search gift. This and other transactions described in the book illustrate how data can only be collected through messy social relations and transactions. Chapter 4 focuses on how data are presented to and consumed by various audiences. Biruk argues that what is considered evidence is fashioned through relations and concludes that no single person or group can decide the quality of the data. Chapter 5 examines the evidence-based rhetoric and maintains that data do not stand alone but require cultural, social, and other scaffolding and negotiating through social relations to become policy and result in action. Users of data with their own assumptions, interests, and agendas leave their mark on them through their packaging, framing, and translating. The concluding chapter is a reflection of the anthropological critique of global health and research. The author reiterates her argument that it is fiction to assume data is free from any social and cultural influence and contends that they reflect and reproduce the social and cultural concerns and values of various stakeholders. Biruk does not dismiss the relevance of survey research but takes seriously the ways in which such research not only measures and claims to represent reality but also creates the worlds and relations that result in specific data. She argues that anthropology, and its prime research approach – ethnography – constructively critiques survey research by conceptualizing research as a social and cultural space where the interests, backgrounds, and realities of various stakeholders intersect temporarily.

In addition to the publication's robust examination of the assumptions and methods that help numerical data gain legitimacy, the author problematizes other themes associated with survey research, such as the "field." Biruk deconstructs the field as a natural and taken-for-granted site of knowledge production and conceptualizes it as a place with multiple actors with various motivations, agendas, and knowledge. Another important contribution of the books is to highlight how hierarchies of expertise and structural inequalities privilege Western researchers over others, despite the prevailing rhetoric of partnership in Global Health. Of particular value for furthering our understanding of survey and other types of research is the author's discussion of the role of fieldworkers. Biruk calls the interviewers and their supervisors "knowledge workers," a term often associated with elites and their claim to ownership of projects and their outcome, challenging the assumption that fieldworkers are minor actors in research. She argues that they are central to research because they are aware that knowledge is relational and context-dependent, and their innovative work in the field is invaluable for producing data considered to be of high quality according to research standards.

Overall, the publication is a powerful critique of the understanding that survey data are an objective and complete representation of reality. Biruk contends that surveys are a necessary means for knowledge making, but they have to be used in tandem with other ways of examining reality. While her thoughts and analyses are generally detailed and convincing, some of her field experiences would benefit from a more meticulous analysis. For example, when describing how fieldworkers chuckled at the thought of some traditional beliefs (69), Biruk concludes that they expressed their disregard for what they consider backward beliefs. This might be true, but what they said could also be shaped by the research site dominated by Western thoughts and approaches. In a different setting, at a different time, and with a different audience they might have expressed a very different opinion of such beliefs. After all, knowledge and behavior are relational and context-bound, as Biruk argues elsewhere in this book. However, examples of incomplete interpretations are rare in the book and overall her thoughts and analyses are robust.

I strongly recommend using this publication as a required reading in undergraduate and graduate courses in Anthropology, Demography, Sociology, and related social sciences that teach students to design and conduct qualitative as well as quantitative research. Further, those interested in African Studies, Global Health, and International Development will tremendously benefit from reading this publication as these disciplines are strongly influenced by survey research. The book is also a must-read for agencies, policy makers, and funding agencies, to familiarize themselves with an appropriate understanding of the strengths and limitations of quantitative research, dynamics influencing the production of quantitative data, and how to appropriately use survey results and recommendations.

Alexander Rödlach

Blanes, Ruy Llera, and **Galina Oustinova-Stjepanovic** (eds.): Being Godless. Ethnographies of Atheism and Non-Religion. New York: Berghahn Books, 2017. 147 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-628-7. (Studies in Social Analysis, 1) Price: $ 95.00

This slim volume is a republished (*Social Analysis* 59.2015.2) collection of ethnographic essays revolving around "non-religion." While many of the works have implications for quantitative and scientific inquiry, the essays are entirely qualitative and situated more in the humanistic end of anthropology and sociology.

