welche durch verschiedene Riten symbolisiert wird. Das westlich Kampfmodell zwischen Gut und Böse lasse sich durch die Vorstellung vom komplimentären Zusammenspiel gleichberechtigter Kräfte ersetzen bzw. ergänzen.

Die meisten Beiträge befassen sich mit der philosophischen Konzeption der ethnologischen Forschung. Es werden die Positionen der ethischen Universalisten und der Kulturrelativisten ausführlich dargestellt und diskutiert. W. Habermeyer versucht, das Modell des kommunikativen Handelns von J. Habermas auf die theoretische und praktische Arbeit der Ethnologen anzuwenden. Er geht dabei von Lebenswelten und Lebensformen aus, welche in allen Kulturen die Formen des Denkens, die Deutungen der Welt und die moralischen Wertungen prägen. Das sind die Positionen der Pragmatischen Philosophie, gesucht wird nach den Regeln der gleichwertigen Kommunikation zwischen den Kulturen. Nun ist das ideale Modell dieser Kommunikation in der Praxis kaum zu erreichen, auch die Aktionsethnologie begibt sich in geschützte Positionen des engagierten Beobachters. Ausführlich diskutiert werden die Fragen einer transzendentalen Anthropologie im Sinne von Thomas Rentsch. Auch M. Foucault wird mit seinem Konzept des Fremden als Anreger gesehen; nicht diskutiert werden in diesem Kontext die Denkmodelle der jüdischen Philosophen J. F. Lyotard und J. Derrida. Ein Teil des Buches befasst sich mit der Umsetzung der ethnologischen Forschung im schulischen Unterricht und in den Formen der Erwachsenenbildung. Auch dort geht es um das Verstehen von fremden Lebenswelten und um die Einübung von gleichwertiger Kommunikation.

Alle Kulturen benutzen häufig Sprichwörter für die Vermittlung moralischer Werte und für die Abgrenzung zwischen wahr und falsch. In Konfliktsituationen wird um einen fragilen Konsens zwischen verschiedenen Positionen gerungen. Es wird betont, dass metaphysische Konzeptionen von Gut und Böse in den monotheistischen Religionen den Austausch zwischen Kulturen erschweren. Hier ist tatsächlich zu bedenken, ob nicht auch das komplimentäre Modell hilfreich und nützlich sein könnte. Auch die Vertreter des globalen "Weltethos" um Hans Küng müssten ihre eigene Position relativieren, um im Dialog mit dem Fremden weiterzukommen. Wahrscheinlich müssen unterschiedliche Geschwindigkeiten des sozialen Lernens akzeptiert werden. Das Buch diskutiert auf hohem Niveau Grundfragen interkultureller Philosophie. Anton Grabner-Haider

Jarvenpa, Robert, and **Hetty Joe Brumbach** (eds.): Circumpolar Lives *and* Livelihood. A Comparative Ethnoarchaeology of Gender and Subsistence. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006. 330 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-2606-7. Price: £ 35.00

Cultural anthropologist Robert Jarvenpa and Archeologist Hetty Jo Brumbach are the editors of this extensively prepared, systematically devised, and highly relevant volume comprising a comparative ethnoarcheological study of Arctic practices of gender and subsistence. The highlight on the word "and" in the title of this book is programmatic for this central perspective of tightly connecting ways of life, processes of subsistence-production, and their contemporary material and potential archeological signature. The volume's objective is to develop a "gendered ecology" by examining "types or degrees of differentiation in female and male economic roles and . . . types of archaeologically visible signatures or 'gendered landscapes' " (4) through a systematic comparative study.

The comparative objective is based on programmed, systematic, and detailed data gathering in collaboration with various local Arctic communities and subsequent computing of data by employing the same analytical protocols. These protocols use Janet Specter's "task differentiation analysis" (adapted from Spector, Male/Female Task Differentiation among the Hidatsa. Toward the Development of an Archaeological Approach to the Study of Gender. In: P. Albers and B. Medicine [eds.], The Hidden Half. Washington 1983) as their methodological and epistemological framework and format.

