationalities, and entanglements with various futurities, this panel speaks to the connections between the temporalities of extractivism and human and planetary health. Through living in the detritus and ruins of extractive industries (particularly in the Global South), or contesting their emergent futurities, we invite papers which draw on rich ethnographic/ creative practice and methods/ emergent methodological frameworks, with particular focus on the elemental ruins of extractive industries (water, air, and soil) and their connectivities to health. Papers which illustrate the myriad ways of living in/against ruin-making will also be of particular relevance to the panel.

18	Extraction and the Transmutation of What Remains Prof Gregg Mitman g.mitman@lmu.de	Extractive projects—e.g., mining, plantation agriculture, or oil & gas development—separate matter considered worthy for commodification from that deemed waste. But these often-violent interventions, including industrial spraying of herbicides and pesticides to control unwanted "pests" in the case of agriculture, do more than cut preexisting relations between rocks, plants, animals, humans, and other entities to generate profit from resources: they also rearrange materialities across shades of life and scales of value in ways that transmute over time. Human and non-human life persists in these spaces, continually transforming them, long after industries have gone. Extraction reorders stuff as much as it takes stuff. Industries have been crushing mountains, uprooting forests, killing animals, and disturbing human livelihoods, whether in the guise of mid-20th-century industrial paternalism, or that of the late neoliberal rush for new extractive frontiers coated in talk of corporate social and environmental responsibility. Surely, the entangled ecologies that sustain more-than-human co-existences are endangered by extractive projects. But in their wake lay novel geobiosymbioses, hybrid socialities, and uneven fragments— some of which are toxic, others beneficial. Those legacies both engage and affect human and nonhuman life differently depending on their unequal positions, with consequences that transmute over time as a result of material processes and political vagaries. This panel invites participants to examine legacies of extraction through the transmutations of what remains. We welcome contributions that attend to the persisting presences of extractive legacies, which may be simultaneously or ambiguously generative and harmful, as they shape conditions for future health and life in a time that is never quite an aftermath.
19	Methodological positions, problems, opportunities and affiliations when health is more than human Dr Andrea Kaiser-Grolimund andrea.kaiser-rolimund@swisstph.ch	Anthropologists studying health crises have long grappled with issues of methodology, epistemology, and ethics. Recent crises, such as the global Covid-19 pandemic, antimicrobial resistance, or ongoing environmental transformations have intensified debates among anthropologists about what kind of engagement is possible and how we should position ourselves and reframe our lines of enquiry when working in complex local and global settings. While many discussions of global health crises focus on human health, often more than human actors are involved at different stages of health problems and interventions, leading us to ask how these various actors can or should be included in our methodological, epistemological and ethical thinking. Using a posthuman lens, this panel encourages challenging and expanding our methodological reflections when health is more than human, taking into account historically grown inequalities as well as different ways of living with other 'beings'/non-human materialities. This panel aims to foster a dialogue among anthropologists working with such lenses and to address challenges and opportunities regarding positions and affiliations of anthropologists in multidisciplinary fields. We invite methodological reflections of anthropologists who encounter complex assemblages of more than human actors in research and policymaking, such as when wearing different 'hats' or advocating for different purposes in interdisciplinary 'One Health' teams or related global health fields. This panel is interested in

