

Circumventing Reality

Report on the Anthropological Work of Professor Emeritus
M.M.G. Bax

Michiel Baud

Susan Legêne

Peter Pels

Amsterdam, 9 September 2013

Contents

Preamble

Introduction

- 1. The allegations against Mart Bax**
- 2. 'Neerdonk' and the Brabant study**
- 3. Medjugorje and the Bosnian study**
- 4. Bax' publications**
- 5. Conclusions of the committee**
- 6. Context and consequences**

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Terms of reference from VU University Amsterdam

Appendix 2 Sources and literature consulted

Appendix 3 Complete list of publications by M.M.G. Bax – Published and non-published publications

Appendix 4 List of publication history of the Medjugorje study, based on the 1995 compilation

Preamble

The issue at the centre of this report is distressing for everyone concerned. It firstly affects the reputation of a Dutch anthropologist, but there are also implications for the discipline of anthropology and its methodology. Furthermore, and not unimportantly, the issue affects a wide range of personal and professional relationships in the academic environment that are founded on expectations of honesty and transparency. Finally, there are ramifications for institutions and the way they operate, extending beyond universities and the funding and monitoring of academic research to the system of programme review committees, peer review, and scientific publishing. Academic relationships are based on trust in the scientific honesty of everyone involved. Any doubt, of any nature, about these crucial elements, leaves deep scars. Several recent cases of scientific fraud have testified to the far-reaching consequences, social as well as academic, when this trust is betrayed and scientific integrity can no longer be taken for granted.

Introduction

This report is written in response to allegations of scientific misconduct on the part of Professor Emeritus M.M.G. (Mart) Bax, that have been hinted at in academic circles since 2002, following his retirement. The allegations were made public in a book by Frank van Kolfschooten, *Ontspoorde wetenschap (Derailed science)*, which was published in October 2012, and had a chapter devoted to this subject. The issue was subsequently re-examined, supported by additional data, in a major article by Richard De Boer (2013) in the newspaper *de Volkskrant*. These allegations prompted the VU University Amsterdam Executive Board to form a committee consisting of Michiel Baud (chair), Susan Legêne and Peter Pels (members). The committee's terms of reference are given in Appendix 1.

The nature of the allegations, where the use of pseudonyms is so predominant (see below), led the committee to set the full cooperation of Mart Bax as a condition for accepting the assignment. This cooperation was duly promised, and led to two 'reports' from Bax to the committee, in which he set out his method and, subject to confidentiality, clarified the location of his research and identified his most important informants. The committee was given permission to make unrestricted use of these reports subject to maintaining the confidentiality of the informants. It conducted three interviews of approximately two hours each with Mart Bax (accompanied by a confidential adviser) at various points in the inquiry. The committee attempted in these interviews to clarify various questions and obscure points that emerged from its inquiry, and from the documentation and correspondence provided by Bax. Having presented its preliminary conclusions to Bax in the final meeting, the committee received another substantial file in which Bax reiterated his defence. Bax also responded at length to the preliminary final version of the report. The committee has noted this defence and taken it into consideration where appropriate.

The committee was aware from the outset that any in-depth verification of Bax' fieldwork would require replicated research, as Peter Kloos (1988) recommended in a general sense for anthropological research at the time. In-depth replication of anthropological research of this kind was not an option for this committee. It doubts furthermore whether this case warrants such research. Accordingly, alongside the three interviews and a study of Bax' oeuvre, the committee concentrated on consulting relevant documentation and people in the Netherlands and other countries who had been involved in various ways with Bax' work in his active career, or in the subsequent debates surrounding his work. The committee attempted first to answer the specific questions that have arisen surrounding Mart Bax' work. The committee was inevitably confronted with other matters in the course of its inquiry, and these are referred to in this report where it was deemed appropriate.

For various reasons that are explained in the report, the committee saw the need to investigate some elements of Bax' work in great detail, as is recorded in Chapters 2 and 3 in particular. The committee moreover carried out a largely 'manual' bibliometric investigation, which is reported on in Chapter 4.

A significant proportion of the research discussed in this report was performed some considerable time ago, and was published between 1974 and 2002. This presented the committee with the challenge of avoiding an anachronistic judgment, arrived at purely from a present-day standpoint. Judgments about what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable behaviour change with time. The committee was aware throughout its inquiry of the need to check its present-day judgments against those of the period in which Mart Bax worked. In this connection, the bases of the committee's analytic framework explicitly included the views presented in publications of Mart Bax' contemporaries, some of whom were his close colleagues. This method is not watertight, since opinions about research have always varied. Furthermore, the intention with these publications was to set scientific standards, not to assess conduct. An advantage of this method nonetheless is the insight it provides into the thinking prevalent in the final decades of the last century about the nature of anthropology and its research methods, and how well Mart Bax' work met those standards.

Carelessness, misconduct and fraud

Sound definitions of the various forms of misconduct, in which there is a sliding scale from carelessness (or *sloppy science* as the Levelt Committee (2012) called it), through unintentional distortion, to deliberate deception, and culminating in fraud, were important in giving direction to the committee's working method and supporting the ultimate assessment.

In connection with the report into the scientific fraud committed by Diederik Stapel, Pim Levelt has said that an assessment of scientific conduct is concerned not only with fraud, but also more 'minor' irregularities, such the omission of unwelcome results, carelessness and vagueness (Levelt 2012b). André Köbben (2012) proposed in an address to the Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW) in connection with the same matter, that a distinction be made between 'deadly sins' and 'everyday sins'. His argument was that "the cumulative effect of minor deception does more harm to science than spectacular major deception". The KNAW report *Zorgvuldig en integer (With due care and integrity)*, finally, pointed out that 'due care' in pursuit of scholarship is a matter of degree (from exemplary to careless), but that integrity is sharply defined in our use of language. In a certain sense, there can also be said to be degrees of integrity: "There is a threshold beyond which integrity is damaged, and people speak of scientific fraud" (2012: 11).

There can be no doubt that scientific misconduct takes a variety of forms, each of which must be assessed in its own way, but all have the potential to undermine trust in science, or in a scientific discipline. It is therefore important to analyse the criteria of, and to specify, these various forms. This will involve examining their relevance and applicability to the specific discipline of anthropology. The KNAW report *With due care and integrity* describes this discipline as having 'an individualistic research culture', which hampers systematic monitoring of the acquired data and the field research (2012: 29). Another factor in the present case is that the allegations are concerned with research practices and results from the relatively distant past. Any judgment must therefore take account of the practices that were deemed acceptable or unacceptable in that period.

There is probably little disagreement about what is considered to be fraud or a deadly sin in scientific conduct. The deliberate invention or forgery of data, the omission of unwelcome insights and data, and the copying of other people's ideas without acknowledgment (plagiarism) are forms of scientific *fraud* that are based on actual or attempted lies and deception.¹ In its inquiry into Stapel's work, the Levelt Committee defined fraud as: "[T]he fabrication, falsification or unjustified replenishing of data, as well as the whole or partial fabrication of analysis results. It also includes the misleading presentation of crucial points as far as the organization or nature of the experiment are concerned" (Levelt 2012a: 17). Our committee has added the adjective 'deliberate', because this is possibly the most important criterion in assessing these behaviours. *Deliberate* deception is an essential factor in the severest forms of misconduct and fraud. This is a crucial point for committees that have to pronounce judgment on the behaviour of fellow scientists. In the absence of a 'confession', committees of this kind must attempt to draw conclusions about the deliberate or inadvertent reasons for the misleading information, on the basis of meticulous, almost legal, evidence gathering. In interviews before this committee, Bax admitted to 'errors' and 'mistakes', but defended his integrity. In his view, there was no element of deliberate deception, and, according to him, where quantities or other facts perhaps did not tally, this did not necessarily mean that the description of observed reality was incorrect at some higher level.

Alongside manifest forms of fraud, the Levelt Committee identified what they referred to as *sloppy science*: "a failure to meet normal standards of methodology" (Levelt 2012a: 5). This concept is comparable with Köbben's 'everyday sins', and with the 'careless science' referred to in the report *With due care and integrity*. This category varies from the omission of unwelcome results and the failure to investigate alternative explanations, to careless research and unverifiable statements. Peter Kloos (1984: 156) suggested in his contemporary overview of anthropological science that most deception was unintentional, consisting of "adjusting the data to better fit the argument". The misconduct in this resides less in presenting a nonexistent reality than in a weak empirical relationship between the information found and an existing reality. A common contributory factor in this weak relationship is an insufficiently explicit analytic and methodological framework.

The Levelt Committee deems fabrication, or the incorrect presentation, of research output to be fraud. However the 'incorrect' category is hard to apply unequivocally in the case of cultural anthropology, because the question regarding validity – the best possible presentation of research data – is often intrinsic to fieldwork and its interpretation. In anthropology, the interpretation and presentation of research results are always central elements of the scientific debate. Fraud can be said to apply only in connection with the 'deliberate' incorrect presentation of research data. The reliability of the presentation is embedded in methodological principles of representativeness, validity and reflexivity. Careless methodology is not necessarily an element of 'deliberately' dishonest conduct. The *With due care and integrity* report also refers to the grey area between questionable practice "where a degree of carelessness can be detected" in the handling of research

¹ The KNAW report *With due care and integrity* refers to the international term FFP: fabrication, falsification/fraud, plagiarism (2012: 12).

data, without it being immediately clear “whether the questionable practice arises from carelessness or unverifiability, or from dishonest actions and intentions” (2012: 13). Our committee therefore distinguishes between deception based on manipulation of data in order to align the presentation of facts and insights with a particular theory or assumption, and carelessness related to incompetent scientific behaviour. Both of these were encountered in Bax’ work.

In his analysis of everyday sins in the social sciences, Köbben also refers to two other points of concern: the erosion of scientific autonomy when scientists weaken or adjust their data to keep clients happy; and the publication pressure that leads in some disciplines to the bizarre proliferation of authors in the publication of a scientific article, and to ever bolder forms of self-plagiarism and the uncreative reuse of data. He points out that plagiarism alone – and in the committee’s view the same applies to self-plagiarism – does not contaminate collections of research material. Although plagiarism – the literal copying without acknowledgment of part or all of previously published texts – always constitutes fraud, and self-plagiarism should be viewed critically, they do not lead inevitably to the falsification of scientific data and knowledge. However, the report *With due care and integrity* rightly concludes that this practice undermines the ‘reward system’ in science and is detrimental to the reciprocal trust among scientists (2012: 13). This committee considers that the same is true of fabricating results and forms of scientific valorization, such as nonexistent publications, and fictitious awards, academic positions and fellowships. Although scientific knowledge may not be adulterated by these kinds of non-events, they do damage relationships within the scientific community, and the reputation of science.

Carelessness (or sloppy science) as such is not an offence, but it does give rise to various forms of unsatisfactory, and sometimes culpable, scientific activities and results, and in the long term may thoroughly infect scientific practice. Pim Levelt therefore concluded, based on Stapel’s ‘major’ misconduct, that the entire discipline of social psychology would be well advised to “put its house in order” (2012b: 4-5). This is to say that it is not enough to tackle individual scientists (and students!) on their careless scientific attitudes, but that the boundary conditions that apply to an entire discipline or scientific field require scrutiny. Possible cases in point range from the existence or lack of internal corrective mechanisms, and the nature of research and publication cultures, to how scientific research is funded. They also relate to the storage and accessibility of research data, peer review before, during and after research, publication practices, and ethical codes, such as the *Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice* (2012 version). Those aspects of the above that are relevant to assessing Mart Bax’ work are discussed in the final chapter of this report.

Anthropology as a science

Anthropology is the science of human society and culture. The colonial background gave rise to a dominant interest in the *other* society and culture (Kloos, 1988: 21). Anthropology as a science sought firstly to describe the differences between cultures and then to explain, or at least to analyse, them. For a time, gathering knowledge about other societies was mainly a matter of deskwork, but in the course of the 20th century *fieldwork* became the most relevant and characteristic

anthropological instrument. Researchers in anthropology were taken seriously only once they had won their spurs in the field (Zwier 1989: 9; Axel 2002: 15). This fieldwork tended to be modelled along the lines of participant observation. Anthropologists aimed with this methodology to be as involved as possible in a society under investigation, at the same time as observing this society and attempting to analyse it. Kloos (1982: 110) comments: "Fieldwork, and the direct interaction with those whose behaviours and ideas are being studied, is an essential element of modern anthropology".

The influence of the person and interpretations of the anthropological researcher prompted questions about both the reliability and the controllability of anthropological knowledge as soon as 'intensive fieldwork' emerged in the early 20th century (Stocking 2001: 179-183). Where the small scale and historical embedding of individual field research raised questions about its representativeness and replicability, it also led to the development in anthropology as a science of a strong theoretical and epistemological basis, centred on reflection on the creation of knowledge and the relationships between facts and interpretations. This reflection emphasizes the position of the scientist as an essential component of knowledge formation, and is also related to the use of language and style of reporting. Kloos (1984: 116) argued in favour of what he called 'perspectivistic realism', which acknowledges that observations and statements that are based on observations are always made from a certain persuasion or viewpoint. In this sense, anthropology has been an important source of inspiration for many theory-of-science and epistemological debates in past decades in the social sciences and humanities.

Anthropological knowledge is highly dependent on the perspectives of people, who are referred to as 'informants', 'investigated persons', 'resource persons', or 'research participants', depending on the period and the tradition. Anthropologists observe what these people do, listen to what they say, and attempt to understand what they think, which creates very specific ethical dilemmas for anthropology and its practitioners. A condition that is commonly set is that the research subjects are aware that research is being carried out, and of the purpose of that research, which is referred to as *informed consent* (Kloos 1984: 169/70; ASA 1999: 3). This is not a watertight formula, because groups and individuals who are investigated will often fail immediately to comprehend the nature of an anthropological study, or appreciate its medium or long-term impact. Furthermore, seeking consent sometimes runs up against the objection that the study might influence the behaviour or views of those involved, or that awareness of the study could endanger the subjects or the researcher. Various interpretations were given to these ethical dilemmas in the course of the 20th century. For instance, the American Anthropological Association's *Principles of Professional Responsibility* of 1971 disapproved in particular of the kind of clandestine research that was carried out mainly in connection with opposition to various guerrilla movements in Latin America and Southeast Asia.

The closely related second dilemma had to do with whether it was acceptable for anthropologists to reveal the research location and the identities of the people who had provided information. In a

limited number of cases, information of this kind could endanger or embarrass the community or individuals involved if published, and anthropologists have sometimes sought refuge in the use of pseudonyms to avoid this situation. The use of pseudonyms serves “[to enable] the disclosure of as much of the data as possible, while protecting the investigated persons from any adverse effects” (Kloos, 1984: 173).

The professional code created for the Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society under the leadership of André Köbben in 1975 (and which was inspired in part by the American Anthropological Association), provided no clear solution for these dilemmas. The preamble to the code states: “There are now calls for more openness and a need for more privacy, which are two principles that can easily obstruct each other. Depending on the situation, the researcher is obliged to make *a choice*, after weighing up all the relevant factors”. ‘Situational ethics’ of this kind, which require the interests of multiple parties involved in the research (research participants, clients, fellow researchers, governments, and the community at large, not necessarily in that order) to be weighed against each other, are also a feature of the more recent ethical guidelines for anthropological research (ASA 1999: 10).

As is clear from the extract from the Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society professional code, both these dilemmas have direct consequences for the controllability and verifiability of anthropological knowledge. The principle of informed consent and today’s privacy legislation are obliging researchers to protect their interviewees on the one hand, while increasing emphasis is being placed on the obligation to publish research data on the other. This contradiction has additional undertones in anthropology because of the power of negative, ‘colonial’ perceptions in anthropological research and in development policy, alongside the ethical considerations (Axel 2002: 17 ff.). The concern for more valid descriptions has led some contemporary ethnographers to argue for an active assessment of informants’ responses to the ethnographer’s account (Latour 2000; Mosse 2006). Moreover, more value is attached in today’s world to the archiving of field research, which facilitates subsequent controls.

1. The allegations against Mart Bax

Against the background of the dilemmas set out in the introduction, the challenge facing the committee was to assess whether a fellow researcher had committed scientific misconduct in various degrees in the past. Do the allegations made by third parties point to misconduct, or to the differences of opinion that can be seen in any scientific debate? If there has indeed been misconduct, was it deliberate and therefore deceitful, or merely a case of methodological carelessness? Did the researcher approach the dilemmas that are intrinsic to the anthropological discipline and its methods in a scientific and ethically sound manner?

In assessing misconduct, the committee must also take into consideration the diverse repercussions of the various transgressions. Certain extreme forms of misconduct can have far-reaching consequences for the entire discipline. It may even be said in the case of Diederik Stapel, who caused PhD students to process research that was based on 'false' data, that there was an actual scientific 'infection', in that the fraud influenced the work of many researchers. However, misleading conclusions, or data obtained by improper, fraudulent or unethical means, may also lead to infection if they are adopted by fellow researchers, besides which they can harm the society that was investigated. Forms of misconduct that are no less serious, such as plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, and the citation of nonexistent publications, have different consequences, in that what they 'infect' is not scientific content as such, but the relationship with employers, grant providers and fellow academics.

The allegations against Mart Bax are concerned with three issues. There are substantial doubts about two of his studies, in Brabant, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These allegations also have repercussions for anthropology as a whole, because Bax and his publications have helped guide academic discussion, both in his own circle and in that of anthropology in a more general sense. Based on the allegations against Bax, the methodology and ethics of anthropology as a discipline have also been included within the scope of this inquiry. Besides these substantive issues, other questions relate to Bax' publications. The precise allegations come down to the following.

The 'Neerdonk' case and Bax research in Brabant (1974-1989)

Allegations:

- No independent empirical evidence can be found for the existence of the pilgrimage site referred to as 'Neerdonk', and the Elzendal monastery there, nor for the conflict between diocesan and regular clergy surrounding the veneration of St. Gerard that led to a wooden chapel being burned down there in 1879, and the ritual 'humiliation' of a saint.
- The interpretation of the situation of the Roman Catholic church in Brabant (and Limburg) is too unrealistic to be credible.
- Bax' use of pseudonyms in this case, which according to him was at the request of the religious order concerned, precludes verification of this interpretation, and his methodology

is therefore unsound and undesirable.

Medjugorje case (1984-2002)

Allegations:

- Bax describes a 'little war' in Medjugorje in 1992, in which some 140 people died, and there were hundreds of refugees. However, several eye witnesses, local intellectuals and other researchers say this did not happen.
- Bax fabricated or misrepresented the region's history (in particular events from the 12th and 13th centuries, for which no historical sources exist) in order to interpret this 'little war'.
- Bax' use of pseudonyms for this case, which he says was necessitated by the conflict situation in the area, as well as his references to untraceable publications, render verification of this interpretation impossible, and his methodology is therefore unsound and undesirable.

Publications

Bax' publications that are presented in the official VU University Amsterdam databases cannot be found or do not exist.

These three allegations underlie the following three chapters in this report. On this basis the committee has formed its conclusions regarding Bax' work (Chapter 5) and shed light on the meaning of these conclusions for the context in which Bax carried out his scientific work, and the consequences for the anthropological discipline (Chapter 6). Some doubts were also expressed about Bax' fieldwork in Ireland (De Boer 2013), but the committee did not consider this element.

2. 'Neerdonk' and the Brabant study

In his inaugural lecture in 1988, Mart Bax described an area of fallow land around an old church tower in 'Neerdonk' in Brabant, which was said to be the site of a wooden chapel that had burned down in 1879, as punishment from the local patron saint, 'St. Gerard', for the parishioners' abandonment of the ancient ritual performed by the 'Fathers of W.' in their monastery 'Elzendal', in favour of an alternative ritual led by diocesan clergy. "The monks responded with a public ritual humiliation of the relics and images of St. Gerard. They called down misfortune on the unfaithful believers and punished the saint for allowing matters to come to this point" (Bax 1989: 10). The humiliation ritual, which was said definitely to have been performed in 1879 for the ninth time since "the end of the seventeenth [century]" (Bax 1989: 44 n.9),² was an empirical confirmation of Bax' theory of structural and ancient rivalry between monastic and diocesan 'religious regimes' within the Roman Catholic Church in Brabant. He based this theory on research that was started in 1974 together with VU University Amsterdam students in Kempen in Brabant, and that resulted in 1982 in an initial outline of this lengthy political process (Bax 1982). The 'religious regimes' of the Church, and in particular how these were expressed in rituals, and how competing priests attempted to shape rural society in Brabant, were illustrations of the theory of state formation in Norbert Elias' figuration sociology. Bax first published his most important article on this subject ("Religieuze Regimes en Staatsontwikkeling (Religious Regimes and State Development)" in 1985, in *Sociologisch Tijdschrift*. Other Dutch anthropologists and historians expressed doubts about the tenability of Elias' 'civilization theory' at a controversial conference in 1981 on Elias and his 'civilization' concept. After that, Bax was the most prominent Dutch anthropologist who supported figuration sociology (see Blok and Brunt 1982; Brunt 1982; Wilterdink 1982). His research in Brabant was to be largely dominated by Elias' paradigm.