By focusing on gender-associated task differentiation, care is taken that men's, women's, gender-neutral and collaborative spheres of work receive, in principle, equal attention. This is in itself important for a comprehensive perspective on society; this is, however, even more so the case as the specific subsistence-production process of "hunting" is, in contrast to common understanding, essentially not confined to the pursuing and killing of the game often accomplished by men. In the societies described, "hunting" as well as "herding" also include the butchering, storing, and preparation of food and other animal products, which are often predominantly spheres of women's work.

The methodological and epistemological framework, as well as the broad perspective on subsistence production, is reflected in the structure of the book. Each case is discussed in twin chapters. The first chapter examines marked gender features such as: the interrelation of genders, gender-associated spaces covering inter- and intrasite community, land and sea uses, main subsistence production processes, and the technology and products used in and evolving from these processes.

The second chapter, employing the methodological tool of the "task differentiation analysis," computes the presented material according to four fields of high relevance to archeological research that is based on a record of artifacts, features, and residues: the social unit, task setting, task time, and task materials, specifically architectural features and material culture characteristic of two or more interrelated subsistence activities, such as practices of killing the animal, transporting the carcass, and food processing and storing among the Iñupiaq of Alaska, presented by Carol Zane Jolles (238–286). The chapter concludes considering the implications of the ethnographic description and analysis for interpreting gender patterning in archeological contexts.

The comparative project is, thus, twofold. A synchronic comparison is conducted between four circumpolar foraging societies, Chipewyan (by Jarvenpa and

Brumbach), Khanty (by Glavatskaya), Sámi (by Pennanen), and Iñupiaq (by Jolles). The long and extensive research tradition in describing these societies, the investigators' professional experience, and the participation of the local community in the project provide excellent conditions for discussion. Each of the groups described proofs to be sufficiently different and sufficiently similar to the others for a productive comparison. This synchronic comparison creates the foundation for a diachronic comparison based methodologically on a heuristic analogy of the various gendered landscapes emerging from the ethnographic description and analysis. Table 10.2 in the "Conclusion" (312 f.) provides an example for how the results of the envisioned modeled ethnographic comparison can be made applicable to archeological research as a heuristic roadmap. Moreover, the comparative approach extends the capacity of each of the particular field case to provide insights into human diversity and similarity and it produced a cohesive book in content and structure.

While the comments above suggest a tightly-knit, comprehensive, and homogenous book, it is important to note that the editors and authors do not omit to address critical issues that loosen the fabric and provide the heuristic nature of the comparative approach due to space. Issues of concern are the complexity of the present situations of the societies under study as well as the somewhat artificial selection of the fields of ethnographic examination.

Everyone of the book's authors, excluding Elena Glavatskaya, who emphasizes the feature of continuity among the Khanty, emphasize that the societies they study experienced histories of colonialism, relocation, integration into various nation states, impacts of global market economy, religious conversions, and other newly introduced elements. These developments made the present situations essentially complex. However, the adherence to the task-differentiation analysis works as a straight-jacket in this respect as the attention of researchers is directed to processes of subsistence-production in which new ways of life only emerge in their material signatures, speak freezers, etc. From this point of view, Glavatskaya's decision not to address the complexities of the present situation as well as the other authors' decision to do so has the same results for the comparative objective of the study. It's strongly programmed and systematic character emerges as the study's strength and weakness.

What also emerges is the study's heuristic approach, which is based on the methodological assumption of the analogy of the archeological past and the ethnographic present. Although these issues are addressed, they are not really dealt with in analyzing or even envisioning their consequences for the ethnoarcheological approach. This will become increasingly important when the impacts of climate change on local ways, technologies, and interactions with the environment add new dynamics to the social and economic changes, none of which goes uninfluenced or without influencing notions of gender.