		ethical reflections on conflicting epistemologies in public health domains, while also inviting scholars working in environmental health with a view of expanding relationships for engagement as well as recognizing new spaces for holistic interventions.
20	Unprotected science: environmental evidence after the biopolitical covenant Prof Paul Wenzel Geissler p.w.geissler@sai.uio.no	The 'biopolitical covenant' – the hope that science and the nation-state would jointly ameliorate citizens' lives and offer protection from unintended environmental and health effects of technological progress – evolved from and spread with imperialism. Promoted by colonialisms, and later by modernist nationalisms, it shaped mid-20th century scientific training and research, and built national and international environmental and health institutions and policies anywhere in the world. While modernist science, particularly in colonial contexts, was neither impartial nor just, reiterating violent divisions of class, gender and race – the idea of an evidence-based social contract provided a credible aspiration against which to contest apparent violations of it, and accredited scientific institutions did produce consensus-validated evidence of environmental harm – even if this was insufficiently acted upon. In the 21st century, both biopolitical promise and evidentiary capacity have further eroded. Protective science is captured by corporate lobbying that perverts legal frames and policies; and in expanding global zones of austerity, environmental science is incapacitated by underfunding and infrastructural decay, undermining claims to validity, and scientists' motivation. Facing mounting environmental and toxic threats, protective science loses the deceptive comfort of older biopolitical frames. Yet, this untethering of science also opens new perspectives and provokes unruly practices and collaborations, building on earlier occasional experiments with scientific resistance to regulatory failures. This panel discusses motivations, methodologies and alliances of scientists and citizens who seek other foundations of evidence and protection, responsibility and contestation, be it within disciplinary science, reusing residual intellectual and material resources, or outside, pursuing radically different approaches, or moving in-between: e.g., activist and citizen science, rogue or maverick science, science drawing on indigenous or spiritual knowledge, the arts or bodily sensibilities and sensitivities.
21	Intimate pollution: hormones as mediators of health and environment across species, place, and time Dr Andrea Ford andrea.ford@ed.ac.uk	This panel invites consideration of endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) as a key link between health and environment. EDCs are synthetic chemicals that interact with the hormonal messaging of humans and other animals, commonly found in everyday items, notably many plastics. These ubiquitous substances transcend local environments through weather patterns and industrial chains, defy consumer rationales of personal protection through "organic" or "green" choices, and have effects that are unpredictable and may remain latent for generations. EDCs are now constitutive of our bodies, complicating any ideas about an un-altered "pure" state, and have been linked to health issues as disparate as diabetes, endometriosis, asthma, early puberty, obesity, and gender dysphoria. There is good reason to consider hormonally-active pharmaceuticals as EDCs, particularly given how they exceed the consumer's bodily system and enter into waterways and other shared environments. EDCs trouble standard political positions around individual autonomy and

		choice, complicating conservative impulses towards protectionism and immunity. Studying "the exposome" troubles standard ways of making knowledge about chemicals: chemical effects come into being in interaction with one another instead of as isolated variables, and timing of exposure often matters more than dosage (counter to the toxicological maxim 'the dose makes the poison'). Add to this the lobbying pressure from petroleum and chemical industries, and it is clear why it can be profoundly difficult to acknowledge and take action about EDCs. Yet, some medical research centers, activist groups, artists, and even industrial initiatives around "green chemistry" are doing so. This nexus begs further anthropological inquiry.
22	Cooking Energy Socialities in Transition Dr Ben Campbell ben.campbell@durham.ac.uk	In the last decade an enormous shift has occurred in the funding of interdisciplinary projects concentrating on the energy transition from biomass fuels to clean cooking technologies. Anthropologists and anthropologically-conversant researchers have been engaged with bringing into visibility the holistic dimensions of what such a transition might entail for many kinds of socio-ecological practices and domestic/neighbourhood relations. These dimensions significantly affect the uptake of new cooking technologies. Sometimes these pressing concerns for cooking energy transition are explicitly driven by health agendas concerning air quality and health among mothers and children in smoky kitchen environments. Other perspectives concern domestic decision-making and the possibilities for empowering women to influence choices in expenditure, and how a variety of cooking fuels can be 'stacked' for flexible cooking technology options. This panel invites applications to think anthropologically about the so-called 'cooking energy transition', to give accounts of collaborations with non-anthropologists that attend to relational implications of clean cooking appliances, to consider the range of domestic and institutional contexts where clean cooking initiatives are thought appropriate, and to reflect on the value and influence of anthropological voices in the literature and in project interactions. Applications are especially requested from researchers who can talk about the generative sociality of conversations at 'the heat of the hearth', how fuels materially differ, how kitchen life makes persons, what foods give nutritious meals, how various kinds of explicitly health-giving foods and herbs are differently available in conditions of climate disruption, how can notions of 'energy ladder' be productively engaged with, and how life-histories of people's relationships with cooking technology can contribute to interdisciplinary dialogues on energy transitions.
23	Livelihoods under pressure: Vulnerability, adaptation, and resilience in developmental contexts Prof Hannah Brown hannah.brown@durham.ac.uk	This panel considers livelihoods at the intersections of climate change, environmental degradation, and global health crises. We aim to foster dialogue between medical, environmental and development anthropology by taking a bottom- up, ethnographic view on changing livelihoods whilst critically engaging with developmental concepts of livelihood diversification, sustainable livelihoods, and alternative livelihoods in a world where climate change adds new pressures as people struggle to get by. People around the world are troubled by climate change, but many communities in the Global South are disproportionately affected by the convergence of emerging environmental and health challenges with long-standing socioeconomic