Allegations

Since the first publication about Brabant in 1980, doubts have been expressed about the quality of Bax' field research and historical evidence (Fischer et al. 1981; Sprangers and Tak 1982: 74-5; Leenders 2000). The inaugural lecture of the new Professor of Political Anthropology also failed to convince everyone (Post 1991a; Post 1991b). In 1994, Gerard Rooijackers, a historian and ethnologist, lamented "anthropologists' otherwise praiseworthy pursuit of guaranteeing the anonymity of their sources" after he had found the Neerdonk case to be scientifically unverifiable, even after consulting various informants (1994: 141 n.24). The recent allegations made by Frank van Kolschooten about fabrication of the 'Neerdonk' case are based mainly on the work of Peter Jan Margry, who (in connection with the Pilgrimage Lexicon that he edited) asked Bax and several 'Brabant specialists' in 2003 whether the pilgrimage to St. Gerard in 'Neerdonk' and the story of his humiliation ritual were based on an actual pilgrimage. In view of the repeated, sensational and public nature of the humiliation ritual, the exceptional event concerning the wooden chapel, and the large numbers of pilgrims that Bax reported (in 1880-81 "almost 8000 pilgrims more than before",

² In a later publication Bax refers to "the last decade of the eighteenth century" (Bax 1992: 185 n.6).

Bax 1989: 44) the inability to demonstrate any of these facts in an existing pilgrimage site in Brabant was remarkable. This, linked to the actions of an ancient 'St. Gerard', who cannot be found in the Roman Catholic calendar of saints, led them to conclude that the case had been fabricated.

Bax' point of view

In correspondence with Margry and Jojada Verrips in 2003 and 2005, and again in his reply to the committee, Bax defended himself with various arguments: (a) the requirement of confidentiality insisted on by 'monks', sometimes oriented to the specific request of Bax' key informant at the 'Fathers of W.', not to check the truth or plausibility of the names, events and places provided by this key informant, because these facts could put the monastic order in a compromising position with the diocese of Den Bosch; (b) that compliance with a requirement of this nature is common among anthropologists (at any rate according to the advice said to have been given by Bax' colleague Matthieu Schoffeleers); and (c) the 'anthropological insight' that human perceptions ultimately result from their mutual power relations, which in the Brabant context usually meant that the actual relationships finally remained hidden beneath the "priestly perspective" of the Catholic elite in Brabant, and the dominant diocesan clergy in particular. This would also explain why no one was able to confirm his findings. They were so controversial that the secular clergy did all in their power to render them invisible. The repeated appropriation by the diocese of compromising archive material from the monastic order, rendered independent verification of Bax' version of history impossible; (d) Bax claims that he 'did away with' his archive immediately after his retirement, and discarded all his notes. He was able to retrieve only a few items of documentary evidence relating to his Brabant research; and (e) the use of a style of writing that was inspired by Norbert Elias and Johan Goudsblom, avoiding methodological subtleties in the interests of clarity.

According to Bax, he was obliged to keep secret the identities of his key informant (who died in 1994), the author of the late nineteenth-century diary, and the monastery itself. His key informant made the arrangements for this himself by *contaminating* the research data that Bax used in his various texts. According to Bax, he submitted the drafts to the informant, who might then, for instance, delete a description of the monastery garden, to conceal the monastery's identity from the diocese of Den Bosch. Bax claims that the informant was also the author of a wide variety of elements: the humiliation ritual (which came from a diary of a deceased priest, which the informant related to Bax), the so-called St. Gerard, the wooden chapel, and so on. In the interview with the committee and his subsequent reflections, Bax considered himself as having been instrumental in presenting the attitudes of this key informant, who was not himself at liberty to publish.

Bax' research in a broader context

The broader context of Bax' research in Brabant sheds an important light on Bax' use of sources, his claims about field research, and his related style of publication. For the Brabant case, the committee has studied the history and content of Bax' publications, and has compared several selected cases with other sources. On a confidential basis, the committee was also informed of the identities of the monastery and the key informant on which Bax claims to have based the 'Neerdonk' case. Two

committee members also visited the monastery. Additional insight was obtained in a series of interviews with experts and persons involved. At Bax' request, we are observing and will continue to observe confidentiality regarding any names of people and places if the information is not in the public domain.

Mart Bax embarked on organizing research projects for VU University Amsterdam anthropology students in Kempen in Brabant in 1974; the first student, Aad Nieuwenhuis, carried out research in Duizel in 1975 (Nieuwenhuis 1976: 79; 1979: v). Bax claims that between ten and fifteen students a year from programmes throughout the country carried out research in this context (at any rate between 1975 and 1981), but the committee has succeeded in retrieving only nine names of VU University Amsterdam students from the university thesis database (plus one student from Nijmegen), seven of whom were involved in the Kempen study.

Bax' first publication about Brabant was written together with a student (Bax and Nieuwenhuis 1980), in which hardly anything about holders of religious power was mentioned.³ His second publication (Bax 1982), which was a largely historical study, prompted his colleague Matthieu Schoffeleers to introduce him to a priest-historian, who Bax claims was his 'key informant' in the monastery referred to in the 1989 inaugural lecture about 'Neerdonk'. According to information that Bax himself provided to the committee, this informant was the only source of his data about 'St. Gerard', his humiliation ritual, the pilgrimage, and the conflicts between the monastery concerned and the diocese of Den Bosch. This does not alter the fact that Bax' style of writing, as in the extract at the start of this chapter, presents these data as if they actually happened. The inaugural lecture stated only that the events that were presented came from a diary entry, with additional details from the monastery annals (Bax 1989: 5): not that they had been recounted by a single informant, who had furthermore disguised the facts ("contaminated", as Bax stated in interviews with the committee and a letter to Verrips in 2005). It was impossible for the committee to ascertain whether this information actually came from the 'informant'.

Bax' frequent use of varying pseudonyms is conspicuous in his publications, in particular those with stories about the role of the veneration of saints in the context of the power struggle between diocesan and monastic clergy in Brabant: the first 'patron saint' of 'Roersel' mentioned in connection with the 'Fathers of W.' is St. Donatus (Bax 1984); an English translation of this article refers to this saint 'from Roersel' as 'St. Gerlach' (Bax 1985c); we find a monastery known as 'De Lindenburgh' in 'Wegsel' (Bax 1985d), which changes in an English translation of the same material into 'Elzendal' (Bax 1990a); while the 'St. Gerard' who was venerated in 'Elzendal' monastery in 'Neerdonk' – embellished, in the inaugural lecture, with the humiliation ritual – is relocated again in an English translation of this material to the village of 'Rykhuisen' (Bax 1989; 1992). Bax suggests in a letter to Jojada Verrips in 2005 that all this should be viewed as the shenanigans ("*Spielerei*") of his key informant.

³ This is partly why Sprangers and Tak criticized the fieldwork on which this publication was based in their 'kandidaats' thesis for Radboud University Nijmegen (1982: 74-5).

Bax' students already used pseudonyms before Bax had met his 'key informant' ('Beursel' for Duizel by Nieuwenhuis [1976]; 'Stengelveld' by Ruitenbeek [Bax and Nieuwenhuis 1982: 41 n.11]). Nieuwenhuis later changed his mind (1979). Wildenbeest already noted in his doctoral thesis that anonymization can lead to falsification of sources (Wildenbeest 1983: xii).

Bax sometimes handled historical sources in a misleading, and certainly extremely careless, way. For instance, whereas the inaugural lecture claims that "the young 'building priest', Jean François Marie van Lierop, fled in a frenzy" after the chapel fire in 1879, and that "the current Fathers of W. believe that the priest was transferred to a 'detention parish'" (1989: 30) the same assertion is backed up in the English translation of 1992⁴ with a bibliographical reference: "Frenken 1950" (Bax 1992: 178). However, the article by A.M. Frenken in Bax' bibliography (1992: 186) does not exist, although there is another article by the same author in that edition of *Bossche Bijdragen* (Frenken 1950-51). The title given by Bax does appear to exist in the *Bossche Bijdragen* of 1927-28 (Frenken 1927-28), but that article is concerned mainly with the parish of Helmond in the 15th up to and including the 17th centuries, and makes no reference whatsoever to events in 1879. The incorrect references to Frenken are repeated five times in the article (Bax 1992: 178, 179 [2x.], 182 [2x.]).⁵ None of these substantiations of alleged historical events in 1879 appear in the inaugural lecture of 1989. We do encounter references to the same titles, which are given correctly in the bibliography (but also carelessly quoted in the text and notes) in Bax' first article about the clergy in Brabant (1982: 26, 28 and passim).⁶ When Bax reused that article in a later publication he copied the references to Frenken incorrectly (Bax 1985a), but they definitely do not refer to the sensational events mentioned in the inaugural lecture.

The committee encountered this carelessness frequently: Bax habitually omitted page references when quoting a source. In some articles the reader has to rest content with a reference to earlier publications by Bax himself (1985d), or simply to the bibliography, with no claim that specific

⁴ However, the reference is now to "Jean François Marie van Lieshout" (1992: 178).

⁵ "Frenken 1954" substantiates the assertion that wealthy monasteries bribed officials at the time of the (Protestant) republic (Bax 1992: 179). Whereas Frenken did write four articles in the relevant publication year of *Bossche Bijdragen* (Frenken 1953-55a, 1953-55b, 1953-55- c., 1953-55d), the title cited by Bax was from an earlier publication year (Frenken 1950-51).

⁶ Notes 16 and 21 (Bax 1982: 26, 28) refer, for example, correctly to articles by Frenken about Helmond (1927-28) and about Apostolic Vicar Van Alphen (1950-51). Note 20 (Bax 1982: 28) substantiates a general assertion about protestants who "leased out" wealthy monasteries to parishes by means of an article that referred only to Helmond (Frenken 1950-51). Other notes refer to "Frenken 1953-55" (Bax 1982: notes 32, 34, 35) that is not included in the bibliography and that could refer to any of at least four articles by Frenken (1953-55a, 1953-55b, 1953-55- c., 1953-55d). Strangely enough, a remark about the resistance of the (regular) Norbertines of Berne to the (diocesan) Apostolic Vicar Van Alphen (Bax 1982: 34, note 40) does not refer to Frenken's article about that subject (Frenken 1956-57a) but to another article in the same edition (Frenken 1956-57b). Finally, Bax substantiates the secular clergy's aversion to the regular monks with a long quote from 1795 by a parish priest in Leiden (1982: 51 note 41, with no page reference, and with incorrect page numbering in the bibliography), but omits to state that secular colleagues of this parish priest were unwilling to make the comment public (see van der Loos 1933-34: 358- 9). *Bossche Bijdragen* is a readily investigated example because this source can be accessed through the KU Leuven's LIAS archiving system: (http://aleph08.libis.kuleuven.be:8881/R/PLBUYNFIIYYXEFQUM25NXS9LHACHC9KLUFGLAJTEAFRL4QN4P3X-00724?func=collections&collection_id=1181)

assertions are substantiated by specific sources (1985e; 1987). Bax regularly refers to archives without declaring their whereabouts, and without specifying entry numbers, box files or documents. Only once in the article mentioned above does he give the entry number of a box file in the Breda diocesan archive (1982: 51 n.41) and otherwise restricts himself to references to “various box files” or “files of correspondence” (ibid: 53 n.63; 54 n.79). He refers without acknowledgment to “recently uncovered archive material” (1985f: 10 n.3) and even to his own research in the archive of a noble family (1992: 185 n.8). When the committee asked him about this, he stated that the family did not exist, and that an exact reference of that kind was therefore incorrect. According to Bax, he had been unable to read the diary on which the description of the humiliation ritual was said to have been based, and that he gave as his main source in the foreword to his inaugural lecture. There actually is a diary of this kind in the monastery concerned (in scrawling handwriting and largely in Latin). The committee was unable to find any such description of the humiliation ritual in that diary – which was the only diary known to the monastery .

Similar confusion arises about the claimed field research.⁷ Where previously the work of students had been referred to (Bax and Nieuwenhuis 1982: 40 n.4; 41 n.11; 1983a: 176 n.4), this is no longer the case in the later publications about Brabant. Another problem is that when Bax was asked about this in 2013, he stated repeatedly that the survey he referred to of church and chapel attendance had been performed by students (because, he said, ‘numbers’ were not his strong point), although he has written in various publications that this survey “was performed by the author” (1984: 643 n.1; see also 1985c: 226 n.2; 1986: 120). The students’ theses that have been consulted contain no statistics of this kind. Bax claims furthermore, through the only table he published about this survey, that church attendance halved (between 1974 and 1982, while the director of the Roman Catholic Socio-Ecclesiastical Institute (KASKI) has stated that the decline could have been only 4% a year in this period (i.e. no more than one quarter in six years). He adds that these figures were also available in the period in which Bax published this article – and this despite Bax’ repeated suggestions that he had used data from KASKI (1982: 53 n.69; 1985b: 18 n.8). Neither KASKI nor the Catholic Documentation Centre are aware of any attendance figures being maintained for monastery chapels.⁸ In one publication Bax also states that he investigated 26 chapels in 1976, but only one monastery recorded visitors to them (1986: 120).

Bax’ suggestion that he carried out fieldwork himself in a nunnery (1983a: 176 n.1) is at odds with his statement to the committee that he carried out research only in ‘Elzendaal’ – an exclusively male monastery. Finally, it must be observed in general that the validity that Bax has claimed for the data he used for Brabant as a whole, certainly where based only on research in separate parts of the province (such as the case of poor “sandy soil” peasants in Kempen), violates the anthropological principle of sociocultural representativeness.

⁷ Field research in Brabant, whether by Bax or his students, was said to be started in respectively 1974 (Bax and Nieuwenhuis 1982: 40 n.4), 1976 (1985b: 17), 1977 (1984: n.1), 1978 (1985c: 1 n.6; 1985d: 178), 1979 (1983a: 176 n.1) or 1984 (1989: 5).

⁸ E-mails Bernts (1 July 2013) and Winkeler (3 July 2013) to committee.

The findings of the committee

Since it has been impossible to find supporting evidence or sources, the allegations that the veneration of saints, the humiliation ritual, the wooden chapel and the conflict with the diocese in 'Neerdonk' were fabricated, is highly plausible. It cannot be established whether the story was conceived by Bax' 'key informant', or that Bax himself was the source. Even in the absence of an answer to this question, the committee is able to form a judgment about how Bax reported on his research.

The committee finds it irresponsible and scientifically unacceptable to present information from one key informant, who explicitly altered persons, places and events (the 'contamination' that Bax refers to), as 'truth'. A scientist may be expected to reflect explicitly on the reliability of his sources and to attempt to check their veracity from other sources. Bax' defence draws an analogy with the uncritical recording of, say, the stories of an African medicine man, which the anthropologist concerned finds implausible. The committee is not at all persuaded by this argument: although possibly the most influential study of 'witchcraft' and 'medicine men' in anthropology – Edward Evans-Pritchard's *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (1937) – does take the trouble to set down the native vision without intervention from the anthropologist, Evans-Pritchard nonetheless presented the world view of the Azande witchdoctors primarily as their belief, and not therefore as 'reality'. Second, Evans-Pritchard actually went to great lengths to critically check the reliability of their claims of healing powers. In the interviews with the committee, Bax said that he considered checks of this kind would have been a sign of distrust towards his 'informant', who had taken him into his confidence at the risk of endangering his own position with the diocese. He stated that he had also followed the advice of colleagues to continue with the information from the 'informant'.

The committee is of the opinion that these two arguments can be no excuse for his academic practices. Since furthermore Bax repeatedly told the committee that he was aware that his 'key informant' had twisted the facts, his methods may be deemed misleading, and classed as scientific misconduct. It is not improbable that Bax himself even put together the story (or large parts of it) that he related in his inaugural lecture. This finding is reinforced by Bax' addition of notes to a second version of his article that create the impression of providing evidence of the historical events that he describes, but that in fact have no direct bearing on that history. Bax had previously cited these sources correctly, and would therefore have known what they contained.

Bax' claim that the 'reality' that he uncovered had been hidden from view by the Catholic elite in Brabant, and the 'diocesan regime' in particular, would also appear to be a conspiracy theory that is hard to believe. Bax himself has submitted material that demonstrates that, even in the heyday of the diocesan regime, the Roman Catholic bastion was not hermetically sealed (Bax 1982; 1985a). It would appear from the viewpoint of the discipline of anthropology to be an exaggeration of the work of Frederick Bailey (1969) that Bax had used previously. Bailey thought that human prescriptive frameworks were only a facade that concealed their 'actual' political and strategic intentions. Bax

claims that he has presented a hidden 'reality' in the Roman Catholic Church in Brabant. This power struggle played out through a struggle for archive building, in order to suppress historical evidence. However, the data needed to demonstrate this claim are missing. His rejection of the 'priestly perspective' and 'liturgical scholars' often appears to be mainly a licence to avoid discussion with critical colleagues.

The committee therefore concludes in this connection that the empirical substantiation of Bax' research in Brabant in general is misleading, careless, and ethically questionable.

It is misleading not only because Bax has uncritically repeated a single key informant's words, but also because he knew that this informant was not telling the truth. Historical sources provide no support whatsoever for his version. The fieldwork data that Bax presents are contradicted by better verifiable sources (such as KASKI statistics). Before the committee, Bax withdrew his written claims of having consulted certain archives, or carried out research in a convent, which were therefore misleading at the time of their publication.

The research is careless in that in many cases Bax disregarded the methodological obligations that anthropologists and historians observe in reporting their research (page references; archive entry numbers).

Finally, it is ethically questionable, not only because Bax has categorically presented an image of Catholicism that is based on a limited and dubious empirical basis, but also because of the failure to acknowledge the use of his students' research – assuming the truth of his statement to the committee that his survey material had been collected by his students.

These are serious reservations. The committee has insufficient proof to classify this working method as scientific fraud, even if it remains unacceptable in many respects. To do so would require unequivocal evidence that Bax himself fabricated the humiliation ritual and the survey data, or himself invented the role of the 'informant'. Whatever the case, in accordance with academic standards that also applied at the time he carried out his research, Bax' handling of evidence must be classed as misleading.

3. Medjugorje and the Bosnian study

According to his own annual reports, Mart Bax carried out research from 1985 in the region surrounding Medjugorje in what is now Bosnia and Hercegovina, on the border with Croatia. However, there are also references in his articles to different early years. In the book *Medjugorje: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Rural Bosnia*, which has a compilation of his articles, Bax writes (1995: xv), “Ever since 1983, I have spent a number of weeks there every year. Even in the war years of 1992, 1993 and 1994”. From his first visit to the town he made “one or more lengthy scientific ‘pilgrimages’ to Medjugorje every year” (1995: xvii). The fieldwork was therefore not carried out in one continuous period, but in annual visits to the region. The violence broke out in the region in approximately 1991, but Bax had been equally unable to speak openly about his research in his earlier studies. He usually solved that problem by saying that he was interested in “the history of the region”. Whatever the case, according to Bax it was dangerous to carry out research in the region. He writes that research material (notes, photos) had been taken from him in threatening circumstances on two separate occasions. Bax again discarded his research material from this fieldwork on retiring.

Bax became fascinated with the region because of a cult of the Virgin Mary that developed swiftly after a group of local children reported a Marian apparition in 1981. Since then young people have acted as ‘visionaries’ who convey messages from Mary. The village soon became a pilgrimage site, attracting tens of thousands of visitors every year. Bax compiled his articles about this phenomenon in the book from 1995 mentioned above. The book, which was published by VU University Press in Amsterdam, may be considered to be one of the most significant of Bax’ international publications.

In various chapters he discusses the historical background and rise of the cult of the Virgin Mary, the role of the visionaries, and the changes in social, economic and political relationships that the cult has brought. He suggests in the last empirical chapter of his book, which has been reprinted several times, that these developments led to fierce local violence in a ‘little war’ in 1992, resulting in 140 deaths in this small village of 3000 residents, and causing hundreds of people to flee. Bax writes in the introduction to his book: “Blood vengeance, vendettas and other forms of private justice were ‘normal’ phenomena that regularly recurred and barely seemed to be alleviated by the pacifying activities of either church or state” (xvii). In line with Elias’ civilization theory, he refers in this connection to a process of ‘barbarization’. The term is used without a question mark in the title of his article, but he admits at the end of the article that this term from Norbert Elias’ theory is hardly applicable: “Civilization and barbarization would seem to be such closely linked or interwoven aspects of processes that it is difficult to stipulate where one stops and the other starts” (1995: 115).