The introduction by Blanes and Oustinova-Stjepanovic details the appropriateness and limits of notions like "godless," "non-religious," "areligion," and "irreligion" while making calls for more ethnography of people who fit such labels, however inadequately they apply. The authors attend to the problems and limitations of such notions, pointing out that non-religiousness manifests itself in a variety of ways. One illustration of how oversimplification might result in overlooking or misrepresenting non-religious positions is in Lee's article that draws upon interviews conducted in southeast England. Rather than focusing on active anti- or atheist movements, Lee emphasizes ambivalence – and its various manifestations – and argues that it too is a real stance and identity regarding religion and is dis-

tinct from the more vocal adherents to organized atheism.

Copeman and Quack address body and organ donation as it pertains to non-religiosity in India. In their case study, organized secularists donate their bodies to science and those in need of organs, framing the donation as a cost-free act of generosity and a signal of their secularity. Unlike their religious counterparts who spend considerable resources on the pomp of ceremony, burial, and/or cremation, godless individuals flaunt their lack of faith, even after death. Notably, the authors point to individuals who engage in painful practices traditionally shrouded in religious significance (e. g., piercing their bodies and suffocating themselves) in order to expose such rituals as folksy practices that violate the body rather than demonstrations of the power of spirits.

Blanes and Paxe focus on the biographical components of atheistic politics in Angola. They pay close attention to a few key figures of Angolan socialism, noting that they came from either religious families or had religious educations. In part due to their status as educated was their attraction to the socialist climate of the 1960 s and 70 s. Through their education, these leaders replaced their visions of "religious utopias" with socialist ones. In turn, socialist institutions developed, and repressed religious groups and leaders while establishing educational institutions designed to promote socialist values, conformity, and homogeneity. Ironically, then, religious repression evolved out of the privilege that a religious upbringing offered.

Tremlett and Shih take on the New Atheist assumption that adherence to religion necessarily means adherence to doctrine and beliefs. They explicate the reasons why anthropologists of religion have largely (and mutually) ignored such works; their targets can really only be a narrow range of traditions; most religious traditions focus on *praxis* rather than *doxa* (the latter being primarily found among the world religions). The second half of the chapter recapitulates some of the authors' respective works in the Philippines and Taiwan to show that doubt is common in practical religious traditions. The former points out that there is a normalized expression of doubt in traditional healing ceremonies and this doubt appears in social interactions rather than merely expressed as individual states of disbelief. The latter details the practices and utility and organizational power of a sea-goddess-cum-anti-nuclear-energy-goddess. In the process of using oracular techniques to communicate with the goddess to predict whether or not another nuclear plant would be constructed, diviners regularly doubted the outcomes (i. e., doubted the goddess), and would rerun their inquiries by rephrasing their questions and repeating the procedure until they received a response that satisfied them.

Luehrmann's chapter reviews Soviet "scientific atheism" and interrogates the view that scholarship from this time largely portrayed religion as essentially antisocial and threatening. Of course, Soviet scholarship was primarily anti-religious (or completely ignored religion) and transparently motivated to disestablish its influence. As predicted by Marxian theory, religion and other forms of division would wane, so why not nudge it a bit? Yet, Soviet scholars recognized that despite their hopes and predictions, religion stubbornly persisted. As such, scholars needed to devise new ways of figuring out the "religion problem." Luehrmann questions the utility of "ethnographic empathy" and points to how – in their pursuit to liquidate religion's influence – scholars' atheism can potentially unravel more about religious adherence. She points to how sociological data encouraged active critiques of policy insofar as effective secular institutions had more of an impact on secularity than reeducation.