The same kind of problem evolves from the artificial, although soundly practical, selection of fields of ethnographic examination. Preferred areas of investigation are, for example, structures and implementations of food processing, dwellings, etc. Applying this selection, Carol Zane Jolles's study of the Iñupiaq of Little Diomede Island (Alaska) comes to very interesting findings; such as, today, just like in the past, the Iñupiaq village organizes labor of harvesting and processing "country food" into distinct male and female spheres that are most clear-cut in designating the hunt as a predominantly male domain and food storage as a female domain and that were somewhat more flexible in other areas (255 f.). The work division between men and women, as exemplified in the elaborate food processing and storage system, provides a good example for the cooperation between men and women and its spatial organization as the process involves moving from the beach and up the slopes to the households (that include traditional storage facilities and contemporary freezer units) (278–284). She also states that Iñupiaq from the Little Diomede Island (Alaska) formulate their identity through cultural practices and systems of values and knowledge that evolved from a life as arctic hunters, gatherers, and fishers and that as been transferred and adapted over generations, for example, to integrate features of the market economy into hunting ways of life (238, 244). The essential interconnection of the physical, social, and spiritual realities is a central feature of most indigenous Arctic cultures in the past but also still today after societies went through a variety of political, social, and religious transitions (see, for Inuit, N. Stuckenberger, Community at Play. Social and Religious Dynamics in the Modern Inuit Community of Qikiqtarjuaq. Amsterdam 2005; N. Stuckenberger, Thin Ice. Inuit Traditions within a Changing Environment. With Contributions by W. Fitzhugh, A. Lynge, and K. Woodward. Hanover 2007; L.-J. Dorais, Quaqtaq. Modernity and Identity in an Inuit Community. Toronto 1997; C. J. Jolles, Faith, Food, and Family. In a Yupik Whaling Community. With Elinor Mikaghaq Oozeva. Seattle 2002).

A group of Inuit students from Nunavut Arctic College, Canada, published a piece on the relevance of the seal in their ways of life. In their writing, they emphasized the essential interconnection between economic, spiritual, and social practices. "Inuit spirituality is not just shamanism or Christianity. An important aspect of spirituality is to be able to provide for your family. Keeping them warm, clothed and fed plays a vital part in one's identity as an Inuk. When a hunter is waiting for a seal, his mind can not be in turmoil as he has to be very patient. The seal is able to feel vibrations and in the winter, can sense this if a hunter is at a breathing hole. The seal is also important to a woman's spirituality and to her contribution to the family. For example, there are different ways for a woman to prepare a sealskin" (A. Peter et al., The Seal. An Integral Part of Our Culture. *Études Inuit – Inuit Studies* 26/1.2002: 170).

While it is arguably true that these fields are less suited for an ethnoarcheological approach, the question

is, if this otherwise practical consideration does not actually seriously undermine the benefits of this approach in societies that are best viewed as holistic by erasing relevant contexts. The question emerges whether or not the relevance of the data produced applying to this approach is for understanding the archeological societies. Again, the problem is noted, but not examined to work out the epistemological consequences.

The study uses ethnography efficiently to support the archeological objective, which in turn helps anthropologists to gain insights into the material dimensions of a society and about its archeological past. I wonder, though, if ethnography could not contribute even more if not harnessed (or at least not to such an exclusive extend) to the archeological endeavor. Specifically, couldn't more attention be paid to the emic perspectives, which, in the end, produce what later becomes archeological evidence? Although gender is undoubtedly a central organizing principle in Arctic societies, as are age or human relationships to the worlds of spirit beings. Also these relationships translate to varying degrees of material signatures – and importantly for the study of gendered landscapes, which is under discussion. For example, in the pre-Christian past and to some degree still today, Inuit followed a seasonal cycle that took them farther into the land or closer to the sea (and unto the sea-ice), which also shaped their social organization. Moreover, it shaped their economic activities as "land" and "sea" and the animals associated with them had to be kept separate due to rules evolving from the interconnections between humans and the world of spirit beings. Thus, Inuit summer and winter sites and items appertaining to the seasonal works that can be found there are not only due to the tasks accomplished by men and women, but are to a large degree placed there also because of ritual injunctions that apply to treating animals and to gender-related tasks. The animal or the spirits emerge as a third person in the activities of men and women. Including this kind of dimension in the comparison would provide gendered landscapes with a relevant context that encompasses and positions gender within the subsistence-production processes.