Criticism/allegations

The book has been criticized on several levels. Local authors have pointed out errors in many names, words in Croatian or Bosnian, and other local details. On a more general level, they are dissatisfied with his account of the history of the region (Zanic 1998; Jolic 2013).

It has been argued from many sides that the 'little war' that Bax describes, with some 140 fatalities and hundreds of refugees, did not take place. This is also said to refute the image he gives of a primitive and inherently violent community.

The method and presentation of the ethnographic research (in particular disguising the identities of people and places) renders it impossible to verify certain assertions. There are also substantial doubts about certain sources quoted by Bax.

This criticism is mainly levelled by people with detailed local knowledge. The first serious criticism was from Ivo Zanic, a political scientist at the University of Zagreb, who discussed Bax' findings in a lengthy and balanced article in his piece "War and Peace in Hercegovina" from 1998. The journalist Richard De Boer later brought together a number of points of criticism based on ideas from other sources and on his own research. One of his informants was the Franciscan priest Robert Jolic, who subsequently wrote a biting critique of Bax' work. Although some of this criticism may be viewed as a defence of Marian veneration and the regional role of the Franciscan order, which Bax presented in an extremely negative light, many of his accusations coincide with those of Zanic. The committee had a Dutch translation of this piece made.

In his long and well thought-out review of Mart Bax' book, Ivo Zanic of the University of Zagreb was the first to provide a clear critique of Mart Bax' work. Some points are concerned with differences of interpretation surrounding the recent history of the region, but others have a more direct bearing on Bax' research and methodology. Under the heading "Lost in time", Zanic comments on some "banal, and therefore hardly understandable mistakes" in Bax' work. These mistakes were concerned with the geography of the area, historical facts and local terminology. The same criticism comes from Robert Jolic, who accuses Bax of consistently misspelling names and distorting historical facts. According to Jolic, many of these errors originate in Bax' poor command of the language. He writes: "Even people with the most superficial knowledge of Croatian will see without difficulty that Bax did not have the vaguest idea of the Croatian language".

According to both critics, some errors have serious consequences for the historical interpretation of the area. For instance, Zanic points to the incorrect observation that the first bishop of Mostar was 'Hungarian', wrongly suggesting an ethnic dimension to the religious conflict in the area. Jolic points out that Bax gave incorrect dates and interpretations of numerous relatively minor events in the Roman Catholic church. His suggestion is that Bax consistently presented the church's position in a more negative light than his data justify.

Zanic's greatest objection is to Bax' interpretation of the post 1918 period. Bax follows the British journalist, Misha Glenny, who explained the conflict in ex-Yugoslavia on the basis of ancient tribal differences. Referring to Glenny (1992), Bax places great emphasis on the blood feuds that he says dominated the history of the area. Bax' critics deny the existence of blood feud, in particular in this part of Hercegovina. They accuse Bax of having no evidence whatsoever for his assertion. According to Bax, an informant told him of sixty cases of blood feud in Medjugorje between 1963 and 1980

that had come to court. Jolic, who lives in the area, says he is aware of not a single case. According to him, this is no surprise, because blood feud is not part of Croatian culture. He calls Bax a man 'obsessed' with clans and blood feud. Zanic reproaches Bax for believing dubious sources without question, while ignoring existing 'first-class' literature. In one outspoken passage he writes: "Bax's hosts wove long stories and boasted about non-existent guerrillas, and he, uncritical and uninformed as he is, blindly believed anything they said. One could call it a textbook example of what emerges when local wishful thinking and an ignorant field-worker meet."

This is not the place to pass judgment on this debate about this region's recent history. Zanic's and Jolic's criticism has been presented here in relatively great detail because it is based on criticism of Bax' fieldwork. The doubts about Bax' fieldwork, assessment of which is hampered by his use of pseudonyms, are an important component of the allegations made against his work. Jolic in particular expresses anger about the impossibility of verifying Bax' sources. His conclusion is: "Bax always closes the door behind him, so that his data cannot be checked, and his informants cannot be identified. In fact they do not exist: they are figments of Bax' imagination". He also has grave doubts about the Croatian sources and archives that Bax claims to have studied. Bax writes that certain insights come from his research in the "provincial archive of the Franciscans" in Duvno. This town has only the monastery and parish archives (the provincial archive is in Mostar), which Jolic himself catalogued only in 2007. The same is true of the Franciscan archive in Humac, which Jolic first made accessible to the public only in 2012.

His criticism of sources has recently been developed further in a lengthy article by journalist Richard De Boer in the newspaper *de Volkskrant*, which focuses on the 'little war' that Bax claims to have discovered. Doubts about the existence of this little war had already been expressed from various sides. For example, the theologian Thomas Müller reported on the Kath.Net website, based on his own visits to Medjugorje in 1994, that he had found "*keine Anhaltspunkte für diesen 'Kleinen Krieg'*".⁹ Based on investigative journalism in the region, De Boer examined several of Bax' assertions. Although his investigation certainly cannot provide the definitive answer, he too observes several incongruities regarding the large number of deaths that are said to have occurred in 1992. No one in the entire region around Medjugorje could be found who was able to confirm a large number deaths in that year. De Boer also observed that records of Citluk that Bax claimed had been burned, could be consulted with no problem at all. Based on his investigation De Boer also expressed grave doubts about Bax' field research.

Bax' point of view

In his reply to the committee, Bax has acknowledged that the number of victims of the 'little war' was incorrect. He writes in a letter of 18 November 2012 (that was posted without his permission on

⁹ 'Den Gegnern von Medjugorje scheint jedes Mittel Recht! Ein Kath.Net-Gastkommentar des Theologen Thomas Müller zu einem Interview von Professor Manfred Hauke in der Tagespost von 2. Februar.' Kath.Net 18-2-2010, 08:20. (<http://www.kath.net/news/25656> most recently accessed 3-9-2013). See also Norbert Mappes-Niediek's critique 'Der Stammeskrieg von Medjugorje', Der Standard, Printausgabe, 27.8.2008 (<http://derstandard.at/1219725070225> most recently accessed 3-9-2013)

the *de Volkskrant* website) that he “discovered” his mistake (“an incorrectly interpreted copy-sheet that I was briefly able to inspect in the course of the interview”) “and received an explanation of it on a subsequent visit to the region”. He used similar terms in a letter in response to a draft of Richard De Boer’s article. He called it an ‘unfortunate mistake’ that he had been put on the wrong track by an informant, which caused him to present information about a massacre in World War II as if it had happened in 1992. He actually refers in this response to ‘several dozen’ victims in the early 1990s.

In a letter to De Boer, Bax explained why there was never a rectification: “Because there was no second edition of the work (his book), so there was no opportunity to do so”. He stated that he had made a start on an article that rectified this mistake. “Unfortunately it did not materialize”. He repeated this argument later to the committee. When asked why he did not rectify this ‘mistake’ in later work, he referred to an attempt to add a ‘long footnote’ to a reprint of the article concerned in a book edited by Joel Halpern and David Kideckel that was due to be published in 2000.

Bax told the committee that the editors of the book have rejected this footnote. He added that it is now clear that the death toll in 1991-2 was even lower than he first thought. There were, so he had been informed, ‘a few’ victims. He repeatedly explained that this ‘mistake’, however much he regretted it, was a mere detail, and did not affect the core of his work. He expressed this as follows in his statement of defence against the committee’s preliminary conclusions: “A distinction must be drawn between a mistake/numbers and a detailed empirical description, based on interviews; a description that is actually true.” (emphasis by Bax).

In his various reports and responses, Bax also emphasized the need for confidentiality and the often substantial problems involved in checking information in the war situation in which he carried out his research. He often had to rely on information from informants, which he found hard to verify. There was also a language problem. Bax had only a very limited command of the local Serbo-Croatian dialect and sometimes had difficulty understanding exactly what people were saying to him. He did attempt to check that in later interviews. It was hard to render visible the doubt and uncertainty that these factors entailed, and to discuss this in the articles he wrote, without making them ‘unreadable’. “The point is to produce a composition that is readable.”

Bax wrote a report to the committee about his fieldwork in Medjugorje, and in the interviews he gave additional details about the identity of his informants. For example, two German-speaking key informants were extremely important to him, in particular because he was able to speak to them again every year. As stated above, Bax no longer has any research material or written notes of these or other interviews. He told the committee in the first interview that he still had two manuscripts in a ‘safe’, which he might develop further at a later stage. The committee was extremely interested in these manuscripts, but in the next interview Bax stated that the term ‘safe’ had been wrongly interpreted, and that he was no longer able to find the manuscripts.

The findings of the committee

There can be no doubt that field research in Bosnia and Hercegovina in the 1980s and 1990s will have been extremely difficult and challenging. Not only was it a period full of conflict and violence, but it was also one of radical political and geographical change. These changes were hard to fathom, and even with hindsight gave rise to strongly contrasting interpretations and views on the history. As in many post-conflict societies, there was a struggle with great intensity and urgency surrounding the history and recollections.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that Mart Bax' fieldwork does not demonstrate watertight evidence on all points, and that his conclusions are not always easy to verify. It also goes without saying that his description of the situation in Medjugorje and his interpretations of the political and religious conflicts have met with dissent and argument. The complex processes of change in the region in a relatively recent period have inevitably given rise to different and sometimes opposing views. Some of Zanic's criticism can certainly be deemed part of an academic debate. The same can be said of Robert Jolic's critique. Furthermore, some of Jolic's critical tone was definitely prompted by Bax' harsh criticism of the Franciscan order. In both cases, however, the criticism was also supported by a large quantity of extremely detailed examples and arguments that raise questions about the methodology and interpretation in Bax' work .

In the light of these questions, the committee notes how heavily Bax has relied in his scientific interpretations of the region on a limited number of foreign journalistic sources. The work of Misha Glenny (1992) plays a major part in Bax' emphasis on blood feud and the historical basis of the regional conflict. This work was a general history written immediately after the start of the conflict. Bax also referred the committee on several occasions to a book by Richard West (1995) in support of his ideas. This too was a fairly superficial general history of the area. The use of this kind of source is not culpable, but it is striking in the light of his frequent dismissal of criticism on his own work with the argument that it came from 'non-anthropologists'. Furthermore, experts have observed that Bax has ignored regional debates about the Bosnian conflict. This point gains in importance in view of the far-reaching conclusions Bax attaches to them, regarding the nature of the Bosnian community, its history, and the possible application of Norbert Elias' ideas to the region. As in the Brabant study, it is also striking that certain sources appear in reprints of articles that were not cited in earlier versions of the same article.¹⁰

It is hard to make definite statements about the extremely complex situation on a local level in

¹⁰ For example, Bax 2002:76, a republication of Chapter 8 in Medjugorje (Bax 1995), has a new footnote 16: "At that stage I was advised to leave the village, which I did. As a result, I could not systematically observe 'in the field' how the 'little war' intertwined with the dynamics of everyday life in Medjugorje – a subject which deserves systematic attention, as has been demonstrated in a fascinating way by Price (sic) (1992) and Povrzanovic (1992). What follows is primarily based on long and frequent discussions with members of the three refugee groups in Germany, and on later observations and interviews on the spot." There are no further references to these two authors. They are listed in the bibliography as: I. Prica, 'Notes on ordinary life in war', and M. Povrzanovic, 'Culture and fear. Everyday life in war' both included in a compilation by Cale Feldman et al. (eds.), *Fear, Death and Resistance – an Ethnography of War: Croatia 1991-1992*. Zagreb: X-Press, 1992.

Medjugorje without detailed investigation. However, the committee has substantial doubts about the nature and the reporting of Bax' fieldwork. The committee understands the frustration of local academics who have complained that his work is impossible to verify. It is also remarkable that the committee has been unable to find any of Bax' colleagues or PhD students who are able to provide additional information about Bax' fieldwork, or who accompanied him in the field. Moreover Bax did not enter into dialogue with local researchers. This lack of clarity about his fieldwork is all the more compelling in that Bax describes events and draws conclusions that regional authorities deem to be implausible, to say the least. Bax has described processes and conflicts that would be considered complex in any society. He did so on the basis of a limited knowledge of the language and brief periods of field research. This is a risky method of research, which is vulnerable to criticism, certainly in the absence of any supporting evidence for his descriptions and interpretation. Also conspicuous is the apparent ease with which fieldwork data are modified in later publications, where the timing of the research is always left vague, or varies.

This aspect is abundantly clear in Bax' description of a 'little war', which is said to have caused 140 deaths and hundreds of refugees in a relatively small community. Bax himself has now acknowledged that the numbers he gave were incorrect. He has given as the cause of this 'mistake' a misunderstanding about information from an informant. He regrets that he was subsequently unable to rectify this mistake.

Leaving aside the question of whether it is right for an anthropologist simply to take such dramatic information as true – and to present it as historical fact – based on information from a single informant, there are also other problems with this account.

The first is that Bax embellishes the account of the little war with many details, events, names and pseudonyms that are said to explain the massacre and violence. For example, he starts his article with: "On the early morning of 27 May, 1992, Ljerka Sivric saw something horrible in the neighbouring yard of her father's brother Djure. Three human bodies, the feet tied to a pipe and the hands behind their back, were suspended upside down, immersed up to the shoulders, in the partially demolished cistern" (Bax 1995: 101). The rest of the article is packed with all manner of other details. If the information about the 140 deaths was incorrect, the committee cannot conclude otherwise than that Bax added these details in the process of writing the article in order to enhance the realism of the alleged 'bloodbath'. Instead of critical reflection on his analysis being based on a very limited number of sources, or even, in the case of the number of fatalities, one single source, the account suggests that there was extensive empirical substantiation, apparently intended to persuade the reader of the incontrovertible truth of the events.

Second, not only did De Boer and Jolic point out several other demonstrable inaccuracies in Bax' account, they also highlighted improbable interpretations. As in his work in Brabant, Bax' interpretations were presented very firmly as fact, whereas it frequently transpired in his interviews with the committee that they were mere assumptions, or hard-to-prove interpretations. Every researcher is confronted with stories and information that are impossible to verify immediately, but

that nonetheless have to be used to help support certain insights. It is one of the principles of science that these doubts and uncertainties must be made explicit and explained as clearly as possible. Bax would appear to have systematically failed to do just that. The argument he put forward to the committee had to do with clarity. Clarity and a flowing argument are indeed important in most arts subjects and the social sciences, but in the committee's view this can be no excuse for careless or misleading methods and interpretations.

Regarding the rectification of the numbers that were revealed to be incorrect, Bax has stated that he had come to understand fairly soon after his book was published that his information about the bloodbath and the numbers of victims in Medjugorje were based on a misunderstanding, and that he was then no longer able to correct this 'mistake'. The committee finds this statement to be implausible. The committee made enquiries with Halpern and Kideckel regarding Bax' explanation of a rejected footnote, but they were unable to confirm this account either from memory or after consulting their archive. Other correspondence available to the committee also shows that Bax made no attempt whatsoever to rectify the error. On the contrary, he consciously allowed the error to be propagated in other publications. For instance, when Willem Campschreur, the author of the section on Bosnia and Hercegovina in the Royal Tropical Institute's country series, sent Bax a text about the little war for confirmation of the correctness of his account, Bax' reply was somewhat denigrating: "It is a rather dull piece: a fairly factual list of events. Readers will wonder about its relevance, but will receive no answer, because you have deprived them of all further information on this point." Within the framework of this inquiry, it is noteworthy that Bax also informs the editor: "It is important in your account for you to make a clear distinction between people's opinions and perceptions, and empirical facts". However, he did not inform the editor that the numbers of deaths and refugees that Campschreur had taken from his book were incorrect.¹¹

Bax clearly admitted his mistake to others only after Van Kolschooten asked critical questions about it in 2012. He furthermore reissued the article concerned three times in 2000 and 2002, with a different title each time, and without amending the incorrect numbers. In view of his knowledge of the pertinent error in a crucial element of the article – with possibly far-reaching effects for the community involved – this cannot be called anything other than serious scientific misconduct.

¹¹ Letter M.M.G. Bax to W. Campschreur, 16 June 2002.

4. Bax' publications

In research into the events in Medjugorje that Mart Bax' described in his publications, the journalist Richard De Boer discovered that some of Bax' publications could not be found. He came across the titles of these publications in the Metis database, in which researchers of VU University Amsterdam (and other universities) register their publications. This is one of the factors that prompted the committee to further investigate Bax' research output. The second factor was Bax' unsatisfactory explanation for being unable to rectify his mistake about the 'little war', and the lack of clarity about exactly when the fieldwork in Brabant and Bosnia had taken place. This led to the compilation of the most complete list possible of publications that did, and did not, materialize. Within the time available, the committee was unable to investigate plagiarism in Bax' work, and this report accordingly makes no comment on this aspect. Nonetheless, the findings gave cause to investigate self-plagiarism.

The committee traced 161 titles in all, and this analysis discusses 154 of these. The committee used the following sources in compiling the list: the actual publications, personnel file, professorial file, evaluation of the endowed chair 1993-1997, endowed chair file, annual departmental research reports, three self-evaluations of the research of the Cultural Anthropology department between 1990 and 2005, PiCarta, Web of Knowledge, Web of Science, and Microsoft Academic Search. Of the 161 traced titles, at least 64 did not materialize for a variety of reasons.¹² The committee found self-plagiarism in the 92 publications that definitely exist (ranging from grey literature to monographs and reviews of others' work), in particular after 1995. Other problems also emerged, which are discussed further below.

A concise summary of Bax' academic career is given first in order to outline the context of this analysis, Bax' defence, and the committee's conclusions.

Bax' scientific career

Bax' scientific research is oriented to three regions, 'Ireland' (c. 1968- c.:1978), 'Brabant' (1973-1989), 'Bosnia and Hercegovina' (1985-1999 – with earlier fieldwork in Serbia, around 1964), and an overall theme: 'anthropological methods and theory development'. In the 1980s, this latter theme was oriented towards the theory of religious regimes, with which Bax acquired international renown. Bax' theoretical ideas were often explained on the basis of fieldwork situations from the research region in which he operated at the time. Bax was never very precise in the specification of fieldwork

¹² The existence of five publications cannot be established with certainty. A source for the nonexistent publications was the Metis database, in which VU University Amsterdam researchers register their published work. Metis was introduced after 2000; Mart Bax retired in 2002. The publications registered in the former OZIS database were normally transferred to Metis. At that time, academics did not yet enter their own publications in either OZIS or Metis, and there was no strict validation protocol. The current Metis system managers have established that the data entered in Bax' case were not validated (e-mail to the committee dated 10-7-2013). Being unvalidated and unconfirmed in other sources, the committee disregards untraced titles that appear only in Metis. This applies to seven titles, all said to be concerned with publications in 2000 (See Appendix 3).

data. The fieldwork periods were not consecutive, excepting the doctoral research in Ireland.

All the research, except the doctoral research in Serbia, took place in the context of VU University Amsterdam, where Bax was employed from 1965. He was awarded his PhD in 1973 by the University of Amsterdam under J.F. Boissevain, as a result of which VU University Amsterdam promoted him to *Hoofd Wetenschappelijk Medewerker* (the equivalent of assistant professor or Researcher). In 1986 (during the preparations for hosting an international conference) promotion followed *Universitair Hoofddocent* (the equivalent of associate professor or Lecturer).¹³ After a career interruption in 1987-1988 because of illness, an appointment followed on 1 September 1988 as endowed professor of 'Political anthropology, with a focus on religious power formation and processes of state formation in particular'. The proposal to create this chair, which was specifically meant for Bax, expressed the importance of the position to VU University Amsterdam as follows: "For the near future, in which programme review committees will descend upon us and negotiation may be needed with other universities about further collaboration on education, but especially on research (including trainee research assistant positions), an endowed chair would (...) strengthen this department's position." In the explanatory notes to its recommendation, the advisory appointment committee also pointed to the importance to VU University Amsterdam of retaining Bax, adding that Bax had hitherto been reluctant to accept a professorship elsewhere, because he was put off "by the administrative burden that a regular position generally entails." The chair was instituted by the Vrije Universiteitsfonds (personal professorship), the curatorial panel of which comprised J. Tennekes (chair), J.M. Schoffeleers, and H.U.E. Thoden van Velzen. Schoffeleers was succeeded on the panel in 1993 by P. Kloos. Bax held the chair until his honourable discharge upon his retirement on 31-8-2002, after which the chair was discontinued because of its personal character.¹⁴

As a fresh full professor, Bax formed a centre of his own in 1990, which was called the *Centre for the Study of Religion and Politics*, but this was to be short lived. It was not mentioned again after 1993. Bax carried out research at VU University Amsterdam between 1984 and 2000 within the following frameworks.

1984-1989 Programme *Religion, Power and Development*, programme director J.W. Schoolr.

Subprogramme 2.1 (Bax): Catholic regimes, state formation and rural societies in the southern Netherlands

1989-1994 Programme *Religion, Power & Development*, programme director P. Kloos (1984.

