

traditions were internally variable, with Boasian anthropology, for example, encompassing a range of priorities and practices. Schools of thought, Murray concludes, are “useful fictions” rather than explanations (285). They make sense as judgments formed outside a discipline rather than by capturing the diversity of positions and individuals within a theory or theory group.

The majority of the essays in this volume are archive-based and Murray is a meticulous archivist. He attends to citation patterns, journals where scholars publish their major work, and field sites of their research. He calls for a “dialogue of interpretation” (287) with research subjects, citing in particular the University of Pennsylvania historiographic tradition. He also relies on oral tradition, the memories of disciplinary elders who were participants in the events he describes and colleagues or students of the major protagonists. The reflexivity of anthropological practice emerges particularly powerfully through Murray’s long-term collaboration with Keelung Hong on the indigenous Taiwanese point of view in contrast to mainstream American policy and anthropological access to China vis-à-vis Taiwan. Anthropologists were not always on the side of the oppressed, evidenced in the Berkeley Japanese-American resettlement project of World War II. Murray understands his own work to be historicist, but nonetheless applauds the emergence within the history of anthropology of contemporary critiques of World War II, Cold War, and imperialist agendas.

Collections of essays do not always hold together, and this one is highly diverse in substantive content. Nonetheless, Murray’s persistent quest for intellectual coherence (i.e., theory), institutional framework, and professional socialization and scholarly networks both integrates the fourteen essays and demonstrates a method of historiographic practice that stands alongside the ethnographic practice of anthropologists which is Murray’s ostensible subject.

Regna Darnell

**O’Keeffe, Brigid:** *New Soviet Gypsies. Nationality, Performance, and Selfhood in the Early Soviet Union.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013. 328 pp. ISBN 978-1-4426-4650-6. Price: \$ 65.00

The history of Roma in Russia and the Soviet Union is little known, and this book provides a much-needed contribution to filling that gap. The author tackles the era between the expiration of the New Economic Policy and World War 2, which coincides with the implementation of Stalin’s revisions of Soviet nationality policies. She documents several important chapters in the interaction between Roma and the Soviet regime, including the sedentarization and collectivization drive of the 1930s, as well as the development of policies that allowed the emergence of unique cultural institutions, such as the world’s first professional Romani theatre, cultural centres, publishing houses churning out journals, textbooks and literary works composed in a newly standardized form of the Romani language, and schools catering to the needs of Romani pupils. The huge volume of new historical material is held together with a theoretical apparatus that empha-

sizes the active and willing collaboration of (some) Russian Roma with the Soviet regime’s assimilationist intentions. According to O’Keeffe, these individuals chose to *perform* the roles assigned by Soviet officialdom to members of “backward” minorities – not only Gypsies – thereby learning how to manipulate the political system and thus gaining advantages for themselves and their group. This central point, repeated a little too often throughout the book, is undoubtedly a useful corrective to the conventional view of Stalinist assimilationist practices having been imposed, if necessary by force, against the wishes of the minority “beneficiaries.” However, in this particular case, the merit of O’Keeffe’s argument cannot be easily determined since she introduces us to only a small group of “activists” who collaborated with the Stalinist regime in the name of progress for “their people.” What happened to the dissenters is left unsaid.

The collaboration-minded Romani activists introduced by O’Keeffe seem to have emerged for the most part from the ranks of élite families that traced their good rapport with the political regime of the day to the era of tsarist Russia. They were members of the dominant *Russka Roma*, found particularly in the western part of the empire and highly concentrated in Moscow and St. Petersburg. In these cities Russka Roma had become the main interpreters of a distorted and idealized “Gypsiness” performed by choirs and musical ensembles maintained by members of the Russian aristocracy. These affluent and assimilated “professional Gypsies” were miles apart from the wild and untamed “camp Gypsies” of the popular imagination, personified in late 19th and early 20th century by itinerant *Vlax Roma* who had arrived in Russia relatively recently from the Balkans. These two groups would have hardly met had it not been for the October Revolution and the redrawing of society that followed it. In a nutshell, the integrated and trusted Russka Roma came to be employed as mediators and brokers in the transformation of the self-contained, illegible and, therefore, mistrusted “backward Gypsies” (especially the Vlax) into Soviet Roma.

O’Keeffe plants the seeds of the collaboration between Soviet officialdom and members of the Russka Roma élite in the All-Russian Gypsy Union that was founded in 1925 as an agency that promoted the establishment of schools, industrial cooperatives, agricultural communes, and a host of other “minority institutions” designed to promote the process of Sovietization. Although closed down a mere three years later – after having conscripted only 674 members, 417 of whom lived in Moscow – the Union seems to have played an essential role in forging a cadre of activists well-versed in navigating the new corridors of power. Not surprisingly, therefore, we see many of the same names in most of the formal encounters between Soviet officials and Roma recounted in this book.