Oustinova-Stjepanovic reflects on her suspension of *dis*belief in order to make better sense of Sufi practices in Macedonia. She poses the question of whether or not atheist anthropologists should suspend disbelief in order to do their jobs properly (whatever that might mean). Despite enduring the persistent sexual advances of a dervish, she concludes that the "suspension of disbelief constitutes a necessary methodological exercise … that probes into the implicit biases of anthropologists and our discipline as such" (129). The author intellectualizes her experiences with a mystic she portrays as a prototypical cultish sexual predator, concluding that Bourdieu was on to something when he suggested that anthropologists who fail to bodily participate in rituals might never quite grasp the "subjective experience of being religious." Had she maintained her identity as an atheist, she would have compromised her methods. She also would not have been at risk of something her "female interlocutors" described as "being forced to have non-consensual sex under the spiritual control of a healer." For whatever reason, she suggests that the "bodily and emotional unavailability" that dispositional atheism affords "undermin[es] the strategy of methodological suspension of disbelief." While it is a little difficult to precisely determine what the take-home message is here, I would encourage any aspiring ethnographer to seriously consider whether this insight is worth – or even necessarily follows from – such a risk.

Engelke's afterword suggests that "we need to get cracking on the research front," but beyond "more ethnographies of atheism, of secular humanism, of ambivalent non-religiosity" (138), it remains unclear what this would entail. While the back cover claims the volume is "[g]rounded in rigorous empirical research," chapters include anecdotes and lexical interrogations to highlights from ethnographic interviews, biography, history, and autobiographical reflections on methods. Will more ethnography operationalize its constructs and seek precise accounts of variation in religiosity or will it find more endlessly nuance-able conceptualizations and point to how oversimplified standard definitions have been? Will it be usefully descriptive for social science or even point to potential, context-specific explanations of non-belief? Will these future works be idiosyncratic and impossible to replicate or will they speak a common

language, unified by the pursuit of knowledge through data collected with systematic and transparent methods? Will it contribute to the enormous secularization literature that focuses primarily on state societies? Most individual chapters show some momentum along their own trajectories and do offer some insights into how people express a lack of commitment or doubt (Lee; Copeman and Quack; Tremlett and Shih) and how (non)religion changes through time (Luehrmann; Blanes and Paxe) with some very interesting ethnographic examples with implications for further empirical research.

(Disclosure Statement: The Understanding Unbelief Project, headed by Dr. Lois Lee [one of the contributors of the volume], awarded Purzycki an Early Career Award.)

Benjamin Grant Purzycki

Brus, Anna: "Der Wilde schlägt zurück." Kolonialzeitliche Europäerdarstellungen der Sammlung Lips. – "The Savage Hits Back." Colonial-Era Depictions of Europeans in the Lips Collection. Hrsg. von Lucia Halder und Clara Himmelheber. Köln: Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum – Kulturen der Welt; Emsdetten: Edition Imorde, 2018. 92 pp. ISBN 978-3-942810-40-1. [Begleitband zu einer Ausstellung im Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum, Köln, vom 16.03. bis zum 03.6.2018] Preis: € 12,00

Verpixelter Popart-Stil? Oder ein zufälliges Resultat experimenteller digitaler Bildbearbeitung? Auf den braun-weiß-orangefarbenen Cover-Entwurf des Kölner Ausstellungsbegleitbandes trifft beides nicht zu: Ein verpixelter Popart-Stil bräuchte poppigere Farbintensität, um popartähnlich zu wirken und die Zufälligkeit eines Resultats digitaler Bildbearbeitung wird im Innern des Bandes durch ein analoges "Pixel-Styling" leerer Buchseiten und solcher Buchseiten aufgehoben, denen Textfelder mit gezacktem Rand eingefügt sind, die an Briefmarken erinnern.