Subprogramme 1 (Bax): *Religious Regimes and State Formation*.

1995-1999 Programme *Global Culture and Local Identities*, programme director J. Tennekes

Subprogramme 1 (Bax) *State Formation, Regimes and Policy Intervention*

The research was reorganized after 2000. Bax was mentioned in the self-evaluation report of 2001-2006, but the subprogrammes had then been discontinued

¹³ [Translator's note: these terms are not real equivalents, since in the hierarchical Dutch system there is no automatic promotion to full professor possible in a tenure track appointment.]

¹⁴ Information and quotes from personnel file of MMG Bax, and Professorial file of MMG Bax, VU Executive Board Archive and Old Archive.

In this research context, Bax was first or second supervisor of six PhD students: 1989 Meijers, 1989 Romijn (2x Bax/Tennekes/Droogers), 1992 Spier (Bax/Goudsblom), 1996 Hanken (Bax/Meijers), 1999 Duijzings (Bax/Thoden), 2003 Schukking (Meijers/Bax). It has been established that Bax was not a member of the Postdoctoral Institute for Sociology (later the Amsterdam School of Social Science Research, ASSR), to which sociologists and anthropologists of the University of Amsterdam, Leiden University, Utrecht University and VU University Amsterdam were affiliated. According to him he was a member, but not an active member, because VU University Amsterdam allowed him insufficient time.

Various conferences at VU University Amsterdam and elsewhere in the Netherlands played an important part in Bax' scientific career:

- Dec. 1979 Conference on Religion and Religious Movements (VU), co-chaired by Gellner and Wolf; proceedings Gellner 1985 and Wolf 1984.
- 17-18 Dec. 1981 Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society conference on 'Civilization theories and civilization processes', University of Amsterdam (see Blok and Brunt 1982; Brunt 1982; Wilterdink 1982).
- Aug. 1983 'Leadership and social change', XIth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Vancouver (see Bax 1983b).
- 1985 Annual conference of the American Anthropological Association, Washington DC.
- 22-26 June 1987 International conference on *Religious Regimes and State Formation* (VU); proceedings Wolf 1991 and Bax, Kloos, Verger 1992.
- Dec. 1990 International conference on *Power & Prayer: Political and Religious Processes in Past & Present* (VU). Proceedings Bax & Verger 1992.

According to the annual reports of the holder of the chair¹⁵, Bax then actively participated in preparations for new conferences outside the Netherlands (1991-92 'Conference on Yugoslavia' Canterbury; 1992-93 'Nation Building and State Formation' Dubrovnik; 1993-1994 'Violence and Civilization' Bielefeld) but for a variety of reasons these conferences did not go ahead, or he took no part.

Finally, Bax reported in his annual reports that he was actively engaged from 1993-94 in the field of postwar reconstruction in former Yugoslavia. "Opportunities for research (and possibly a permanent position) arose unexpectedly when the UNO strongly advocated help in the postwar reconstruction of Mostar and district in the west of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Entirely contrary to his intentions, the holder of the chair became involved in what is known as Applied Anthropology!" (Annual Report for 1993-1994). From 1996-97, according to him, he was a member of the coordination team of the

¹⁵ In full: 'Beknopt verslag activiteiten bijzonder hoogleraar politieke antropologie over de periode september 19xx tot en met augustus 19xx' (Concise report of the activities of the endowed professor of political anthropology for the September 19xx – August 19xx period, inclusive'. These reports, signed by Mart Bax, are in the archive of the Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds and kept in the 'Oud Archief' of VU University Amsterdam.

Srebrenica inquiry conducted by the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation/NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (1996-97 Annual Report and further); and from 1998-99 he became 'special advisor on Bosnia-Herzegovina to the war crimes tribunal in The Hague'. About this he said: "As a result of this, a certain tension may arise with the normal research work. Ethical, humanitarian and general social considerations justify this relative shift in activities and research output." (Annual Report 1998-99).

Findings with respect to the publications

The committee oriented its investigation in the first instance to the publications. The list of over 150 publications that the committee assumes here (see note 12) is subdivided in Table 3.1 into Bax' research priorities. The list includes book reviews, grey literature that is included in a university library and therefore also in PiCarta, including reissues, and including co-authored forewords etc. that were published separately. (See Appendix 3 of this report).

Subject	materialized	not materialized*
Ireland (1973-1981)	11/2**	
Brabant(1980-1991)	22/2	5 (1982-1990)
Bosnia and Herzegovina (1989-2002)	36/1	45*** (1991-2002)
Anthropology (1973-1999)	23	7 (1982-1992)
Total	92/5	57

* The years stated after the publications that did not materialize give the period in which they were supposed to have been published.

** The number following the "/" is the number of possibly existing publications; as yet we have been unable to find them.

*** Excluding the seven unvalidated titles from Metis

The most conspicuous detail is the number of publications that definitely did not materialize. Disregarding two Irish publications that could not be found, the first nonexistent publication was from 1982. Bax' CV as included in the file from 1987 at the time of his appointment as endowed professor refers to a nonexistent 'Brabant' article in the *Journal of Peasant Studies* Vol. 9(4). This CV refers to another three nonexistent publications from the 1980s.

These are also referred to in the personnel file that was routinely used at the time in the reviews of VU University Amsterdam staff. The committee also found nonexistent publications in the '*Verlagen 1987 en programma's 1988* (Reports for 1987 and programmes for 1988)' submitted by H. Tennekes to the secretary of the Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies department, Scholten.¹⁶ This report includes 18 of Bax' publications from 1984-1987, of which two could not be found, and two definitely do not exist. It would appear that the incorrect declaration of publication output started in 1987.

From 1990, the first year of Bax' professorship, and then almost entirely in the context of the Bosnian research, the volume of publications that did not materialize increases by 3 to 8 titles a year. The evaluation report of the second term of Bax' endowed professorship (1993-1997), which was

¹⁶ Reports for 1987 and programme for 1988, in Old archive; file 1. VCW – research programme 1987-1988

written with a view to extension, includes a list of publications with 39 titles, 25 of which were never published. The most recent self-evaluation of anthropological research at VU University Amsterdam with any connection to Bax' work (2000-2005) refers to two publications about Bosnia by Bax: an article said to have been published in *Current Anthropology*, 42(4), 51-62 and a chapter in a volume published by Oxford UP entitled *Marian Apparitions Crosscultural*. Neither title ever materialized. Viewing the publications that did not materialize in their totality, they include articles, translations of claimed own articles into other languages, such as Croatian or German, and collaborative book projects. For instance, the list includes a book entitled *Nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe* (Michigan: Odena Press), compiled by Andrei Simic, and with a contribution from Bax on pp. 60-71. This book does not exist, and Andrei Simic has informed the committee that he never considered, or had contact with Bax about, a project of this kind. We restrict this part of our report to these examples, and refer further to Appendix 3.

The publications that were published include conspicuously many republications of the same article, usually with a different title and sometimes with a different introduction, concluding remarks, or acknowledgments stating the fieldwork period, and thanking the informants and reviewers. For instance, the eight chapters of the book *Medjugorje* (Bax 1995), in addition to the book publication, were published separately in at least 27 articles, including eight original Dutch versions of the separate chapters and epilogue of the book, eight English translations of these Dutch articles, four (one of which twice) included in another edited volume, and seven published in a different journal with an almost identical but different title. In 1998 the *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* carried a new article about Medjugorje (Bax 1998), a translation of which was later included in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (Bax 1999) and again a year later in *Ethnologica Europaea* (Bax 2000). The committee notes that almost the entire 'Bosnian' publication output (36 articles including reviews and grey literature) was based on nine different 'original' articles (see Appendix 4).

This form of 'recycling' started as early as the Brabant study. For instance, the 'Uprising on the Lindenburgh' article first appeared in Dutch in the *Sociologische Gids* vol. 32, issue 3, pp. 178-195 (Bax 1985d), and in English in *The Netherlands Journal of Sociology* vol. 22, issue 2, pp. 130-144 (Bax 1986b), after which entire sections were reused in Bax' contribution to Peter Kloos' edited volume, *True Fiction* (1990a). The article 'Religious Regimes and State Formation: Towards a Research Perspective', *Anthropological Quarterly* 60 (1): 1-11 (Bax 1987; which, with explicit consent, was later reprinted as an introduction to the conference compilation edited by Eric Wolf [1991: 7-27]), is an almost literal translation, with minor additions, of an article in *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 12 (1): 22-47 (Bax 1985e), and so on. All in all, we have traced the 'Brabant' publication output (25 articles including inaugural lecture, polemics, grey literature and reviews) to approximately seven original articles. Only in three cases (Bax 1988: 112; 1991a; 1991b) was there an explicit reference to earlier publication of the same material.

As in the Brabant study, changes were made to parts of articles from the research in Bosnia in translated or republished form, without further explanation. For instance, Chapter 3 of *Medjugorje*

(Bax 1995) refers to the visionary who had initially (Bax 1990b) been called Mirjana, as Marijana. The years also change. Whereas the article from 1990 dates the events and the related statement by 'Father Krsto' as 1987 and 1988, this changes to 1988 and 1989 in the book from 1995.

A final problem, again comparable with the findings for the Brabant study, is Bax' references to his own publications. The committee checked the bibliographies in books and articles with the greatest possible care. At first the committee found no references to work that had never been published. At most there were perhaps unjustifiably many references to 'forthcoming' publications. However, the references to his own work in the bibliography are notoriously careless. An example will suffice here. Four of the seven references to his own work in the three reissues of Chapter 8 of *Medjugorje* (Bax 2000a; 2000b; 2002) that were discussed above in Chapter 3 are inaccurate. The errors range from a wrong year, or journal issue, or page, to the announcement of a 'forthcoming' article that was never to be published.¹⁷

Other scientific activities

Finally, in the CV and the self-evaluation reports, the committee encountered various claimed scientific achievements that are very probably incorrect, the most important being:

- the claim to have graduated *cum laude* from the University of Amsterdam (Source: CV, repeated in the VU University Amsterdam press release on his appointment as professor). This should have been 'with merit'.
- Fellowship in Princeton (Source: Professorial file – concise report on professorship 1990-1991). Bax has stated that this did not happen.
- Receipt by Bax of the 1992 *Annual Award of the Scandinavian Ethnology Society* for research into European ethnology (Source: self-evaluation report 1990-1995; concise report professorship 1990-91). Nothing is known about this, and Bax did not attend the conference concerned.
- Award to Bax of government funding for a Srebrenica inquiry of the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies; role as one of the coordinators of NIOD's Srebrenica research project. NIOD has no knowledge of this.
- Invitation as Visiting Fellow at the US Institute for Peace (Cornell) with a six-month USIP Jennings scholarship (concise report professor 1993-1994). Invitation not confirmed. Visit did not take place.
- Extensive BBC interview about *Medjugorje book* (concise report professor 1995-1996). Cannot be found.
- Reviews of *Medjugorje book* in *Times Literary Supplement* and *New York Review of Books*

¹⁷ This refers to: 'Priests and Warlords. The Dynamics of Processes of State Deformation and Reformation in Rural Bosnia Hercegovina.'

(concise report professor 1995-1996). Cannot be found in the digital archives of these journals.

- Documentary about *Medjugorje book* by Sydney University, broadcast on Australian state television (concise report professor 1996-1997). Not confirmed.
- EU funding of *NLG* 40,000 for a 'Rebuilding the Mostar Area' project (Annual Report 1994; Annual Report 1996-99; self-evaluation report 1995-2000). Not confirmed.
- Honorary membership of the Croatian Society of Anthropologists and Ethnologists, State University of Zagreb (1997) (self-evaluation report 1995-99, Annual Report 1998). No organization with this name could be found.
- Award for the 'best publication on gender' from the Dutch Association for Social and Cultural Sciences, 1998 self-evaluation report 1995-2000). There is nothing about this in the "awards" section of the *NVMC* and *SISWO* journal, *Facta* in the publication year 1998.
- Pittsburgh University Annual Book Prize for *Medjugorje: Religion, politics, and violence in rural Bosnia*. (self-evaluation report 1995-2000, p. 59 and concise report professor). Not confirmed by the university.

Bax' reply

Bax' reply concerning references to publications that had not appeared, and the unverifiable, or demonstrably incorrect, achievements and honours, is simple: this information was not provided by him. Bax claims that he was not involved in drawing up his CV for the appointment of endowed professor. He had been absent through illness for some considerable time (Bax himself refers, probably in error, to 1985/86; the personnel archive shows that the years concerned were 1987-88), and his superior had said that he was able to take care of this formality himself. Furthermore, according to his own account, Bax had no part whatsoever in 1995, 2000 and 2005 in drafting his department's internal research evaluations. He has never seen the reports and he has no recollection of ever speaking to a programme review committee.

Bax' own explanation for the non-existent publications and achievements that have ended up on his CV, an assessment form, a departmental research report and the self-evaluation reports, is that they exemplify what he says is the common practice for every professor to list planned work each year with a view to the allocation of budget and time. Each year he would provide the titles of articles, conference papers and other 'prospects' that he was working on. That would sometimes not lead to publication, because of missing a deadline, cancellation of a conference, his illness, breakout of war, and other such reasons. Apparently, others in the department had put his 'prospects' on official lists. He did not concern himself with this aspect, and was unaware of any official status that these lists of publications had acquired. He submits that the physical disability that prevented him from reading a computer screen, the fact that he therefore never learned to work with computers, and his aversion to bureaucratic procedures, had been his undoing in this respect.

Bax gave the committee a list of explanations for the non-published publications, to the best of his recollection, in some cases giving a reason for not attending a conference that a proposed publication was intended for. Bax also told the committee that he saw little problem in the widespread republication of the same article, with or without amendments such as a new title, different acknowledgments, or different dates. According to him, this was a common strategy at the time, and a way to allow more people to read his texts. Bax also put forward a substantive argument in his defence. He states that a major challenge facing anthropology is to describe 'ongoing time'. He was addressing this aspect by returning to a fieldwork site at regular intervals, submitting his findings to his earlier informants, and listening to their reactions. He would then incorporate any new insights into his publications.

The findings of the committee

Regarding the publications that did not materialize, the committee notes that Bax, first as senior lecturer and later as leader of a prominent scientific sub-programme of the Department of Cultural Anthropology at VU University Amsterdam, failed since 1986 in his responsibility of due care for the correct reporting of his scientific activities in official documents. The committee has gained the impression that Bax systematically sought to exaggerate the importance of his programme and himself in this period. The annual reports suggested an extraordinarily high scientific production and an active international scientific network, for which Bax travelled widely by invitation. The committee observes, however, that the reality was different.

In the 1995 self-evaluation report, Sub-programme 1 'Religious Regimes and State Formation' claims 77 publications of the total of 333. Of these 77 publications, 56 are in Bax' name. On checking, it appears that 25 of these 56 publications do not exist. The 31 Bax publications that do exist are based on a considerably smaller number of 'original' publications, which were translated, repeated literally, or both. Five years later, in the 2000 self-evaluation report, 38 of the 372 titles put forward by the department are from Bax. On checking, it appears that at least 18 of these do not exist. Those that do exist are often republications of previously existing documents. Furthermore it must be noted that none of the claimed publications about Croatia exist, and that Bax has claimed a non-existent editorship. The self-evaluation report also refers on several occasions to a chapter by Bax that is incorporated in a (non-existent) book by someone else.

Bax was unable to provide the committee with a satisfactory explanation for his signature being on various lists containing incorrect data. Even in the improbable case that Bax was unaware of the use of his name as author of countless non-existent publications, he has failed in his duties as programme leader and professor. In this capacity he had personal responsibility for the incorrect information provided to three consecutive international research review committees, the curatorial panel of his chair, and successive departmental research directors.

Regarding the publications that did materialize, the committee has commented in the chapters above on the underlying methodology and scientific reliability. The bibliometric analysis adds the

problem of self-plagiarism. It is not unusual for a chapter of a book to be published first as an article. There are also many reasons for a Dutch language peer-reviewed article also to appear in translated form in an international scientific journal. Finally, it is likewise not uncommon for a successful article to be incorporated into an edited volume on a broader theme into which the article fits. However, it is unusual for all these forms of republication to be applied systematically (sometimes multiple times in a single year in different journals). An original oeuvre of approximately 16 articles grew in this way to a list of publications many times larger.

From a scientific viewpoint, the committee's primary misgivings are that the republication was rarely declared in the articles concerned, which would frequently be given a new title, and that certain matters and dates were changed in a way that creates the impression of new research. Bax has failed demonstrably to inform the compilers (and readers) of edited volumes of the previous publication (possibly several times) of the submitted piece. Bax' 'scientific' explanation for the amendments to articles – that they had to do with an 'ongoing time' analysis – would hold water only if the author had taken care to identify the points from an earlier version that he had reinterpreted in the light of new insights. Instead, the committee sometimes observes what might be called self-plagiarism squared. An example of this is seen in the republication of an article that itself had previously been a chapter of the 1995 *Medjugorje book*, in which these two earlier publications were cited as if they substantiated a new claim.¹⁸

The incorrectly reported data were used in support of Bax' longstanding position at VU University Amsterdam and the attainment of his endowed professorship. The most important element was the reported, but actually non-existent, publications. Bax's presumed international reputation that these publications and other achievements suggested, was one of the three explicit reasons for the *Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds* to extend his appointment as endowed professor for the second time in 1998. The other two reasons were Bax' active role in the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (which also Bax has stated to be false) that is mentioned in the evaluation, and the six PhD students said to be engaged on their theses in 1998 (in reality only one candidate completed the PhD).¹⁹ All these incorrect declarations were concerned with non-existent achievements or activities, which means that *scientific* fraud is hardly the right term, since no scientific insights or debates have been influenced by them. More appropriate terms would be 'technical' (Köbben), or 'labour law' fraud. Furthermore, the incorrect reporting also has an impact on the trust in science that was mentioned in the preamble above. The incorrect reporting has clearly influenced the position, prestige, and possibly the funding, of Bax' research programme, the department of Cultural

¹⁸ For example in Bax 2000b:187 (edited volume of Halpern/Kideckel) that is the same as Chapter 8 of *Medjugorje* (Bax 1995), footnote 12 is: "I described these changes at great length from various angles in other publications (cf. Bax 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1995)".

¹⁹ Dean D. Th Kuiper in his letter dated 20-2-1998 gives five reasons to extend Bax' professorship (1- successful occupation of the chair, 2 – importance of the chair in national distribution of tasks, 3 – international reputation of professor, 4 – strategic importance of his role in the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research, 5 – the many students still engaged on their PhDs) and identifies points 3-5 as the most important for extending the appointment. VU Old Archive – Bax file – Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds.

Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies, and VU University Amsterdam as a whole. Possibly the most disconcerting aspect of this case is its effect on the scientific fraternity. The image (both favourable and unfavourable) of Bax and his scientific merits that scientists and non-scientists, in the Netherlands and abroad, inside and outside VU University Amsterdam, upheld for many years, now seems suddenly to appear in a different light. The committee returns below to the question as to the role played by peer review and institutional monitoring, and whether these could have prevented all the problems. What will always remain, however, is that Mart Bax' actions cannot stand the test of criticism in any way.

5. Conclusions of the committee

Based on the above, observing the constraints referred to above in this report, and taking account of the various elements of Mart Bax' reply, the committee arrives at the following findings with respect to the allegations made against him. Before presenting this final assessment, the committee points to an interesting, but in a certain sense also tragic, paradox. A number of researchers who have shared their critical insights into Bax' work with the committee have remarked on how impressed they were – and sometimes still are – with Bax' ideas. His conception of the various 'religious regimes' has been of direct inspiration to them. Various interviewees referred to Bax' keen eye for crucial themes and insights, which were topical and innovative at the time. In this sense they stressed that he had spurred both themselves and others on to new research. They acknowledge this influence from Bax' work, but this leaves them all the more taken aback by the doubts in hindsight that have arisen around his research and conclusions.

General assessment

The most important allegations are concerned with Bax' fieldwork and the conclusions he has drawn from them. As stated in the introduction, checking and verifying anthropological fieldwork is notoriously difficult, and this was already widely acknowledged in the period in which Bax worked. Checks of this kind become ever more complicated with the passage of time, changes in the communities, and the death and disappearance of key people. This difficulty is exacerbated by Bax' custom of repeatedly changing the names of places and people, and sufficing with only the briefest of references, if any, to the sources consulted. For this committee, the problem of verifiability was naturally particularly urgent. This was why it set Bax' personal cooperation as a condition for accepting the assignment. Bax responded by giving his full cooperation. Unfortunately, it must be said that this cooperation was not enough to resolve several problems.

It was without doubt crucial that Bax was unable to submit any original and locally collected research material, because he 'did away with' his archive after 2002.

