

darzustellen. Der Autor zeigt, wie die zunächst enttäuschende, aber später dann für beide Seiten erfreuliche und ergebnisreiche Zusammenarbeit mit dem dänischen Inuitit-Experten Johannes Rink verlief. Auch hier war sich Boas seiner Grenzen bewusst, sodass Rink immer sein Mentor im Hinblick auf die Inuktitut-Sprache blieb.

Von dem inhaltlichen Aufbau und der positiven Rezeption von Boas' Habilitationsschrift "Baffin-Land" berichtet das neunte Kapitel, wobei die umfassenden Listen von Ortsnamen in Inuktitut bis heute eine wichtige Ressource nicht nur für die Wissenschaft, sondern vor allem auch für die Einheimischen sind (s. o.).

Im zehnten Kapitel wird die Frage diskutiert, weshalb Boas nur einen Monat nach seiner erfolgreichen Habilitation Deutschland verließ und endgültig in die USA übersiedelte. Schließlich fand er die lang ersehnte feste Anstellung als Mitherausgeber der angesehenen Fachzeitschrift *Science*. Nach seiner späteren Tätigkeit als Kurator am American Museum of Natural History in New York erhielt er eine Professur an der dortigen Columbia Universität, von wo aus er bis zu seiner Emeritierung 1936 sein viel beschriebenes umfangreiches wissenschaftliches Programm umsetzte.

Im elften Kapitel wird beschrieben, wie Boas – neben seiner bereits in den Vordergrund rückenden Nordwestküsten-Forschung – die Arbeiten an den Inuit-Materialien vor allem mit Rink noch einige Jahre fortsetzte. In einem weiteren Artikel zur Baffininsel führte Boas in den *Annalen der Hydrologie und maritimen Meteorologie* umfangreiche meteorologische Daten auf, die sich heute als eine "important and extremely valuable source for the analysis of climatic change over the past one hundred thirty years" (133) erweisen.

Schließlich werden im letzten Kapitel noch einmal Boas' "Lasting Contributions" zusammengefasst. Das wertvolle Vermächtnis der Forschungsergebnisse aus der frühen Phase von Boas' Schaffen für die Inuit dieses Gebietes ist bereits genannt worden. Anschließend hatte Boas insgesamt 47 Doktoranden betreut und damit eine ganze Generation namhafter amerikanischer Kulturanthropologen geprägt. Sein wichtiges politisches Engagement und sein entschlossener Einsatz gegen Rassismus und Nationalismus und sein Eintreten für eine Anerkennung der Gleichwertigkeit von Kulturen im Sinne des Kulturrelativismus ist an anderen Stellen ausführlich behandelt worden, darf aber zur Charakterisierung seiner Gesamtpersönlichkeit hier nicht fehlen, zumal diese Erkenntnisse zum großen Teil auf unmittelbaren Erfahrungen während seiner Feldforschung auf der Baffininsel beruhen – worum es in diesem Buch vor allem geht.

Auf der Grundlage bislang wenig bekannter Materialien gewährt das Buch wichtige Einblicke in frühe Entwicklungen von Boas' wissenschaftlichem Schaffen, welches ebenfalls zahlreiche Abbildungen seltener Fotos, Zeichnungen und handschriftlicher Dokumente enthält, die zum größten Teil aus den Archiven der American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia (PA), stammen.

Erich Kasten

Murray, Stephen O.: American Anthropology and Company. Historical Explorations. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013. 370 pp ISBN 978-0-8032-4395-8. Price: £ 45.00

Although Stephen O. Murray is in the narrowest sense an anthropologist, he has moved across the boundaries of allied disciplines throughout his career. This collection of his essays, published over the past three decades, is particularly welcome because his seminal historical essays on 20th-century American anthropology have appeared in widely diverse journals and monographs and have addressed varied audiences. For the first time, anthropologist readers can now gain a nuanced appreciation of Murray's historicist voice and its occasionally discordant challenge to the inherited wisdom of disciplinary folklore and oral tradition. He demonstrates that American anthropology has never operated in splendid autonomy from the rest of the social sciences; rather, anthropologists have progressed in the company of multiple others – including sociologists, psychologists, linguists, and historians – in patterns that have shifted over both time and place. Murray's ethnographic exemplars range across East Asian and Latin American areal domains in ways that complicate the simple stereotype of an American anthropology that, until after World War II at least, focused almost exclusively on the study of the American Indian. But he is also careful to document that, counter to anthropological corridor talk and despite increasingly global expansion of potential fieldwork sites, much publication in American anthropology in the 1930s and 1940s continued to deal with Indians.

All anthropologies cross the boundaries of disciplinary cross talk and national tradition but they do so in unique ways. Murray's initial training in sociology perhaps predisposed him to calibrate the American emphasis on culture, albeit more sociological in his reading than has usually been credited even before the advent of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown in Chicago in 1931, with the British approach to society as the fundamental unit of analysis. Some of the main characters in Murray's narrative are the conventional Americanists: Alfred L. Kroeber, Robert H. Lowie, Margaret Mead, and Edward Sapir, though not, interestingly enough, Franz Boas. But alongside them, we find William F. Ogburn, W. I. Thomas, and Dorothy Swaine Thomas, as well as Robert Redfield, who straddled the division between sociology and anthropology at Chicago. In Murray's version of the history, sociologists were doing ethnography in the prefabricated social laboratory of the city of Chicago well before anthropologists claimed ethnographic fieldwork as the defining mantra of their discipline. And it was Redfield, the creature of the disciplinary margins, who drew peasants into the purview of anthropologists preoccupied with tribal societies. Murray emphasizes institutional alternatives to Boas at Columbia, particularly at the universities of Chicago and Berkeley.

Culture and personality in the United States drew on particular versions of psychology and psychoanalysis that articulated with the evolving boundaries between anthropology and sociology. These disciplines and national

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 Romen. Of all these initia-