O’Keeffe provides some very interesting glimpses of these encounters in her description of special schools set up for Romani pupils – starting in Moscow in 1926 – the so-called “Gypsy artels” that were meant to teach Roma the rudiments of a proletarian work ethic, the pursuit of sedentarization and collectivization, and the establishment of Moscow’s Theatre Roman. Of all these initia-

tives, only the theatre survived World War 2. The rest of the special provisions died an early death due to a variety of factors. O’Keeffe explains the implications of changes in the Soviet nationality policy in the mid-1930s when the status of small minority languages began to be eroded in favor of Russian. This triggered a rapid decline in the provision and maintenance of Romani schools and didactic material. But she also demonstrates the haphazard manner in which Soviet officials dealt with the special needs of the Roma. It seems that the regime possessed only a vague notion of the objective state of the Romani population, including its size, dispersal, and differentiation. On the one hand, this ignorance aided the Russka activists in exerting some influence on government policies, but it also contributed to a high degree of arbitrariness in official evaluations of progress made by the same activists. O’Keeffe presents compelling evidence of some of the key aims of the Soviet regime – especially the sedentarization and collectivization drive – having rested almost solely on the activists’ shoulders without the necessary institutional support, let alone financial backing.

This is a meticulously researched and well-written work. The material on which it is based consists predominantly of Russian archival records and memoirs of some of the key activists. It is perhaps the nature of the data which explains why so little attention is given to the dissenters among the Roma who failed to see the need to embrace Sovietization. For an anthropologist it is especially intriguing to read O’Keeffe’s fascinating account of the typecasting of the Vlach Roma as an illegible segment of Soviet society that had to be “opened up” and transformed. But we learn little about the ways in which the Vlach may have resisted such pressure.

O’Keeffe is very good at showing the proverbial big-picture within which we ought to locate the attempted Sovietization of Russian Roma. This is done by way of helpful references to literature addressing the transformation of post-revolutionary Russia and, specifically, to the parallel experiences of other small nationalities. It is probably asking too much of a work devoted to a specific era in a specific region to venture beyond those confines in the search of some transnational patterns and explanations. But O’Keeffe’s assertion in the concluding chapter that the Soviet Union was unique in giving the Roma citizenship and full participation in society – on the condition of assimilation – begs the question of how singular the treatment of Soviet Roma may have been? And this brings to mind all kinds of interesting parallels, such as the role of nobility-sponsored music ensembles in the forging of an assimilated, and well-integrated, Gypsy elite in 18th- and 19th-century Hungary, the attention given to “Gypsy schools” in post-World War I Czechoslovakia, or the juxtaposition of “criminal itinerants” vs. benign settled Roma in much of prewar Europe. But these musings should not detract from the value of O’Keeffe’s stimulating contribution.

David Z. Scheffel

**Pechenkina, Kate, and Marc Oxenham** (eds.): *Bioarchaeology of East Asia. Movement, Contact, Health*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013. 512 pp. ISBN 978-0-8130-4427-9. Price: \$ 99.95

The recent rise of East Asia at the global scale has not only occurred within the political, technological, and economic sectors but also in the scientific. With China leading the way, these advancements have been progressing at a steady pace due to financial support from the government and encouragement of foreign collaboration. Pechenkina and Oxenham’s first book is a welcomed compendium to a large anthropological body of research, which had previously lacked data from this historically and culturally diverse region, covering the areas from the western Inner Asian steppes east to Japan, and from Mongolia in the north, south to the tropical Malay Archipelago. The volume’s principal foci are the themes of population migration/spread, intergroup contact, and human health throughout East Asia within a timeframe spanning from the Neolithic to the Medieval periods. The editors bring together a diverse group of scholars working in several countries including Mongolia, China, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Thailand among others. Evaluating geographical and temporal health trends in such a vast territory is a difficult task due to the substantial heterogeneity and complex population history of human groups that have inhabited these regions, not to mention the cultural differences resulting from the local material and food resources available to them.

Readers interested in learning about how biological anthropology developed in China and Japan will be pleased to read the book’s first chapter, which provides a comprehensive overview of the history of the field, framed within the turbulent political backdrop of the late 19th and 20th centuries. This chapter introduces the reader to seminal figures within vertebrate paleontology and human skeletal biology listing how their scholarly contribution has influenced these fields up to today. In the following chapter, the editors set the stage for the rest of the volume by discussing the interaction between humans and their surroundings across East Asia’s various ecological zones, starting with human colonization of the region, initial subsistence strategies and the eventual spread of cereal grain agriculture and animal husbandry in both mainland and island environments.

The main corpus of the book is divided into two parts. The first part, “Biological Indicators of Population Histories in East Asia,” consists of studies of population movement and contact via craniometric approaches in Mongolia (Dashtseveg) and territories bordering the Sea of Japan (Pietrusewsky), as well as combined craniometrics and dental nonmetrics in South China, Japan, and Southeast Asia (Matsumura and Oxenham). Nonmetric approaches are also employed to assess past and present variation in Mongolian and Northeast Asian crania (Myagmar), as well as Chinese and Mongolian teeth (Lee). Suzuki also examines the eastward spread of agricultural groups in the Neolithic and Eneolithic periods by identifying and diagnosing cases of tuberculosis infection in China, Korea, and Japan.