Second, Bax referred frequently to informants, most of whom had already died, or, in the case of the Medjugorje research, could not be found within the time available to the committee. Another aspect in the Medjugorje research was that Bax, with no archive, was no longer able to recall the names of many 'less important' informants who are quoted in his publications. In general, Bax had trouble remembering events from many years ago, which is not entirely surprising considering his age.

A third problem, finally, was the context of the research. The research in Brabant took place more than thirty years ago. The situation in Medjugorje and the wider context of Bosnia and Hercegovina has also changed to such an extent that it is no longer easy to verify research from before 1995. This is a problem for all ethnographic replications, but certainly so in the context of a war such as that in former Yugoslavia, which disintegrated into independent states.

This most significant obstacle to the committee's work was the persistent lack of clarity surrounding

numerous aspects of Bax' scientific career. In its attempts nonetheless to obtain the clearest possible picture of Bax' fieldwork and academic activity, the committee was frequently confronted with inadequate footnotes, carelessness, secrecy, pseudonyms, contradictory information, non-existent publications, and so on, that formed a smokescreen that greatly hampered its work and the establishment of the truth. Even in the interviews, Bax regularly changed details of his defence and raised matters that later appeared to be incorrect or inaccurate. The committee therefore had to devote a disproportionate amount of time to checking facts and collecting data that might help give an accurate insight into Bax' scientific work. This investigation has raised the suspicion that many of the problems in Bax' work date from after the 1986/87 period.

On the basis of consulting relevant documentation and people, and the close reading of Bax' published work, the committee has constructed its findings with the greatest possible care and supported its conclusions with the firmest and soundest possible arguments. The committee has moreover sought to adhere to the criteria that the academic community applies in the critical assessment of its own performance, both at the time of the research concerned and at present. And, however unpalatable it may be for all concerned, the committee has arrived at the final conclusion that Bax has committed several forms of scientific misconduct. This conclusion relates to two areas. First, Bax' scientific work surrounding two research projects, and second, the academic reporting of this research to his employers – VU University Amsterdam and the *Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds*, which was responsible for his chair – to the academic community as a whole, and to the various programme review committees that assessed his work and that of the department, in particular.

Regarding these two areas of research with which the allegations are concerned, the committee concludes that there was scientific misconduct and fraud in academic reporting.

Scientific misconduct

In the case of the 'Neerdonk' research, the committee was unable – on the basis of the confidential information provided by Bax – to find supplementary or supporting evidence for the historical events he presented in his inaugural lecture. Not only did this information do nothing to make the 'Neerdonk' case more plausible, it also became clear as the interviews proceeded that Bax himself was completely unclear about the facts related to him by his 'informant'. The committee is even uncertain as to whether the content of the inaugural lecture can actually be attributed to his 'informant', or that Bax put this together himself. The committee concludes at any rate that disseminating and presenting unproven and improbable events as historical 'facts' was embedded in research that systematically disguised the names of people and places, concealed sources, and in some cases exhibited substantial carelessness. The carelessness varied from the simple omission of page references (rendering statements unverifiable), through the consistent omission of references to specific archive documents or locations of field research, to the substantiation of descriptions of historical events with literature that was unrelated to these events. This last aspect in particular crosses the line between methodological carelessness and deliberate deception.

The use of pseudonyms in Bax' work – which can be a legitimate practice – frequently raises the suspicion of direct deception. He was aware that facts he presented that were based on an anonymous source had been “contaminated”. Despite that, he failed to check the correctness of these facts. He furthermore used them as truthful details and events in constructing a theoretical argument. The committee attaches much weight to these misleading methods, and the more so in that this was an inaugural address, with which a new professor accepts his position in the presence of students and the general public. The committee also has grave misgivings about suggestions in articles that certain forms of research were carried out “by the author”, whereas, when questioned on this point, Bax would regularly deflect responsibility for these facts on to others (students, ‘older colleagues’).

Regarding his research in Medjugorje, the committee notes that while Bax' work attracted serious and reasoned criticism, much of it falls within the bounds of normal scientific debate. However, it is striking that Bax never seriously responded to this criticism within the scientific context. The committee has been able to form a clear opinion about the only case in which Bax did respond to criticism. Initially, Bax did not respond to the criticism surrounding his description of the ‘little war’, and the high number of victims in particular. It was only after the publicity erupted in 2012 that Bax admitted he knew about the mistakes on which the description was based shortly after the first publication in 1995, and that the number of victims had been far lower. He did not rectify this error. The committee considers the failure to rectify incorrect information about a specific and not insignificant tragic event, as well as the various improbable excuses made for it by shifting ‘the blame’ onto others, as disgraceful and unethical scientific conduct. This case also has methodological consequences. If the information about the 140 deaths was incorrect, the committee cannot conclude otherwise than that the correctness of all details and descriptions that support the empirical substantiation of this assumed event must also be questioned.

The committee arrives at the following conclusions regarding Bax' scientific work.

1. The committee is convinced that Bax had a keen eye for a number of pressing questions in political and religious anthropology, and as such has inspired other researchers. On the other hand, it is clear to the committee that he has exhibited various forms of careless or misleading behaviour in his research. His research and interpretations are marked by carelessness, in which the basic requirements of verification, provision of evidence and triangulation have been dispensed with. Even when the committee takes into consideration the tightening of methodological standards in anthropology over time, and the substantial challenges facing anthropologists in the complex conflict situation in Bosnia and Hercegovina in the 1980s and 1990s, it may have been expected of Bax that he would have shed more light on how the material was collected, and the nature of his argumentation.
2. Openness of this kind was systematically absent in his research in Brabant and in Bosnia-Hercegovina alike. In Bax' work, all doubts and uncertainties involved in his research were rendered invisible and kept out of the reader's sight. More to the point, uncertainties and doubts did not

restrain Bax from drawing firm, sometimes even improbable, conclusions about the society he had investigated. This has yielded him scientific prestige and status, but the committee concludes that much of his reasoning does not pass the test of methodological criticism. The committee absolutely rejects Bax' defence that source-criticism and the expression of doubts would have been detrimental to a clear and readable, and theoretically coherent, account.

3. This lack of transparency is all the more serious in view of the doubts about the validity of the interpretations and assumptions in Bax' work. Doubts and uncertainties are inherent to scientific research in general, and to ethnographic fieldwork in particular. The situation is acknowledged in anthropology, possibly more than in other social sciences. Scientific debate requires a clear and explicit presentation of the sources and arguments. It is possibly even more important for authors to correct and rectify incorrect interpretations as soon as they come to light. In the case of the 'little war', Bax knowingly dispensed with this.

In connection with the observation under point 2, the committee concludes that in this respect Bax has committed unethical scientific behaviour. The committee takes an extremely critical view of the progressive propagation of this, certainly not innocent, story. The committee again finds that the way in which this case was presented in his book testifies to an unsound scientific method. The committee has found insufficient evidence to be able to classify this method, however deplorable in many respects, as scientific fraud. This conclusion would require establishing unequivocally that Bax 'deliberately' fabricated elements. The committee finds moreover that the role that this story has played in the political and scientific debates in the region in recent years gives cause for serious concern.

Fraud in university reporting

Regarding the publications, two of the committee's findings are unequivocal.

1. A significant proportion of the publications put forward under Bax' name in official documents – for assessing (1) the continuation of the chair by the *Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds*, and (2) cultural-anthropological research at VU University Amsterdam, the leadership of the Faculty and by three international programme review committees – between 1989 and 2005 – do not exist. The inclusion of non-existent publications in formal departmental reports has misled both the employer and the international academic community. The articles suggest that Bax remained academically active until 2002, whereas actually he only authored a single original article after 1995. Furthermore, other achievements in scientific valorization were also claimed, in the form of non-existent honours, non-existent prominent assignments, and PhDs that were not awarded. Bax' defence that he was never aware of this incorrect reporting is implausible, but is unacceptable at any rate in view of his status as full professor.

The committee has concluded that Bax deliberately attempted to create the appearance of substantial academic production and an important international network. Texts that do not exist can cause no substantive harm and have no detrimental effects in scientific terms. However, the

incorrect reporting has definitely influenced the position, prestige, and possibly the funding, of Bax' research programme, the department (Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies), and VU University Amsterdam as a whole. In this sense, this aspect should be regarded more as a form of forgery of documents, on which basis the author obtained a professorial appointment, academic status, and access to funding.

2. Bax has reissued existing publications on a large scale without clear acknowledgment of their provenance. In this sense, this is plainly a case of self-plagiarism. The repeated publication of the same article is not necessarily a problem. However, it becomes self-plagiarism if systematically disguised by alterations, such as a new title, different acknowledgments, the renaming of informants or places, and even different dates for the same events. All of the above happened in Bax' publications. In doing so he has deliberately misled editors of compilations and journals and his readers, and built up an insufficiently transparent scientific oeuvre. The committee has not investigated whether plagiarism was also committed. Self-plagiarism alone provides sufficient grounds to reduce Bax' work with respect to Brabant and Medjugorje to a core body of some sixteen original articles. An indication was given above of the methodological and substantive criticism that these articles have attracted. The notoriously careless bibliographies, with incorrect editions, years, and page numbers of his written work, has helped create a smokescreen around his oeuvre. An element of the trust granted within the scientific community is that the origins of articles are made fully explicit, in particular where research material is reused. Bax has failed to do so too frequently, and has thereby betrayed not only the trust of his employer, but also of his colleagues and the scientific community as a whole.

The committee also finds that Bax systematically presented incorrect information to various committees. Many of the publications submitted to them, which were therefore determining factors in assessing Bax' work (and that of the department in which he worked), do not exist. Other reported achievements, such as awards and scholarships, did not actually happen. The committee takes an extremely serious view of the fact that Bax wrongly affiliated himself with the Yugoslavia tribunal and the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, because he has implicated these organizations in his deception.

The committee deems Bax' defence, that 'others' did this, to be implausible. The committee cannot view this course of action other than as deliberate deception.

The committee has noted that these non-existent publications had no role in the scientific debate, and no demonstrable influence on the programme review committees' assessments of the department. This means that what has happened here was less scientific fraud than labour law fraud. This can be viewed as manifest 'misconduct', to remain within the terms of the Regulations of the endowed chair referred to above. The incorrect reporting has clearly influenced the position, prestige, and possibly the funding, of Bax' research programme, the department of Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies, and VU University Amsterdam as a whole. The

committee likewise takes an extremely serious view of the betrayal of the trust between academic colleagues.

6. Context and consequences

The background to this report was distressing, and the conclusions for the researcher concerned are serious. But however one views this case – and opinions are bound to vary – there can be no doubt that it raises questions about the conduct of science in general, and the discipline of anthropology in particular. How do the methods of this senior scientist and endowed professor relate to what was common practice in the scientific context in which he worked, and to the thinking and standards of today? How could the matters touched on in this report remain hidden and unchallenged for so long? What does this say about the embedding of his research, both in VU University Amsterdam and the scientific world as a whole? Are there any lessons to be learned from this case? And if so, what are they? The committee briefly sets out in this final chapter some ideas on a somewhat more general level than the Bax case alone.

Scientific and institutional context

In the 1970s and 1980s, academic science in general, and cultural anthropology and non-Western sociology in particular, were in a process of reorientation. The political, theoretical and institutional differences were great, the convictions strong, and the debates passionate and sometimes fierce. In this context, various schools and camps had a tendency to isolate themselves within their own circle of aficionados. Island kingdoms could be said to have existed in many scientific fields. Intense discussion and exchange of knowledge and insights would take place within these closed communities, but much less so, if at all, between the different communities, or schools. This same segmentation could also be seen in scientific journals. For instance, in 1982 the *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* became the almost exclusive organ of figuration sociology (see also Van El 2002: 30-48).

The formation of sects and schools of thought could also be seen in the relationships within Dutch university departments. The interviews that the committee conducted regarding the situation in the Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies department at VU University Amsterdam in the 1980s and 1990s portray a department that was divided into small groups around a few full professors, each defending their own empire, and with little enthusiasm for debate, dialogue and cooperation. Despite the democratization that also affected VU University Amsterdam, (De Wolf 1998: 103-105; Van Deursen 2005; 298-310), the position of the full professors was still fairly unassailable, and there was little freedom to criticize their ideas, activities, or policy. Full professors would engage in skirmishes among themselves about sharing out research funds, administrative and educational obligations, and they were subject to scant supervision, either from above by the Dean or Executive Board, or from below, by students and other university bodies. There was nothing to stop a full professor from withdrawing from administrative and organizational duties. Another consequence was that PhD students often had little freedom. They were obliged to adjust to the ideas of their supervisors, or seek refuge elsewhere.

The department of Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies and VU University Amsterdam

According to many, the group led by Mart Bax epitomized this situation. Insiders and outsiders talk of a sect, which was a good and safe place to be for the insiders, but that systematically rejected outside influences; and not always in a pleasant way. The few letters written by Bax from that time that the committee has seen, and the negative remarks in the annual reports about the organizational context in which the professor worked, testify to a strongly inward-looking attitude, with a certain condescension towards colleagues and other outsiders. PhD students were obliged to find their place in a tightly closed environment, in which Bax' word was law. Some thrived in this environment. Others found the situation extremely unpleasant. The small number of successful PhDs awarded in this research group may be said to speak volumes in this connection. This inward looking attitude also applied in a certain sense to the relationship with VU University Amsterdam as an institute. The university was viewed as a necessary source of funding, but otherwise an awkward and demanding organization that was best kept at a distance. This was certainly also the result of the substantial changes that Dutch universities – therefore also VU University Amsterdam – underwent in this period, in which education and research were bureaucratically streamlined, and stiff economy measures were pushed through (Van Deursen 2005, 385-91).

In this context, there was no clear view within the department as a whole of the scientific activities of Bax himself and his researchers. Bax was known for being absent on a regular basis because of fieldwork, but there was hardly any clear view of his specific activities. The education that was provided under his leadership was oriented mainly to propagating the paradigm of Norbert Elias. Other ideas, sometimes from colleagues within the department, were publicly treated with a degree of contempt. His own and his group's research results were rarely discussed by non-insiders. This lack of transparency was readily accepted because many colleagues, also those who were critical of his behaviour, deemed the size and international impact of his scientific production to be important for the department's prestige and survival.

One must also consider the role of the curatorial panel of the chair concerned in the splendid isolation that emerged around this senior scientist and endowed professor. The *Stichting het Vrije Universiteitsfonds* created a large number of endowed chairs from its foundation in 1985, as part of a new VU University Amsterdam personnel policy. With a view to the desire to promote incumbent personnel, the assessment of a new professor's activities during the appointment procedure as well as the later annual reports and five-yearly evaluations was not always as critical as one might have wished. The board of the university at the time also kept itself fairly distant from the academic workplace. Thus few corrective mechanisms arose within the university to identify any tensions, mutual conflicts, or misconduct, let alone to rectify them. In this connection, the VU University Amsterdam's publishing house also seems not to have taken (or been able to take) a very critical stance towards the professor as an author. The publishing house was able to give little substance to its status as university publisher in this way.

The anthropological community

As stated above, scientific debate, and anthropological theory creation in particular, were hardly conducive to an open theoretical and methodological debate. The different 'schools' were in sometimes fierce opposition, and little effort was made to enter into dialogue with those holding dissenting views. When dialogue did occur, the tone was often unpleasant, or even hostile.

Alongside these contemporary differences about scientific theory, a lively debate arose in this period about the nature of knowledge and argumentation in the arts and social sciences. Anthropologists and historians alike pondered the question as to the extent to which the knowledge they produced was shaped by literary sources (van Bremen et al. 1979; Clifford and Marcus 1986; White 1973). This was referred to as the 'literary turn' in anthropology, which strictly speaking marked the rise of the epistemological view that research output in the social sciences and humanities must by its nature be understood as 'texts'. Moreover, discussion also arose about the nature of the insights generated in these disciplines, as was evident for example in the booklet edited by Peter Kloos, *True Fiction* (1990). These views were sometimes reduced to a debate about the presentation of scientific knowledge. However, Bax' reliance in his defence on a style of writing in which methodological details are sacrificed unhesitatingly in favour of 'clarity', shows complete disregard for what the pioneers of the *literary turn* intended. Indeed, their criticism of the (often unconscious) literary 'packaging' of knowledge questioned the ethical and political implications of anthropological perceptions.

Changes

The elements described above from the end of the 20th century shed some light on the institutional and scientific context in which Bax worked. Today these elements have largely disappeared, adapted, or been corrected.

In the contemporary university context, scientific relationships have gradually been subjected to more rigorous management requirements. In the context of economy measures and increasing bureaucracy, internal cooperation has become more common within departments of anthropology in the Netherlands. It is harder for island kingdoms in which full professors are able to wield the sceptre more or less unchallenged to survive under today's administrative pressures and audit regimes. The individualistic research culture of the arts and social sciences has increasingly been replaced by a situation of collective research projects, because of the collectivization of research grants (from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and European funding agencies alike). Certainly when measured against the international competition, this cannot always be interpreted as an improvement in safeguarding research quality, but it has nonetheless brought an end to forms of scientific sectarianism and the proliferation of authoritarian tendencies. The new digital communication media would appear to be creating better conditions for a more varied and open research culture, centred more on collaboration and mutual criticism.

The kind of irregularities with publications that this committee has observed in the case of Bax are

far less likely today. Colleagues and administrators have more resources at their disposal to check whether a publication was demonstrably published. Improvements in the procedures surrounding the use of the Metis database have practically eliminated the entry of non-existent publications. Plagiarism is likewise much more readily detected today. Needless to say, however, systems of this kind can never be watertight. Reciprocal trust will always be essential. Colleagues and research directors must be able to take it on trust that publications are not based on plagiarism or self-plagiarism, and that articles and research material are not reproduced without an explicit statement of the history. Trust can only be encouraged, and not enforced: for example by persuading researchers to engage in the frequent exchange of data and insights. While lip service is being paid to the need to further enhance this “seminar culture” in the Netherlands, the high work load and other reasons are still preventing it from being put into practice sufficiently.

This case demonstrates that where quarrels and island kingdoms arise, the transparency of science can be threatened. Science is served by debate and refutation. There is no doubt that an open and generous research culture is the best guarantee against misconduct and fraud.

In this context, university administrators would be well advised to reconsider the possibly detrimental impact of the increased publication pressure on researchers and research, especially where measured by the quantification of authorship. In Bax’ case, the benefits of a high scientific production were often placed above quality, validation and substantive discussion. It is clear in this context that a person such as Bax would have been able to acquire much room for manoeuvre and power. This was at the expense of critical scrutiny of his reporting. The emphasis on scientific production has only increased in recent years. This can lead to unhealthy relationships in which publication pressure can (again) lead to scientific sectarianism, a lack of argument, and dependence.

Bax’ case also raises questions about the effectiveness of the peer review system in scientific research practice. On the one hand, the case shows that publication sometimes occurs exclusively within an extremely limited circle of like-minded people, who know each other well as colleagues, and often have their own journal. On the other hand it demonstrates that the system of programme reviews and peer reviews in journals and publishing houses does not always work. The editorial teams of journals should not normally accept articles that have not been reviewed by experts in the field of research concerned (in particular of the region concerned). The proliferation of journals in the social sciences and humanities and the quantitative increase in scientific articles renders that aim practically impossible. However, it is already a step in the right direction if researchers, referees, editorial teams and administrators are aware of these issues.

The Bax case also points to a question that is increasingly being asked in today’s world: whether, and, if so, how, research data on which scientific production is based, should be stored. This topic is also given considerable attention in the report *With due care and integrity* (2012). The fact that anthropological fieldwork notes and monographs have now themselves become historical sources, and the new ways of accessing data collected by individual field researchers through digital and multimedia storage and presentation functionality, provide opportunities for researchers and

administrators in the various arts and social science disciplines to experiment with new forms of digital storage. Initiatives of this kind are leading today to pioneering methodological work, in which, for example, audio-visual files can be made available far more easily, thereby facilitating monitoring and transparency, and radically changing the way researchers communicate both with each other and with research participants. It must not be forgotten that this places far greater demands on the protection of the privacy and interests of research participants, and on other ethical considerations. The existing academic order exhibits a dichotomy between the requirements of protection of research participants through informed consent and the legal protection of privacy on the one hand, and the requirement of transparency of research data on the other. Where measures to avoid the misuse of data, often modelled on medical science practice, are taken to extremes, scientists may be asked on the one hand to retain personal details as briefly as possible before destroying them, and on the other hand to keep these data for as long and as publicly as possible in order to oppose forms of research fraud. However, the medical model (where, for example, accusations of malpractice by patients and their legal representatives are a genuine concern) cannot always be applied to other disciplines. This should give academic administrators, from deans to the Association of Universities in the Netherlands, reason to deal with these contradictions in a far more nuanced way.