Sollen mit diesem ausgefallenen Design, das unweigerlich das Auge irritiert, Sehgewohnheiten in Frage gestellt werden? So wie im Jahr 1931, als Julius Lips' Ausstellung "Masken der Menschen" nicht nur Begeisterung, sondern auch Ablehnung hervorrief? Eigentlich wollte Julius Lips 1931 anstelle der Maskenausstellung anlässlich des 25-jährigen Jubiläums des Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museums bereits genau die Ausstellung zeigen, die nun erst im Frühjahr 2018 in Köln zu sehen war und im Herbst 2019 in Berlin gezeigt werden wird. Was ist in der Zeit dazwischen geschehen? Fast neunzig Jahre Geschichte haben bezogen auf die Beurteilung von Julius Lips in der deutschsprachigen Ethnologie wohl kaum vergleichbar auseinanderdriftende Einschätzungen seines Lebens, seines wissenschaftlichen Wirkens und seines Werks hervorgebracht. Bis heute unversöhnliche Pro- und Contra-Positionen sind eng mit der nationalsozialistischen Verquickung des früher als "Völkerkunde" bezeichneten Faches sowie mit Kontinuitäten in der deutschen Nachkriegszeit verknüpft, die durch die deutsche Zweistaatlichkeit und die gängigen Narrative des Kalten Kriegs geprägt war. Diese ineinander verwobenen Verflechtungsgeschichten eines "geradezu exemplarischen Falls deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte" (A. Gingrich: Wege, Irrwege und Potenziale von Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Die "Causa Lips" und ein Fach, das früher Völkerkunde hieß. In: I. Kreide-Damani [Hrsg.], Ethnologie im Nationalsozialismus. Julius Lips und die Geschichte der "Völkerkunde". Wiesbaden 2010: 7) verlangen nach wissenschaftlicher Ausgewogenheit und handfesten wissenschaftlichen Belegen, auch wenn nur Teilaspekte davon neu beleuchtet werden wie Julius Lips' populärwissenschaftlich angelegte, international überaus erfolgreiche antifaschistische Exilpublikation "The Savage Hits Back or The White Man through Native Eyes". Dagegen werden im Kölner Ausstellungsbegleitband – ohne konkrete Angaben der zugrunde liegenden Quellen – wissenschaftlich belegte Ergebnisse mit nicht belegten und nicht zu belegenden, zeitlich oder lokal gefärbten, an Netzwerke oder Einzelakteure gebundenen "Wahrheiten" verflochten (Beispiel s.u.).

Aber mal grundsätzlich: mit wie viel Wissenschaftlichkeit darf der Besucher einer Ausstellung und Leser eines dazu erscheinenden Begleitbandes denn überhaupt konfrontiert werden? Diese Frage erübrigt sich, weil wissenschaftliches Arbeiten – ohne das Publikum weiter zu tangieren – hinter den Kulissen passiert. Es kann mit gründlich recherchierten, sorgsam aufgearbeiteten Ergebnissen aufwarten, die Nachfragen von Laien und Fachkollegen standhalten und ein öffentliches Interesse am Fach und seinem Museum nachhaltig beflügeln.

In dem vorliegenden Begleitband stiften dagegen Ungenauigkeiten und fehlende oder in einem anderen Kontext zu findende Quellenangaben eher für Verwirrung. So heißt es in dem mit einem missverständlichen Unterton als "Die verkehrten Welten des Julius Lips" betitelten Einführungsbeitrags über den ehemaligen sozialdemokratischen Kölner Museumsdirektor und Universitätsprofessor: "Zunächst vermutlich ohne politische Absichten sammelte Lips seit den 1920er Jahren Darstellungen von EuropäerInnen und von Fotografien solcher Objekte aus europäischen und amerikanischen Sammlungen und plante eine Ausstellung und Monographie zum Thema. Der Berliner Ethnologe Hermann Baumann kam ihm … jedoch zuvor" (11 f.).

Wer dagegen in den Bildlegenden zu Lips' Europadarstellungen nachliest, wird feststellen, dass die auf dem Deckblatt des Begleitbandes schemenhaft verpixelt abgebildete "Schreckfigur" von den Inseln der Nikobaren nicht von Julius Lips zum Aufbau einer entsprechenden Sammlung erworben wurde, sondern bereits im Museum war, als Lips 1925 seine Stellung als Assistent von Fritz Graebner antrat (22). Dies gilt auch für die zweite Kölner "Schreckfigur" gleicher Provenienz (70). Beide Figuren wurden dem 1906 eröffneten Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum schon 1908/1909 von seinem Fördererverein zum Geschenk gemacht. Näheres über den Schenkungsakt zu erfahren, wäre interessant gewe-