		vulnerabilities. They are also more commonly the targets of development projects that aim to encourage particular kinds of livelihood transition. Such communities have often relied on natural resource-dependent livelihoods that are increasingly threatened by climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecosystem degradation, and which may also pose heightened risks of emerging infectious diseases. However, often they also display tremendous agency and innovation in the face of these interconnected challenges. By centring our panel on livelihood strategies, and how these take place within, in conversation with, and beyond developmental framings, this panel will explore the lived experiences of those most affected by these planetary changes. By examining diverse case studies from around the world, we aim to illuminate the ways in which communities are navigating, adapting to, and resisting the impacts of global climate change on their livelihoods and wellbeing. We also seek ethnographic insights into how programmes aiming to support livelihoods are received or reworked on the ground.
24	Varieties of Environmentalism in East and Southeast Asia Dr Loretta Lou ieng.t.lou@durham.ac.uk	In 1999, Asia's Environmental Movement became a landmark publication, offering the first comprehensive overview of the rise of environmentalism in East and Southeast Asia (Lee and So 1999). Nearly three decades later, the region has become a key player both in the global environmental crisis, and the global struggle against it. Many East and Southeast Asian countries have pursued rapid economic growth at the cost of their environment, leading to severe pollution, carbon emissions, and biodiversity loss. While there exist several ethnographic studies shedding light on environmental activism in East and Southeast Asia (Choy, 2011; Hathaway, 2013; Lora-Wainwright, 2017; Kim, 2022; Chao 2022), there is still a gap in Anthropology that examines the diverse forms and processes of environmentalism in East and Southeast Asia, especially when compared to the robust recognition of environmentalisms in South America. Environmental management and movements in East and Southeast Asia are shaped by distinct historical, political, and geographical contexts. Factors include strong state leadership, democratization, colonial and post-colonial relationships with Japan and Euro-American places, specific cultural traits – Buddhism and Confucian ethics – in addition to the material conditions, such as high population density and sometimes limited natural resources (Weller, 2006; Keck, 2020; Li and Shapiro, 2020; Seow, 2022). These conditions shaped particular developmental trajectories and environmental management strategies, promoting critical responses to mainstream paradigms. Furthermore, recent developments led to severe environmental repercussions, including China's rise as the "factory of the world" and the largest carbon emitter, the Fukushima nuclear disaster, and public health crises like the humidifier disinfectant scandal in South Korea, which claimed over 1,800 lives. This panel seeks to expand the scope and analysis of environmentalism in East and Southeast Asia. We define environmentalism in its broadest sense as the ideologies and practices that shape human-nature relationships out of concern for the environment. This may include various topics, ranging from indigenous environmentalism, radical environmentalism, corporate environmentalism, green and sustainable living, and

		political environmental movements. We encourage papers on a variety of themes, including but not limited to: • Traditional ecological knowledge and indigenous management • State, market and civil society in environmentalism • Sustainability practices in urban and rural communities • Climate change activism • Climate resilience and adaptation strategies in local communities • Biodiversity conservation • Multispecies and more-than-human entanglements • Food sovereignty and sustainable agriculture • Toxicity, pollution, and environmental justice • The intersection of nature, religion, and cultural movements • The intersection of environmental and wellbeing movements • Deep ecology and spiritual ecology • The Asian experience of the Anthropocene • Ecofeminism • Environmental and labour movements • Environmental education and youth engagement in ecological movements • The role of digital media in shaping environmental awareness and activism