Finally, openness and alertness are two extremely important elements when colleagues and administrators are confronted with suspicions of misconduct or fraud. The committee is acutely aware of the obstacles and hazards surrounding the detection of misconduct among colleagues. The committee has noted that rumours had circulated for some considerable time about Mart Bax' scientific work. Some colleagues also attempted to tackle Bax on this subject. This was restricted to private initiatives, and ultimately had no effect, certainly in part because of Bax' persistent emphasis on the 'confidentiality' of his sources. The Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society, a professional association, likewise took no action when they received signals to this effect, nor did they inform his employer.

When journalists publicly exposed the case, VU University Amsterdam, being the university that had accommodated Bax throughout his academic life, took action immediately. However, it must be noted that this action was not pursued energetically at first. The committee has the impression, for whatever reason, that the Executive Board delayed for too long before giving this case the attention it deserved. Allegations of this kind, also about someone who had already left the university, create considerable unrest for the department concerned, the discipline, and the university itself.

There can be no doubt that broaching the subject of misconduct among colleagues is an extremely sensitive matter. There can be severe consequences for the whistle-blower, and the department's reputation may be harmed. This problem cannot be solved simply by forming a committee, or appointing a confidential advisor. The most important remedy would appear to be an open and participative working climate, centred on collaboration between colleagues and administrative transparency. The specific case discussed in this report, which is concerned with matters in the relatively distant past, show all the more clearly that allegations of misconduct and fraud do not

vanish of their own accord. They must be explored as rapidly, thoroughly and transparently as possible. It is important on the one hand to investigate the allegations in all fairness to the accused person, but on the other hand the university concerned may be expected to provide full disclosure without hesitation. In that connection, the committee thanks all concerned at VU University Amsterdam and the professional field for their open cooperation with, and commitment to, this inquiry.

Appendix 1 Terms of reference from VU University Amsterdam

CEDLA
Attn. Professor J.M. Baud
Roetersstraat 33
1018 WB AMSTERDAM

DATE	OUR REFERENCE	YOUR LETTER DATED	YOUR REFERENCE
22.07.2013	FD/ev/2013/1006	-	-
E-MAIL	TELEPHONE	FAX	ENCLOSURE(S)
e.i.verkerk@vu.nl	020 598 5320	020 598 5770	-

Re: Terms of reference from VU University Amsterdam

Dear Mr Baud,

The Rector of VU University Amsterdam hereby confirms the formation on 18 March 2013 of a Committee to be presided over by Professor J.M. Baud (CEDLA, University of Amsterdam). The other members of the Committee are Professor S. Legêne (VU University Amsterdam) and Professor P.J. Pels (Leiden University). This committee will conduct an inquiry into the truth of various allegations of scientific misconduct directed at emeritus professor M.M.G. Bax, who at the time was endowed professor of Political Anthropology at VU University Amsterdam. The allegations concerned have been made by:

- Frank van Kolschooten in his book "*Ontspoorde Wetenschap*" that was published in 2012, and in which he asserts that (some of) the facts pertaining to a monastery in Brabant and the Medjugorje pilgrimage site presented by Professor Bax had been fabricated;
- Richard de Boer in *de Volkskrant* on 13 April 2013, in which he asserts that (a substantial number of) facts described by Bax regarding the "little war" in Medjugorje are incorrect, and that Bax must have been aware of this;
- Richard de Boer, also in *de Volkskrant* on 13 April 2013, in which he asserts that a (considerable) proportion of Bax' publications as they appeared in official publication lists do not exist.

The terms of reference have three parts:

1. the Committee will investigate the truth of these allegations;
2. if scientific misconduct is found, the Committee will set out the possible consequences for the university research culture and the discipline of anthropology;
3. if scientific misconduct is found, the Committee will recommend measures to rectify any harm and prevent repetition.

The Executive Board has already agreed to the Committee's proposed working procedure, and the financial consequences thereof. The Executive Board guarantees the publication of the Committee's report, and the proper archiving of the underlying (possibly confidential) research data that form the grounds on which the Committee arrived at its conclusions. The Committee will coordinate its

activities with the Ombudsman for Scientific Integrity of VU University Amsterdam, Professor A.P. Hollander.

The Executive Board indemnifies the Committee and its members against any legal consequences of their work and findings.

Yours sincerely,
on behalf of the Executive Board,

Professor F.A. van der Duyn Schouten
Rector

c.c. Professor P.J. Pels, Professor S. Legêne, Professor. A.P. Hollander

EXECUTIVE BOARD

WWW.VU.NL

VISITING AND POSTAL ADDRESS
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV AMSTERDAM

Appendix 2 Sources and literature consulted

Personal communication (interviews, telephone contact, e-mail) with:

M.M.G. Bax (three interviews dated 5-6-2013, 27-6-2013, 31-7-2013)

G. Banck, A.P.J. Bernts, J.C.H. Blom, R. de Boer, J.F. Boissevain, J. Breman, L.A. Brouwer, C. Bijker, W. Campschreur, E. Claverie, G. Duijzings, P. Geschiere, J. Halpern, C. Hanken, Fr. R. Jolic, K. Knibbe, A.J.F. Köbben, E. Koster, D. Kooiman, W.J.M. Levelt, N.H. v. Lingen, M. Lovrenovic, P.J. Margry, P. Meurkens, F. Papma, M. v.d. Port, L.D. Meijers, P.G.J. Post, Ph. Quarles van Ufford, P. v. Rooden, O. Salemink, J.Sanders, A. Simic, J.T. Sunier, H. Tak, H.U.E. Thoden van Velzen, P. v.d. Veer, J. Verrips, L. Winkeler.

Restricted archives, consulted in confidence and cited as necessary in this report:

VU old archive and VU Executive Board archive: Personnel file MMG Bax (on film, no longer complete); Professor file M.M.G. Bax, *Stichting het Vrije-Universiteitsfonds* file M.M.G. Bax

VU University Amsterdam Metis, publication database; publications of M.M.G. Bax

Documents submitted by M.M.G. Bax to the committee (June-August 2013)

Documents submitted by F. van Kolschooten, P.J. Margry and O. Salemink to the committee

Documents from certain Dutch monastic archives

Cited publications by Mart Bax

(1980, with Aad Nieuwenhuis) Boerenemancipatie in Brabant: Vergruizeling van een beeld (Peasant emancipation in Brabant: The shattering of an image), *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 61: 163-180.

(1982, with Aad Nieuwenhuis) Peasant-Emancipation in the Roman Catholic South of The Netherlands: The Shattering of a Tableau-Vivant, *The Netherlands' Journal of Sociology* 18: 25-45.

(1982) 'Wie tegen de Kerk piest wordt zelf nat': Over uitbreiding en intensivering van het clericale regime in Noord-Brabant ('He who pisses against the Church gets wet himself': about expansion and intensification of the clerical regime in Noord-Brabant), *Antropologische Verkenningen* 1 (2): 20-58.

(1983a) 'Us' Catholics and 'Them' Catholics in Dutch Brabant: The Dialectics of a Factional Process, *Anthropological Quarterly* 56 (5): 167-178.

(1984) 'Officieel geloof' en 'Volksgeloof' in Noord-Brabant; veranderingen in opvattingen en gedragingen als uitdrukking van rivaliserende clericale regimes ('Official faith' and 'popular faith' in Noord-Brabant; changes in attitudes and behaviours as an expression of rival clerical regimes), *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 10 (4): 621-647.

(1985a) Religious Infighting and the Formation of a Dominant Catholic Regime in Southern Dutch

Bibliography and sources version 1-9-2013/sl

Society, *Social Compass* XXXII (1): 57-72.

(1985b) *Brabant – Opnieuw Missiegebied? Een veranderend kerkbegrip als gevolg van wijzigende intra-religieuze machtsverhoudingen (Brabant – a Mission Area Again? A changing church concept as an effect of changing intrareligious power relations)*. Antropologische Papers VU no. 3. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

(1985c) Popular Devotions, Power, and Religious Regimes in Catholic Dutch Brabant, *Ethnology* 24: 215-228.

(1985d) Opstand op de Lindenburgh. Monastieke machtsverhoudingen in een ontwikkelingsperspectief (Uprising on the Lindenburgh. Monastic power relations in a development perspective), *Sociologische Gids* 32 (3): 178-195.

(1985e) Religieuze regimes en staatsontwikkeling: notities voor een figuratie-benadering (Religious regimes and state development: notes for a figuration approach), *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 12 (1): 22-47.

(1985f) 'Dichtbij en toch Vreemd (Close Yet Strange)', in A. Koster (ed.) *Culturen dicht-er-bij. Ervaringen van acht antropologen (Cultures close by. The experiences of eight anthropologists)*. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, pp. 3-12.

(1986a) 'Terug naar Donkere Tijden? Over het falen van een voorgeschreven kerkelijke orde in hedendaags ruraal Brabant (A Return to Darker Times? About the failure of a prescribed ecclesiastical order in contemporary rural Brabant)', in G. Rooijackers and T. Van der Zee (eds.), *Religieuze volkscultuur. De spanning tussen de voorgeschreven orde en de geleefde praktijk*. Nijmegen: SUN, pp. 119-135.

(1986b) Rebellion at the Lindenburgh: Southern Dutch monastic power relations in a developmental perspective, *The Netherlands Journal of Sociology* 22 (2): 130-144.

(1987) Religious Regimes and State-Formation: Towards a Research Perspective, *Anthropological Quarterly* 60 (1): 1-11.

(1989) *De vernedering van een heilige. Religieuze machtspolitiek in een Zuidnederlandse dorpsgemeenschap (The humiliation of a saint. Religious power politics in a village community in the south of the Netherlands)*. Inaugural address at VU University Amsterdam, 5 October 1989. Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht.

(1990) A Monastic Community between 'Fiction' and 'Non-Fiction', in P. Kloos (ed.), *True Fiction. Artistic and Scientific Representations of Reality*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, pp. 9-20.

(1991) Religious Regimes and State Formation: Toward a Research Perspective, in Eric R. Wolf (ed.), *Religious Regimes and State Formation. Perspectives from European Ethnology*. New York: SUNY Press, pp. 7-27.

(1992) St. Gerard's Wrath: Religious Power Politics in a Dutch Community, *Anthropological Quarterly* 65 (4): 177-186.

(1995) *Medjugorje: Religion, Politics and Violence in Rural Bosnia*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

(1998) Maria en de mijnenwerpers van Medjugorje: de dynamiek van etnische zuivering in ruraal Bosnië-Herzegovina (Mary and the rocket launchers of Medjugorje: the dynamics of ethnic cleansing in rural Bosnia-Herzegovina), *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 25 (3): 371-94.

(1999) Warlords, priests, and the politics of ethnic cleansing: a case-study from rural Bosnia Hercegovina, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23 (1): 16-36.

(2000) Holy Mary and Medjugorje's rocketeers. The logic of an ethnic cleansing process in Bosnia. *Ethnologia Europaea*, 30 (1): 45-58.

Other sources and cited literature

"Bakens & Dwaallichten. Integriteit in de wetenschap (Beacons & False Guides. Integrity in science)", File *De Gids* 176: 4 (2013): pp. 3-21

ASA (Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth), *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice*, March 1999. [http://www.theasa.org/ethics/Ethical_guidelines.pdf Accessed 31-5-2013]

Axel, B.K., 'Introduction: Historical Anthropology and Its Vicissitudes', in B.K. Axel (ed.), *From the Margins. Historical Anthropology and Its Futures*. Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2002, pp. 1-44.

Bailey, F., *Stratagems and Spoils. A Social Anthropology of Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.

Bax, M., P. Kloos and A. Koster (eds.), *Faith and polity: essays on religion and politics*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1992.

Bax, M., and A. Koster (eds.), *Power and prayer: religious and political processes in past and present*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1993.

Bax, M., and A. Nieuwenhuis, 'De plank misslaan, maar toch doorhameren; kanttekeningen bij Fischer, Van der Veen en Trienekens (Missing the point, but hammering on regardless; comments on Fischer, Van der Veen and Trienekens)', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 7: 23 (1981): 286-288.

Berkhout, K., and E. de Bruin, 'Slordig omgaan met slordigheden (Handling sloppiness sloppily)', *NRC Handelsblad*, 15-16 September 2012.

Beroepscode opgesteld in samenwerking met een aantal instellingen en verenigingen op sociaalwetenschappelijk gebied vastgesteld in de ledenvergadering van de Nederlandse Sociologische en Antropologische Vereniging dd 18-12-75 (Professional code drawn up with various organizations

and associations in the social science field and adopted in the meeting of members of the Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society held on 18-12-1975).

Blok, A., and L. Brunt (eds.), 'Beschaving en Geweld. Antropologische en historische kritiek op de civilisatietheorie van Norbert Elias (Civilization and Violence. Anthropological and historical critique of Norbert Elias' civilization theory)' (Special issue), *Sociologische Gids* XXIX: 3-4 (1982): 193-344.

Boer, R. de, 'Het kaartenhuis van hoogleraar Bax: Wetenschapsfraude, Reportage Feit en Fictie op Voet van Oorlog (Prof. Bax' house of cards: Scientific fraud, Report of fact and fiction on a War footing)', *de Volkskrant – Science section*, 13-4-1013.

Bremen, J. van, S. van der Geest, and J. Verrips, *Romanthropologie. Essays over antropologie en literatuur (Romanthropology. Essays about anthropology and literature)*. Amsterdam: Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum University of Amsterdam, 1979.

Brunt, L., 'De beginselen der sociologie (The principles of sociology)', *Sociodrome* 7: 1 (1982): 13-15.

Campschreur, W., *Bosnië-Herzegovina: mensen, politiek, economie, cultuur, milieu (Bosnia-Herzegovina: people, politics, economics, culture, environment)*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers/NOVIB, 2002.

Clifford, J., and G.E. Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Deursen, A.J. van, *Een hoeksteen in het verzuild bestel (A cornerstone of the pillarized system)*. VU University Amsterdam 1880-2005. Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 2005.

Documentation for the Research Assessment of Socio-Cultural Studies. Faculty of Social Sciences VU University Amsterdam, March 1995.

Documentation for the Research Assessment of Socio-Cultural Sciences. Faculty of Social Sciences VU University Amsterdam, May 2000.

El, Carla van, *Figuraties en verklaringen: Stijlgebonden schoolvorming in de Nederlandse sociologie (Figurations and explanations: Style-oriented school formation in Dutch sociology)*. Amsterdam: Aksant, 2002.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E., *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E., 'Social Anthropology: Past and Present', *Man* 50 (1950): 118-24.

Fischer, E.J., D.J. van der Veen and G.M.T. Trienekens, 'Historiserende Antropologie in discussie. Vegruizeling van een pretentie of genese van een samenwerking? (Historicizing Anthropology in discussion. Crushing a pretention or genesis of collaboration?)', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 7: 23 (1981): 265-280.

Fluehr-Lobban, C. (ed.), *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991

Frenken, A.M., 'Altaren, beneficiën en geestelijkheid der voormalige parochiekerk van Helmond (Altars, benefices and clergy of the former parish church of Helmond)', *Bossche Bijdragen* IX. (1927-28): 209-266.

Frenken, A.M., 'Van Alphen en de rijksbezoldiging der geestelijkheid (Van Alphen and the state remuneration of clergy)', *Bossche Bijdragen* XX (1950-51): 118-266.

Frenken, A.M., 'Van Alphen en de eerste pogingen tot Herstel der Hierarchie (Van Alphen and the first attempts to restore the hierarchy)', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXII (1953-55a): 69-96.

Frenken, A.M., 'De nieuwste Sint-Oda legende (The latest St. Oda legend)', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXII (1953-55b): 97-115.

Frenken, A.M., 'Van Alphen en het Bossche Seminarie (Van Alphen and the Seminary of Den Bosch', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXII (1953-55c): 228-260.

Frenken, A.M., 'Bij herlezing van Rogiers "Geschiedenis van het Katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16^e en 17^e eeuw" (On rereading Rogier's "History of Catholicism in the north of the Netherlands in the 16th and 17th centuries")', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXII (1953-55d): 276-300.

Frenken, A.M., 'Van Alphen en de Religieuzen, bijzonder de Norbertijnen van Berne (Van Alphen and the Religious, in particular the Norbertines of Berne', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXIII (1956-57a): 1-31.

Frenken, A.M., 'Aanvullingen op Schutjes' "Geschiedenis van het Bisdom 's Hertgenbosch" ('Additions on Screens' "History of the Diocese of 's Hertgenbosch")', *Bossche Bijdragen* XXIII (1956-57b): 46-166.

Gellner, E. (ed.), *Islamic dilemmas: reformers, nationalists and industrialization: the southern shore or the Mediterranean*. Berlin/Amsterdam: Mouton, 1985 (Religion and Society 25).

Glenny, M., *The Fall of Yugoslavia. The Third Balkan War*. London etc.: Penguin, 1992

Hanken, C., D. Meijers and Fred Spier (eds.), *Het regime van Mart Bax. Opstellen voor de meester-antropoloog (The regime of Mart Bax. Papers for the master anthropologist)*. Amsterdam: Department of Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies, VU University Amsterdam, 2002. [Antropologische Bijdragen 15]

Houtman, D., *Op jacht naar de echte werkelijkheid. Dromen over authenticiteit in een wereld zonder fundamente (Hunting the true reality. Dreams of authenticity in a world without foundations)*. Inaugurale address, Erasmus University. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications, 2008.

Jolic, R. Fr., 'Ziekelijke verzinsels over Medugorje' ('Bolesne izmisljotine o Medugorju'), ('Sick imaginings about Medugorje'), Citluk, 30. svibnja 2013, unpublished manuscript. (Translated for the

committee, August 2013).

Kloos, P., *Antropologie als wetenschap (Anthropology as science)*. Muiderberg: Coutinho, 1984.

Kloos, P., *Door het oog van de antropoloog. Botsende visies bij heronderzoek (Through the eye of the anthropologist. Conflicting visions in the replication of research)*. Muiderberg: Coutinho, 1988.

Kloos, P. (ed.), *True Fiction. Artistic and Scientific Representations of Reality*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1990.

Köbben, A.J.F., "Bedrog in de Wetenschap (Deceit in Science)", *Address to the meeting of the Department of Literature of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences on 9 January 2012*.

Köbben, A.J.F., 'Ethische dilemma's bij onderzoek (Ethical dilemmas in research)', in M. Mentzel et al. (ed.), *Ethische vragen bij sociaal-wetenschappelijk onderzoek*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1995, pp. 12-26.

Köbben, A.J.F., *Wie niet waagt die niet wint. Over validiteit en representativiteit bij antropologisch en sociologisch onderzoek (Nothing ventured, nothing gained. About validity and representativeness in anthropological and sociological research)*. Amsterdam: Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW), 1991. [Mededelingen van de Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Part 54, no. 1]

Kolfschooten, F. van, 'Check strafblad van wetenschappers (Check scientists' criminal record)', *NRC-Handelsblad*, 20-21 April 2013.

Kolfschooten, F. van, *Ontspoorde wetenschap. Over fraude, plagiaat en academische mores (Derailed science. About fraud, plagiarism and academic mores)*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij De Kring, 2012.

Latour, B., When things strike back: a possible contribution of science studies, *British Journal of Sociology* 5 (2000): 105-23.

Leenders, J., 'Over roomse en protestantse heiligen (About Roman Catholic and protestant saints)', in J.C.H. Blom (ed.), *De verzuiling voorbij*. Amsterdam: Spinhuis, 2000, pp. 46-66.

Levelt, W.J.M. et al., *Falende wetenschap: De frauduleuze onderzoekspraktijken van sociaal-psycholoog Diederik Stapel (Flawed science: The fraudulent research practices of social psychologist Diederik Stapel)*, 28 November 2012a (<https://www.commissielevelt.nl/>).

Levelt, W.J.M., 'Het was slodderwetenschap, het hele systeem heeft gefaald (It was sloppy science: the entire system failed)' (Interview), *NRC- Handelsblad* 28 November 2012b: 4-5.

Loos, J.C. van der, 'Antonius van Gils in betrekking tot de Noord-Nederlandse missie (Antonius van Gils in relation to the north Netherlands mission)', *Bosche Bijdragen* XII (1933-34): 353-373.

Mosse, D., 'Anti-social anthropology? Objectivity, Objection, and the Ethnography of Public Policy and Professional Communities', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12: 4 (2006): 935-956.

Nieuwenhuis, A., *Machtsverschuivingen en eliteformatie in een Brabants dorp (Power shifts and elite formation in a village in Brabant)*. Amsterdam: Research project report Cultural Anthropology/Sociology of Non-Western Societies, VU University Amsterdam, 1976.

Nieuwenhuis, A., *Boerenleiders in een heidedorp. Een antropologische studie van machtsverhoudingen in een Brabants dorp 1850-1923 (Rural leaders in a heathland village. An anthropological study of power relations in a village in Brabant 1850-1923)*. Amsterdam: private publication, 1979.