While these concerns are serious, one cannot really avoid limitations in any study that benefits from a programmed and systematic approach. The question in each specific case is, if those costs can or cannot be accepted and ameliorated by using complimentary ethnographic resources when making use of the data produced in the study. I think that the contributors to this volume should indeed have followed up on the consequences of their methodological decisions for the reasons given above. However, the case studies and their comparison provide thorough ethnographies and helpful tools for archeological investigation. The volume undoubtedly will play a crucial part in the ongoing fruitful and corrective dialogue between Arctic archeology and ethnography.

For scholars, the book provides inspiration for interdisciplinary research with a focus on material culture. For those interested in the specific groups discussed, the detailed ethnographies are a great resource. Each chapter by itself, as well as in combination with other chapters, provides engaging material for readings and discussions in teaching archeology and anthropology. My hope is that this study will also further foster the presently increasing fascination of anthropologists in objects. A. Nicole Stuckenberger

Jones, Martin, and **A. C. Fabian** (eds.): Conflict. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 176 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-83960-0. Price: £ 25.00.

In den meisten wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen wird völlig zu Unrecht angenommen, dass Harmonie der normale Seinszustand ist. Dabei seien Disharmonie und Konflikt doch weit mehr als reine Ausnahmen, behaupten Jones und Fabian, ganz im Gegenteil bildeten sie doch wohl den Kern des Ganzen. In der Tat gewinnt man diesen Eindruck bei der Lektüre von "Conflict", einer Sammlung von Vorträgen, die im Rahmen der "2005 Darwin College Lectures" öffentlich gehalten wurden.

Der Evolutionsbiologie David Haig untersucht die paradoxe Tatsache, dass unsere inneren Konflikte nun einmal existieren, obwohl sie evolutionsbiologisch ganz klare Nachteile haben. Wozu sich also den Kopf zerbrechen? Wozu das ganze Hin und Her von Für und Wider, wenn es doch nur Energie und Zeit raubt? Simon Baron-Cohen, ein Psychologe, erläutert in der Einleitung seines Essays die altbekannte Tatsache, dass männlicher und weiblicher Verstand unterschiedlich funktionieren, dies aber nicht unbedingt zu Konflikten führen müsse, sondern im Gegenteil Basis für gegenseitigen Respekt sein könne. Leider verfolgt Baron-Cohen diese Aussage dann nicht weiter, sondern beschränkt sich darauf, besagte Unterschiede en détail aufzuschlüsseln, so dass man sich des Öfteren des Eindrucks nicht erwehren kann, sein Essay finde sich im falschen Buch wieder. Der Anthropologe und Autor von "Demonic Males", Richard Wrangham, begibt sich mit "Why Apes and Humans Kill" auf vertrautes Terrain. Zentraler Punkt ist die Frage, ob das Töten beim Menschen denselben evolutionsbiologischen Prinzipien unterliegt, wie das bei anderen Spezies der Fall ist, oder ob es einer eigenen Logik folgt.

Barry Cunliffe, in der Archäologie zu Hause, blickt zurück auf die Geschichte der Kriegsführung und kommt zu dem Schluss, dass sie eine verlässliche Konstante unserer Gesellschaft ist, die lediglich im Laufe der Zeit ihr Kleid wechselt. Die Politologin Lisa Anderson konzentriert sich auf den Konflikt im sogenannten Mittleren Osten – für sie ein Kunstbegriff – und stellt die These auf, dass diese Region hauptsächlich deshalb so unruhig ist, weil sie von Menschen so und nicht anders definiert wurde und nach wie vor wird. Kate Adie, ehemalige Chefkorrespondentin der BBC, macht sich über Konflikte, über die sie selbst berichtet hat, Gedanken. (Selbst-)Kritisch beleuchtet sie aber auch die Konflikte, die hinter der Fassade der Medienlandschaft brodeln. Wie nah darf eine Kamera an das Geschehen, an die Opfer heran? Welche ethische Verantwortung