Post, P.G.J., Recensie M. Bax, Relieuzes regimes in ontwikkeling (1988) en De vernedering van een heilige (1989) (Review of M. Bax, Religious regimes in development (1988) and The humiliation of a saint (1989), *Volkskundig Bulletin* 16.2 (1991): 215-216.

Post, P.G.J., Recensie M. Bax, Relieuzes regimes in ontwikkeling (1988) en De vernedering van een heilige (1989) (Review of M. Bax, Religious regimes in development (1988) and The humiliation of a saint (1989), *Antropologische Verkenningen* 10:1 (1991): 71-72.

Quality Assessment Research – Research assessment – Sociology and Anthropology. Association of Universities in the Netherlands July 1996.

Report of the Evaluation Committee for Research Quality Assessment 2001-2006, Faculty of Social Sciences VU University Amsterdam, February 2008.

Research Assessment Social Sciences: Self-Evaluation Report 2001-2006. Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, 2007.

Rooijackers, G., *Rituele repertoires. Volkscultuur in oostelijk Noord-Brabant 1559-1853 (Ritual repertoires. Popular culture in the east of Noord-Brabant 1559-1853)*. Nijmegen: SUN, 1994.

Schapera, I., 'Should Anthropologists Be Historians?', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 92: 2 (1962): 198-221.

Selier, F., 'In Search of Limitation. Aspects of Forty Years of CA/SNWS at the Free University, Amsterdam', in H. Vermeulen and J. Kommers (eds.), *Tales from Academia. History of Anthropology in the Netherlands*, Part I. Saarbrücken: Verlag für Entwicklungspolitik, 2002, pp. 547-567. [Nijmegen Studies in Development and Cultural Change Vol. 39]

Shore, C., and S. Wright, 'Coercive Accountability: the Rise of Audit Culture in Higher Education', in M. Strathern (ed.), *Audit Culture. Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 57-89.

Socio-Cultural Sciences, Assessment of Research Quality. Utrecht: Association of Universities in the Netherlands, 2001.

Sprangers, H., and H. Tak, 'Voortgezette 'Overherigheid' in een Noord-Brabants Dorp. Boeren- en Arbeidersverenigingen in Dongen (1920-1940) (Advanced 'Overherigheid' in a Noord-Brabant Village.

Peasants' and labourers' associations in Dongen (1920-1940)'. Nijmegen: 'Kandidaats' thesis IKSA, 1982.

Stocking, G.W., 'Reading the Palimpsest of Inquiry: *Notes and Queries* and the History of British Social Anthropology', in *Delimiting Anthropology. Occasional Essays and Reflections*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001, pp. 164-206.

Verrips, J., 'Moedwillige misverstanden? (Wilful misunderstandings?)', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 7: 23 (1981): 281-285. West, R., *Tito and the Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia*. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

Wildenbeest, G., *De Winterswijkse Scholten: opkomst, bloei en neergang. Een antropologische speurtocht naar het fatum van een agrarische elite (The Scholten of Winterswijk: rise, prime and decline. An anthropological quest to find the fate of an agrarian elite)*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 3rd edition, 1985. [1st edition 1983]

Wilterdink, N., 'De civilisatietheorie in discussie. Opmerkingen bij een congres (The civilization theory in discussion. Comments about a conference)', *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 8: 4 (1982): 571-590.

Wolf, E. (ed.), *Religion, power and protest in local communities: the northern shore of the Mediterranean*. Berlin/Amsterdam: Mouton, 1984 (Religion and society 24).

Wolf, E. (ed.), *Religious Regimes and State-Formation. Perspectives from European Ethnology*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.

Wolf, J.J. de, *Eigenheid en samenwerking. 100 jaar antropologisch verenigingsleven in Nederland (Individuality and collaboration. 100 years of anthropological society life in the Netherlands)*. Leiden: KITLV Press, 1998.

Žanić, I., 'War and Peace in Hercegovina', fall/winter 1998.

(<http://www.c3.hu/scripta/books/98/34/zanic.htm>) (most recently accessed 3-9-2013).

Zorgvuldig en integer omgaan met wetenschappelijke onderzoeksgegevens (Handling scientific research data with due care and integrity). Amsterdam: Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW), 2012. [KNAW – Recommendations of the KNAW Committee on Research Data]

Zwier, G.J., *Antropologen te velde. De cultuurschok van de veldwerker (Anthropologists in the field. The culture shock of the field worker)*. Baarn: De Prom, 2nd revised edition, 1989.

Appendix 3 Complete list of publications by M.M.G. Bax – Published and non-published publications

Key to sources:

CV = CV in appointment file for endowed professor (1988-89)

VCW1987-88 = Research report 1987 *Vaste Commissie voor de Wetenschap*

D1995 = Documentation Research Assessment 1995

Eval 93-97 = Bibliography evaluation in 1998 with a view to extension of professorship

D2000 = Documentation Research Assessment Socio-Cultural Sciences 2000

S2007 = Research Assessment Social Sciences: Self-Evaluation Report 2001-2006 (2007)

M = Metis, the database of scientific publications by VU University Amsterdam researchers

PUBLISHED PUBLICATIONS				
	Source	Year	Title	Title of compilation/conference/publisher
1	Mentioned in 2 (1966)	1964	Servië, een bijdrage tot de typologie van de peasant society (Serbia, a contribution to the typology of the peasant society) (doctoral thesis)	Amsterdam (Municipal University), not published.
2	PiCarta	1966	Bibliography peasant society	Amsterdam (VU University Amsterdam), stencil publication.
3	CV, PiCarta	1970	Patronage Irish style: Irish politicians as brokers	Sociologische Gids 17, 3.
4	Thesis	1971	Kiesstelsel en leider-volging relaties in Ierland (Electoral system and leader-follower relationships in Ireland)	Mens en Maatschappij 46: 366-75.
5	Thesis	1972	Integration, forms of communication, and development: centre-periphery relations in Ireland past and present	Sociologische Gids 19: 137-44.
6	PiCarta	1973	Dimensies in politieke antropologie: discussiestuk voor de themagroep politiek (Dimensions in political anthropology: discussion paper for the politics topic group), 8 March 1973	Internal publication.
7	CV, PiCarta	1973	Harpstrings and confessions: an anthropological study of politics in rural Ireland	Thesis, Amsterdam (Municipal University) 1973.
8	CV	1975	The political machine and its importance in the Irish Republic	Political Anthropology 1, 1: 6-20.
9	PiCarta	1975	Changing elites and parochialization of Irish rural politics	Symposium on 'Aspects of developmental change in rural Ireland', Amsterdam, 22-3 1975.
10	CV, PiCarta	1975	On the increasing importance of machine-style politics in the Irish political process	J. Boissevain & J. Friedl (eds.), <i>Beyond the Community: Social Process in Europe</i> , p. 134 ff.
11	CV, Web of Science	1976	Harpstrings and confessions: machine-style politics in the Irish Republic	Assen, etc.: Van Gorcum (commercial edition of thesis).
12	PiCarta	1977	Network structuralists and network actionists: an old dichotomy under new cover	Paper prepared for a session on 'Current research and theory in social network analysis' of the 76th annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association
13	Web of Science	1978	Binnenstebuiten en ondersteboven. De antropologie van de industriële samenleving (Terreinverkenningen in de Culturele Antropologie) (Inside out and upside down. The anthropology of the industrial society (Explorations in Cultural Anthropology))	Contributions to Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 134, 1: 181-2.
14	CV	1978	Figurational analysis: a better perspective for networkers; with an illustration from Ireland	Anthropological Quarterly 51, 4: 221-30.
15	PiCarta	1979	Corruption in developing countries	Civis Mundi 18, 1: 33.
16	CV, PiCarta	1980	Boerenemancipatie in Brabant: Vergruizeling van een beeld (Peasant emancipation in Brabant: The shattering of an image)	Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis 6, 18: 163-80.
17	PiCarta	1981	Fredrik Barth (1929): voortrekker en avonturier (Fredrik Barth (1929): pioneer and adventurer)	Intermediair 17, 35: 23.
18	PiCarta	1981	M. Bax and A. Nieuwenhuis, Historiserende antropologie in discussie, 3: de plank mislaan maar toch doorhameren (Historicizing Anthropology in discussion, 3: Missing the point, but hammering it home regardless); comments on Fischer, Van der Veen and Trienekens	Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis 7, 23: 286.
19	CV	1981	Ireland – Changing power balances of a nation-state and its rural communities (Title should be: The small community in the Irish political process)	P.J. Drudy (ed.), <i>Ireland; land, politics and people</i> . London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 119-140
20	CV	1982	Fredrik Barth. Portret van een voortrekker (Fredrik Barth. Portrait of a pioneer)	G. Banck & B. van Heijningen (eds.), <i>Beroep antropoloog. Vreemde volken, visies en vooroordelen</i> . Amsterdam: Interpress.
21	CV, PiCarta	1982	M. Bax and A. Nieuwenhuis, Peasant emancipation in the Roman Catholic South of the Netherlands: the shattering of a tableau-vivant	The Netherlands' Journal of Sociology 18: 25-45.
22	PiCarta	1982	"Wie tegen de Kerk piest wordt zelf nat": Over uitbreiding en intensivering van het clericale regime in Noord-Brabant ("He who pisses against the Church gets wet himself": about expansion and intensification of the clerical regime in Noord-Brabant)	Antropologische Verkenningen 1, 2: 20-58.

23	CV	1983	"Us" Catholics and "Them" Catholics in Dutch Brabant: the dialectics of religious factional process	Anthropological Quarterly 56, 5: 167-78.
24	PiCarta	1983	Schisma in een parochie: spanning tussen kerkelijke autoriteiten en de plaatselijke kloostergemeenschap in een Brabants dorp (Schism in a parish: tension between ecclesiastical authorities and the local monastic community in a village in Brabant)	Intermediar 19, 13: 21.
25	PiCarta	1983	Religious leadership and social-cultural change in Southern Dutch society: the dialectic of a politico- religious process	Paper prepared for a symposium on 'Leadership and social change' of the XIth International Congress of anthropological and ethnological sciences. Vancouver, August 20-5, 1983.
26	CV, PiCarta	1983	Ritualisering en versobering in een Brabantse dorpsparochie (Ritualization and austerity in a Brabant village parish)	178), 1979 (1983A. Koster, Y. Kuiper en J. Verrips, Feest en ritueel in Europa. Antropologische essays.
27	CV, PiCarta	1984	"Officieel geloof" en "volks geloof" in Noord-Brabant; veranderingen in opvattingen en gedragingen als uitdrukking van rivaliserende clericale regimes ("Official faith" and "popular faith" in Noord-Brabant; changes in attitudes and behaviours as an expression of rival clerical regimes)	Sociologisch Tijdschrift 10 (1983-1984): 621-47.
28	CV, PiCarta	1985	Religieuze regimes en staatsontwikkeling; notities voor een figuratie-benadering (Religious regimes and state development; notes for a figuration approach)	Sociologisch Tijdschrift 12, 1: 22-47.
29	CV, PiCarta	1985	Religious infighting and the formation of a dominant Catholic regime in southern Dutch society	Social Compass 32, 1: 57-72.
30	CV	1985	Popular devotions, power and religious regimes in Catholic Dutch Brabant	Ethnology 24, 3: 215-27.
31	CV, PiCarta	1985	Brabant- opnieuw missiegebied?: een veranderend kerkbegrip als gevolg van wijzigende intra-religieuze machtsverhoudingen (Brabant – a mission area again? A changing church concept as an effect of changing intrareligious power relations)	Antropologische Papers VU, no. 3. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
32	CV, PiCarta	1985	Opstand op de Lindenburgh; monastieke machtsverhoudingen in een ontwikkelingsperspectief (Uprising on the Lindenburgh; monastic power relations in a development perspective)	Sociologische Gids 32, 3: 178-95.
33	Ned. Lit.	1985	Dichtbij en toch vreemd (Close by yet foreign)	A. Koster (ed.), Culturen dicht-er-bij. Ervaringen van acht antropologen. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, pp. 3-12.
34	CV, PiCarta	1986	Politieke antropologie in vogelvlucht; van 'law and order' naar zingeving en macht (A bird's eye view of political anthropology; from 'law and order' to meanings of life and power)	Binneken and Kouijzer (eds.), Politieke psychologie Samson, pp. 132-41.
35	CV, PiCarta	1986	Terug naar donkere tijden? Over het falen van een voorgeschreven kerkelijke orde in hedendaags ruraal Brabant (A return to darker times? About the failure of a prescribed ecclesiastical order in contemporary rural Brabant)	G. Rooijackers and T. van der Zee (eds.), Religieuze volkscultuur. De spanning tussen de voorgeschreven orde en de geleefde praktijk. Nijmegen: Sun, pp. 119-35.
36	PiCarta	1986	Rebellion at the lindenburgh: southern Dutch monastic power relations in a developmental perspective	The Netherlands Journal of Sociology 22, 2: 130-44.
37	CV, VCW1987-88	1986	Religieuze machtsbalansen en een veranderende kerkopvatting in Noord-Brabant (Religious power balance and a changing attitude to church in Noord-Brabant)	F. Besauw et al. (eds.), Balans en perspectief. Over aard en functie van het verleden. Utrecht, Proceedings RUU, pp. 179-203. (Should be: pp. 1259-72)
38	CV, VCW1987-88	1987	Religious regimes and state formation; towards a research perspective	Anthropological Quarterly 60, 1: 1-11.
39	CV, PiCarta	1987	Maria-verschijningen in Medjugorje: rivaliserende religieuze regimes en staatsvorming (Marian apparitions in Medjugorje: rival religious regimes and state formation)	Sociologisch Tijdschrift 14, 2: 195-223.
40	PiCarta	1988	Development and decline: the evolution of sociopolitical organisation, by H.J.M. Claessen, P. van de Velde and M. Estellie Smith: book review	Contributions to Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 144, 1: 173-4.
41	PiCarta	1988	Return to mission status?	Ethnologia Europaea 18, 1: 73.
42	PiCarta	1988	Religieuze regimes in ontwikkeling: verholde vormen van macht en afhankelijkheid (Religious regimes in development: concealed forms of power and dependence)	Hilversum: Gooi en Sticht.
43	CV, PiCarta	1988	Politieke antropologie in vogelvlucht (A bird's eye view of political anthropology)	Amsterdam: VU University Press.
44	PiCarta	1989	De zieners van Medjugorje: professionalisering en beheersingsproblemen in een Joegoslavisch bedevaartcentrum (The visionaries of Medjugorje: professionalization and management problems at a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 16, 1: 3.
45	PiCarta	1989	De vernedering van een heilige: religieuze machtspolitiek in een Zuidnederlandse dorpsgemeenschap (The humiliation of a saint: religious power politics in a village community in the south of the Netherlands)	Inaugural address VU University Amsterdam 5 October 1989. Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht.
46	PiCarta	1990	The great Father and the danger: religious cults, material forces and collective fantasies in the world of the Surinamese Maroons, door H.U.E. Thoden van Velzen and W. van Wetering: book review	Antropologische Verkenningen 9, 1: 56.

47	D1995	1990	Patronage in a holy place; preliminary research notes on a 'parallel structure' in a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre	Ethnos 55, 1-2: 41-55.
48	PiCarta	1990	The madonna of Medjugorje: religious rivalry and the formation of a devotional movement in Yugoslavia	Anthropological Quarterly 63, 2, 63-75.
49	PiCarta	1990	Religieus cliëntelisme in een Joegoslavische boerengemeenschap (Religious clientelism in a Yugoslav rural community)	Sociologische Gids 37, 2: 94.
50	PiCarta	1990	Vrouwengekte in Medjugorje: duivelsterreur en pelgrimsdwang in een Joegoslavisch bedevaartsoord (Female delusion in Medjugorje: devil terror and pilgrim pressure at a Yugoslav pilgrimage site)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 17, 1: 29.
51	D1995	1990	The seers of Medjugorje; professionalization and management problems in a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre	Ethnologia Europaea 21, 2: 82-98. (Should be 2: 167-76)
52	PiCarta	1990	Helers en heiligen: volksgenezers en wonderdoeners in Brabant door J. van Uffelen (Healers and saints: folk healers and miracle workers in Brabant by J. van Uffelen): book review	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 16, 4: 154.
53	D1995	1990	A monastic community between 'fiction' and 'non-fiction'	P. Kloos (ed.), True fiction, artistic and scientific representations of reality. Amsterdam: VU University Press, pp. 9-20.
54	D1995	1991	Religious regimes and state-formation: toward a research perspective	E.R. Wolf (ed.), Religious regimes and state-formation, perspective from European ethnology. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 7-27.
55	CV, D1995, Eval 93-97	1991	Marian apparitions in Medjugorje; rivalling religious regimes and state formation in Yugoslavia	E.R. Wolf (ed.), Religious regimes and state-formation, perspective from European ethnology. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 29-55.
56	PiCarta	1991	De heiligen van Gomila: geloof en geweld in een Joegoslavische boerensamenleving (The saints of Gomila: faith and violence in a Yugoslav peasant community)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 17, 4: 111-38.
57	D1995	1991	Religious regimes in Catholic Dutch society	M.Swartz en F. McGlynn, Anthropological approaches to political behavior. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, pp. 273-93.
58	PiCarta	1992	Mart Bax, Peter Kloos, Adrianus Koster (eds.), Faith and polity: essays on religion and politics.	Amsterdam: VU University Press.
59	D1995	1992	Women's madness in Medjugorje: between devils and pilgrims in a Yugoslav devotional centre	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 2: 42-54.
60	D1995, Microsoft AS	1992	Mental health and religious power politics in Yugoslavia (Should be: Female suffering, local power relations and religious tourism: a case study from Yugoslavia)	Medical Anthropology Quarterly 6: 114-28.
61	D1995	1992	Ritual and violence in rural Yugoslavia (Should be: The Saints of Gomila...)	Ethnologia Europaea 22: 17-31.
62	PiCarta	1992	Hoe de berg heilig werd: de politiek van sacralisering in een Joegoslavische gemeenschap (How the mountain became holy: the politics of sanctification in a Yugoslav community)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 18, 4: 3-23.
63	D1995	1992	St. Gerard's wrath: religious power politics in a Dutch community	Anthropological Quarterly 65, 1: 221-42. (Should be: 65, 4: 177-86)
64	PiCarta	1993	Politieke antropologie in vogelvlucht (A bird's eye view of political anthropology)	
65	D1995	1993	Power and the definition of the sacred; popular religious regime-formation in former Yugoslavia	Etnoloska Tribina 16: 119-32.
66	D1995	1993	How the mountain became sacred. The politics of sacralization in a former Yugoslav community	Ethnologia Europaea 22: 115-25.
67	PiCarta	1993	Medjugorjes kleine oorlog: barbarisering in een Bosnische bedevaartplaats (Medjugorje's little war: barbarization at a Bosnian pilgrimage site)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 20, 1, 3-26.
68	PiCarta	1993	Power and prayer: religious and political processes in past and present	In: M. Bax and A. Koster (eds.), Power and prayer: religious and political processes in past and present. Amsterdam: VU University Press, pp. 79-91.
69	Web of Science	1994	Review of contesting the sacred: The anthropology of Christian pilgrimage. John Eade and Michael J. Sallnow	American Ethnologist 21, 4: 938-9.
70	PiCarta	1994	Manipulating the sacred. Diocesan encapsulation and local resistance in Dutch Brabant	Transactions. Essays in honor of Jeremy F. Boissevain, pp. 53-64.
71	PiCarta	1995	Medjugorje: religion, politics and violence in rural Bosnia	Amsterdam, VU University Press.
72	M, D2000	1996	Killing the Dead in Surmanci; about the local sources of "The War" in Bosnia	Ethnologia Europaea, 26, 1: 17-25.
73	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	1996	Making holy in Medjugorje; The politics of meaning in a Bosnian village community	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 6, 4. (Should be 6, 2: 219-32)
74	PiCarta	1996	Medjugorje: religion, politics and violence in rural Bosnia	Internationale Spectator 50, 3: 160.
75	PiCarta	1996	De doden van Surmanci: de locale bronnen van 'de oorlog' in Bosnië-Herzegovina (The dead of Surmanci: the local sources of 'the war' in Bosnia-Herzegovina)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 23, 2: 316-30.
76	PiCarta	1996	Medjugorje: religion, politics and violence in rural Bosnia	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 23, 2: 396.
77	M,D2000	1997	Civilization and decivilization in Bosnia: A case study from a mountain community in Herzegovina	Ethnologia Europaea 27, 2: 80-112.

78	M,D2000	1997	Identity formation in Bosnia: the Muslim case; a review	Ethnos 62, 1-2: 151-3.
79	M, D2000	1997	Mass graves, stagnating identification, and violence: a case study in the local source of 'the War' in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Anthropological Quarterly 70, 1: 11-21.
80	M, D2000	1997	Priests and visionaries in a Bosnian holy shrine: the dynamics of a power process	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 7, 2: 293-305.
81	PiCarta	1998	Maria en de mijnenwerpers van Medjugorje: de dynamiek van etnische zuivering in ruraal Bosnië- Herzegovina (Mary and the rocket launchers of Medjugorje: the dynamics of ethnic cleansing in rural Bosnia-Herzegovina)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 25, 3: 371-94.
82	PiCarta	1999	Regime-antropologie: twee opstellen (Regime anthropology: two papers)	Antropologische bijdragen 5. Amsterdam (Department of Cultural Anthropology etc.)
83	M, Microsoft AS	1999	Warlords, priests, and the politics of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Ethnic and Racial Studies 23(1): 16-36.
84	M, D2000	1999	Gender formation and gender politics in a Bosnian community (Incorrect title, should be: Ruza's problems. Gender relations and violence control in a Bosnian rural community)	S.P. Ramet, P. Ramen and B. Magas (eds.), Gender-politics in the Western Balkans: women, society, and politics in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States. Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania State University Press.
85	PiCarta	1999	Ethnic identification, local feuding and religious factionalism: the relative autonomy of the homogenization process of a Bosnian region	Antropologische bijdragen 7. Amsterdam (Department of Cultural Anthropology etc.)
86	M	2000	2000) Holy Mary and Medjugorje's rocketeers. The logic of an ethnic cleansing process in Bosnia.	Ethnologia Europaea 30, 1: 45-58.
87	M, Microsoft AS	2000	Planned policy or primitive balkanism? A local contribution to the ethnography of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Ethnos 65, 3: 2-24. (Should be: pp. 317-40)
88	M	2000	The celebration of a violent past: local sources of ethnonationalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Etnoloska Tribina 23, 3: 57-78. (No; This article is in Narodna Umjetnost http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=53301)
89	M	2000	Barbarization processes in a Bosnian rural community	J.M. Halpern en D.A. Kideckel, Neighbours at war. Anthropological perspectives on Yugoslav ethnicity, culture and history. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 187-203.
90	M	2000	Warlords, priests, and the politics of ethnic cleansing: a case study from rural Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ethnic and Racial Studies 24, 2: 20-42. (Should be: 23, 1: 16-36.
91	PiCarta	2002	Introduction – 'Peter Kloos: man of inspiration and many-sided anthropologist (1936-2000)'	Dick Kooiman, Adrianus Koster, Peer Smets and Bernhard Venema: (eds.), Conflict in a globalizing world; studies in honour of Peter Kloos, pp. 1-3.
92	PiCarta	2002	Violence formations and 'ethnic cleansing' at a Bosnian pilgrimage centre	Dick Kooiman, Adrianus Koster, Peer Smets and Bernhard Venema: (eds.), Conflict in a globalizing world; studies in honour of Peter Kloos, pp. 69-87.
			II Titles of possibly published but untraced publications by M.M.G. Bax	
1	CV	1976	Changing elites and 'demodernization' in Irish politics	Anglo-Irish Studies.
2	CV	1977	How corrupt is the Irish bureaucracy? Tom Garvin's views reconsidered	The Economic and Social Review.
3	CV, VCW1987-88	1985	Pillarization reconsidered. The North Brabant case	J. Boissevain (ed.), A social anthropology of Dutch society. Selected readings. London: Athlone, pp. 61-79.
4	CV, VCW1987-88	1985?	Voorbij de eeuwigheid. Hiërarchie, ruimte en conflict in een Brabants klooster (Beyond eternity. Hierarchy, space and conflict in a Brabant monastery)	J. Verrips and K. Verrips (ed.), Proxemie en Kynesiek. Antropologische verkenningen (Proxemics and Kinesics. Anthropological Explorations). Euromed publications, pp. 103-21. (? Should probably be: Ruimtegebruik en Lichaamstaal in Europa en Noord-Afrika (Use of Space and Body language in Europe and North Africa). Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1990: 175-192.)
5	M	1998	Priests and visionaries in a Bosnian holy shrine: the dynamics of a power process	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 7, 2: 122-32. (Should be: vol. 8: 122-32).
			Titles of non-published publications of M.M.G. Bax (minus sign means not published)	
1	CV	-1982	Transactionalism on the threshold?	Proceedings of the Ethnology Department 19, University of Oslo.
2	CV	-1982	An encapsulated peasant movement in North Brabant (the Netherlands)	The Journal of Peasant Studies 9, 4.
3	CV, VCW1987-88	-1984	Fighting with sacraments. The politics of religion in southern Dutch society	Midwestern Journal for the Study of Ethnohistory 8, 2: 132-48.
4	CV, VCW1987-88	-1986	De onmacht van 'Religie en Macht' (The powerlessness of 'Religion and Power')	F. Besauw et al. (eds.), Balans en perspectief. Over aard en functie van het verleden. Utrecht, Proceedings RUU, pp. 86-99.
5	VCW1987-88	-1987	The misleading dichotomy of religion and power: towards a new research perspective	Sociological Abstracts 10, 6: 60-81.
6	D1995	-1990	Religious and political clientelism: a comparison	European Studies Review 20, 3: 233-40.

7	D1995	-1990	Shrines and state-formation in Yugoslavia. Some preliminary observations	Anthropological Quarterly 63, 4: 217-25.
8	D1995	-1990	Beyond eternity. Time, rank and power in a Dutch monastery	London School of Economics Quarterly 2, 1: 66-86.
9	D1995	-1990	Crosses and chapels as politico-religious markers; with an illustration from Catholic Dutch Brabant	Princeton journal of folklore 14, 1-2: 24-41.
10	D1995	-1991	On the priestly perspective in the study of religion; causes and consequences	Occasional papers no. 47. Universities of Bergen and Oslo Press.
11	D1995	-1991	Monasteries and state-formation; a Dutch-Yugoslav comparison	British Journal of Slavic studies 38, 4: 288-312.
12	D1995	-1991	Feuding and faith in Yugoslavia; preliminary observations on violence control	New Mexico Quarterly 18, 4: 223-9.
13	D1995	-1991	Male power and female belief. Observations from Yugoslavia	Sociologija Sela 33, 2: 91-106.
14	D1995	-1991	Ethnic boundaries, state formation and religious expansionism in Bosnia	Journal of Croatian Studies 43, 2: 110-7.
15	D1995	-1991	Fragmented warfare and state-formation in Yugoslavia; preliminary observations	Journal of European Political Research 21, 3: 196-208.
16	D1995	-1991	Ethnic nationalism in Central Yugoslavia	178), 1979 (1983A. Simic (ed.), Nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe. Michigan: Odena Press, pp. 60-71.
17	D1995	-1992	The sacred in political perspective: a review	American Ethnologist 29, 4: 181-4.
18	D1995	-1992	M. Bax and M. Povranovic, Wartime in a Yugoslav community; an anthropology of fear	M. Gullestad, Culture and fear. Anthropological perspectives. Michigan: Prester, pp. 92-109.
19	D1995	-1992	Ethnic antagonism and the construction of religious community: a case study from former Yugoslavia	Cambridge: Anthropology Papers 89: 16-23.
20	D1995	-1992	Ethnicity and nationality: concepts in Yugoslav political arenas and discourse	Cultural Studies 6: 37-46.
21	D1995	-1992	Ethnic violence and local warfare in a Yugoslav mountain area: preliminary observations	Etnoloska Tribina 16: 81-93.
22	D1995	-1992	Ethnic violence and religious community in Herzegovina	Proceedings conference on issues of identity in contemporary 'Yugoslavia'. Canterbury p. 21-44.
23	D1995	-1992	Guns and boundaries in Yugoslavia	Abstracts in Anthropology 24: 729-33.
24	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1993	Identity-formation in exile. Bosnian refugees in Germany	Hessischer Blatter für Volks- und Kulturforschung 29: 17-28.
25	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1993	Medjugorje at war	L. Rupcic, Fear, death and resistance in Bosnia-Herzegovina; an ethnography of war. Zagreb: Mlado, pp. 31-51.
26	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1993	Vengeance and fear in a Bosnian mountain community	East European Security Studies 12: 156-68.
27	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Sacralization and secularization in a rural parish in Bosnia-Herzegovina	G. Bowman, Antagonism and identity in the national idiom: the case of former Yugoslavia. Oxford: Berg Press, pp. 41-53.
28	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Mali rat i veliko u Bosni i Hercegovini	Etnoloska Tribina 17: 80-96.
29	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Local warfare in Bosnia: a case of barbarization?	Proceedings of the XIIIth ISA World Congress of Sociology (II), Bielefeld, 18-23 July 1994. Bielefeld: KIM, pp. 181-203.
30	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Violence and the politics of identification in rural Bosnia	The Anthropology of East Europe Review 12, 3: 16-23. (Special issue, rev. ed.).
31	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Clergy and military mobilization in Bosnia-Herzegovina: preliminary observations	Slavic Review 16: 19-23.
32	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	Nationalizing the sacred: shrines and identification in rural Bosnia	M. Vego, Transformation of identity in Eastern Europe. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp. 86-101.
33	D1995, Eval 93-97	-1994	M. Bax and P. Jelescanin, Marijina ukazanja u Hrvatskoj	Hrvatski Etnografski Zbornik 74, 1: 47-58.
34	D2000, Eval 93-97	-1995	Military mobilization and primordial ties in rural Bosnia	Glas Koncila 11: 6-15.
35	D2000, Eval 93-97	-1995	M. Bax and G. Crnkovic, War monuments in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Etnoloska Tribina 18: 21-29.
36	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1996	S Gospinom vidjelcom u Medjugorje	Glas Koncila 12, 3: 198-217.
37	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1996	The exodus of Bosnian barbarici; "war" and Croat refugees in Germany	Etnoloska Tribina 19, 1: 21-32.
38	M, Eval 93-97	-1996	Feuding and warfare; civilizing and decivilizing tendencies in rural Bosnia	J. Halpern and D. Kideckel (eds.), Politics and warfare in Ex-Yugoslavia. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
39	M, Eval 93-97	-1996	Gender relations and violence control in Rural Bosnia-Herzegovina	S.P. Ramet and M. Bax, Women, society, and politics in Yugoslavia. Pittsburg, Pa.: Penn State University Press, pp. 40-61.
40	M, Eval 93-97	-1996	Introduction	S.P. Ramet and M. Bax (eds.), Women, society, and politics in Yugoslavia. Pittsburg, Pa.: Penn State University Press.
41	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1996	Moc rimske katolicke crkve u ruralnom nizozemskom Brabantu i Hercegovine.	Narodna umjetnost: Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research 32, 5: 272-91.
42	M, D2000	-1997	Marian apparitions in Medjugorje and Hrasno: a church political comparison	Narodna umjetnost: Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research 33, 2: 143-50.
43	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1997	Genocide and ethnic cleansing in rural Bosnia; a case study	Stephen Mennell (ed.), Decivilising processes in Europe. Anthropological perspectives. London: Strint Press, pp. 60-73.
44	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1997	Nationalism, religion, and ethnicity in rural Bosnia-Herzegovina	Franjo Simic Lectures in History and Society 3. Zagreb: University of Zagreb Press.

45	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1997	Violence and religion in the Balkans	The Donald W. Treadgold Papers 9. Seattle, Wa: The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies.
46	M, D2000, Eval 93-97	-1997	Civilizing and decivilizing processes in Bosnia.	Proceedings of the 18th World Congress on Violence and Human Coexistence. Dublin: UCD Press, pp. 32-41.
47	M, D2000	-1998	Holy Mary and Medjugorje's rocketeers: the dynamic of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia	Replika Ethnologika 18: 190-204.
48	D2000	-1998	War monuments and ethnic antagonism: a case study from Bosnia-Herzegovina	Replika Ethnologika 18: 31-48.
49	M, D2000	-1998	Barbarization in Bosnia: a case study	J.M. Halpern (ed.), Culture and Conflict in Former Yugoslavia. Pittsburgh, Pa: Penn State University Press, pp. 216-33.
50	M, D2000	-1998	War as an integrative mechanism: Bosnian case	Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Warfare in the Balkans. Dubrovnik: Dubrovnik State University.
51	M, D2000	-1998	Elias and the war in Bosnia: a preliminary empirical confrontation with Norbert Elias' civilization theory	Anthropological Quarterly 71, 2: 108-17.
52	M, D2000	-1998	Franciscans and Croat National integration in Bosnia-Herzegovina: preliminary observations	Bosnia Franciscana 6, 4: 114-21.
53	M, D2000	-1998	Witnessing and memorizing: the implications of different forms of personal experience of war situations	Narodna umjetnost: Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research 35, 2: 130-42.
54	M, D2000	-1999	Ethnic cleansing in Bosnia; local perspectives	A. Weingrod and A. Levy (eds.), Proceedings of a conference on constructing cultures, diasporas, ethnicities, identities. Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, pp. ?-?.
55	M, D2000	-1999	The dynamics of ethnic homogenization in a Bosnian rural area	B. Baskar and B. Brumen, Mediterranean ethnological summer school publications 5. Ljubljana: Institu za multikulturne raziskave, pp. ?-?.
56	M	-2000	Religion 'on the ground'. Towards a processual approach of religious social formations in anthropology and sociology. With an illustration from ex-Yugoslavia	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 10, 2: 212-29.
57	M	-2000	Civilization and decivilization in Bosnia: A case study from a Bosnian mountain community.	Osteuropa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens 47, 3: 30-51.
58	M	-2000	Hercegovacki rat i mir	Erasmus 18, 2: 84-92.
59	M	-2000	Processes of state deformation and reformation in Bosnia	Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans 2, 1: 18-31.
60	M	-2000	Religious nationalism and violence in Bosnia	Narodna umjetnost: Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research 37, 2: 268-91.
61	M	-2000	M. Bax and A. Simic, Nationalism as folk ideology: illustrations from former Yugoslavia. (Chapter exists, but without Bax)	J.M. Halpern en D.A. Kideckel (eds.), Neighbours at war. Anthropological perspectives on Yugoslav ethnicity, culture and history. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, pp. 103-16.
62	M	-2000	Ethnic cleansing in Bosnia: local perspectives	178), 1979 (1983A. Levy, J. Brun and A. Weingrod, Diasporas, ethnicities and identities: anthropological perspectives. London: Hirst & Comp, pp. 35-56.
63	M,S2007	-2001	Competitive sharing of Marian shrines in two regions of the former Yugoslavia	Current Anthropology 42, 4: 51-62.
64	M,S2007	-2001	Mejugorje's little war: violence formation and ethnic cleansing in a Marian apparitions centre in Bosnia-Herzegovina	V. Balaban, Marian apparitions crosscultural. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 4 List of publication history of the Medjugorje study, based on the 1995 compilation

Regarding: Dutch edition, English translation, inclusion in compilations, republication under a different title with unspecified alterations

	Title	Publication
1995	Prologue	
1995	Chapter One Introducing Medjugorje: A Cook's Tour	
1995	Chapter Two The Blessed Virgin Appears: Genesis and Evolution of a Devotional Regime	
1987	Maria-verschijningen in Medjugorje: rivaliserende religieuze regimes en staatsvorming (Marian apparitions in Medjugorje: rival religious regimes and state formation)	Sociologisch Tijdschrift 14, 2: 195-223.
1990	The madonna of Medjugorje: religious rivalry and the formation of a devotional movement in Yugoslavia	Anthropological Quarterly 63, 2: 63-75.
1991	Marian apparitions in Medjugorje; rivalling religious regimes and state formation in Yugoslavia	E.R. Wolf (ed.), Religious regimes and state-formation, perspectives from European ethnology. New York: State Univ. of NY Press, pp. 29-55.
1995	Chapter Three Taming the Untamable: Seers and Management Problems	
1989	De zieners van Medjugorje: professionalisering en beheersingsproblemen in een Joegoslavisch bedevaartcentrum (The visionaries of Medjugorje: professionalization and management problems at a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 16, 1: 3.
1990	The seers of Medjugorje; professionalization and management problems in a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre	Ethnologia Europaea 21, 2: 82-98. (Should be 2: 167-76)
1997	Priests and visionaries in a Bosnian holy shrine: the dynamics of a power process	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 7, 2: 293-305.
1995	Chapter Four Going for Grace, Fighting for Spoils: Religious Patronage	
1990	Religieuze cliëntelisme in een Joegoslavische boerengemeenschap (Religious clientelism in a Yugoslav rural community)	Sociologische Gids 37, 2: 94.
1990	Patronage in a holy place; preliminary research notes on a 'parallel structure' in a Yugoslav pilgrimage centre	Ethnos 55, 1-2: 41-55.
1995	Chapter Five Haunted by Priests, Pilgrims, and Devils: Women of Medjugorje	
1990	Vrouwengekte in Medjugorje: duivelsterreur en pelgrimsdwang in een Yugoslav pilgrimage site	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 17, 1: 29.
1992	Women's madness in Medjugorje: between devils and pilgrims in a Yugoslav devotional centre	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 2: 42-54.
1992	Mental health and religious power politics in Yugoslavia (Should be: Female suffering, local power relations and religious tourism: a case study from Yugoslavia)	Medical Anthropology Quarterly 6: 114-28.
1993	Power and prayer: religious and political processes in past and present	In: M. Bax and A. Koster (eds.), Power and prayer: religious and political processes in past and present. Amsterdam: VU University Press, pp. 79-91.
1999	Gender formation and gender politics in a Bosnian community (Incorrect title, should be: Ruza's problems. Gender relations and violence control in a Bosnian rural community)	S.P. Ramet, P. Ramen and B. Magas (eds.), Gender-politics in the Western Balkans: women, society, and politics in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States. Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania State University Press.
1995	Chapter Six Holy Mountains: Sacralization as a Political Process	
1992	Hoe de berg heilig werd: de politiek van sacralisering in een Joegoslavische gemeenschap (How the mountain became holy: the politics of sanctification in a Yugoslav community)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 18, 4: 3-23.
1993	How the mountain became sacred. The politics of sacralization in a former Yugoslav community	Ethnologia Europaea 22: 115-25.
1993	Power and the definition of the sacred; popular religious regime-formation in former Yugoslavia	Etnoloska Tribina 16: 119-32.
1996	Making holy in Medjugorje; The politics of meaning in a Bosnian village community	Journal of Mediterranean Studies 6, 4. (Should be 6, 2: 219-32).
1995	Chapter Seven Gomila's Saints: Ritual and Violence Control	
1991	De heiligen van Gomila: geloof en geweld in een Joegoslavische boerensamenleving (The saints of Gomila: faith and violence in a Yugoslav peasant community)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 17, 4: 111-38.
1992	Ritual and violence in rural Yugoslavia (Should be: The Saints of Gomila...)	Ethnologia Europaea 22: 17-31.
1995	Chapter Eight Barbarization: Total Local Warfare	

1993	Medjugorjes kleine oorlog: barbarisering in een Bosnische bedevaartplaats (Medjugorje's little war: barbarization at a Bosnian pilgrimage site)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 20, 1, 3-26.
2000	Planned policy or primitive balkanism? A local contribution to the ethnography of the war in Bosnia Herzegovina	Ethnos 65, 3: 2-24. (Should be: pp. 317-40)
2000	Barbarization processes in a Bosnian rural community	J.M. Halpern en D.A. Kideckel, Neighbours at war. Anthropological perspectives on Yugoslav ethnicity, culture and history. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 187-203.
2002	Violence formations and 'ethnic cleansing' at a Bosnian pilgrimage centre	Dick Kooiman., Adrianus Koster, Peer Smets and Bernhard Venema: (eds.), Conflict in a globalizing world; studies in honour of Peter Kloos, pp. 69-87.
1995	Epilogue Surmanci's Secret: A Never-Ending Story?	
1996	De doden van Surmanci: de locale bronnen van 'de oorlog' in Bosnië-Herzegovina (The dead of Surmanci: the local sources of 'the war' in Bosnia-Herzegovina)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 23, 2: 316-30.
1996	Killing the Dead in Surmanci; about the local sources of "The War" in Bosnia	Ethnologia Europaea, 26, 1: 17-25.
1997	Mass graves, stagnating identification, and violence: a case study in the local source of 'the War' in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Anthropological Quarterly 70, 1: 11-21.
2000	The celebration of a violent past: local sources of ethnonationalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Etnoloska Tribina 23, 3: 57-78. (No; This article is in Narodna Umjetnost http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanakjezik=53301)
	New article	
1998	Maria en de mijnenwerpers van Medjugorje: de dynamiek van etnische zuivering in ruraal Bosnië- Herzegovina (Mary and the rocket launchers of Medjugorje: the dynamics of ethnic cleansing in rural Bosnia-Herzegovina)	Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 25, 3: 371-94.
1999	Warlords, priests, and the politics of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Ethnic and Racial Studies 23:1, 16-36.
2000	Holy Mary and Medjugorje's rocketeers. The logic of an ethnic cleansing process in Bosnia.	Ethnologia Europaea 30, 1: 45-58.