ture, sexual libertarianism, the changing role of women (feminist ideologies) and the education of children (girls), premarital sex, and homosexuality. Fears about secularization, especially challenges to parental authority and the transformation of male and female roles in the society serve as a powerful incentive to Islamist extremism. Multiculturalism and European freedoms permit Muslims to enforce traditional rules and to practice Islamic fundamentalism in Europe in ways they cannot legally do in their homelands. But finally, Jenkins, while not trivializing the real dangers posed by terrorist violence, is optimistic about the general prospects for ethnic and religious assimilation of Muslims: the longer they live in Europe and experience its powerful cultural trends, the more they are likely to acquire common European cultural and social attitudes.

Chapters ten, "Transforming Europe," and eleven, "Transforming Faith," state a more general question: How can the European Union preach certain values as secularism, tolerance, individualism, freedom of expression, equal treatment of men and women, heterosexuals and homosexuals, a progressive view on gender, family, and sexuality while at the same time Muslim communities uphold radically different values? Christianity emphasizes the value of an individual, traditional Islam, in contrast, is communal and collective. But what does indeed, asks Jenkins, make the core of European values that should be imposed on the newcomers? The dilemma of cultural politics is that if multiculturalism means glorification of every society and tradition, then on what grounds should the European expect Muslims to respect constitution and Western and Christian roots of Europe? According to Jenkins this is not so much a Muslim problem as a religious problem on the side of the European elites, which failed till now to understand the importance of religious thought and motivation. This is also a problem of the fundamental clashes between Christian and Islam belief and the secularism, the official ideology of Europe. Even if the outcome of contemporary debates is not evident, both Islam and Christianity will change radically in coming decades, through the experience of living in Europe's social and cultural environment but also from the fact of living side by side and having to interact with each other in a multifaith setting.

In chapter twelve, "Europe's Religions Tomorrow," Jenkins projects some consequences of the fact that within a foreseeable future, European nations will have more Muslims who as prospective citizens will have voting rights. European Christians will have no alternative but to look closely at Islam to find there many familiar and inspiring elements, in the first place, the belief in the existence and power of a personal God who intervenes directly in human affairs. They will have to tackle the question what is then Islam? A Christian deviation or a divinely revealed and by God himself founded religion? If the latter is true, is Christian evangelism toward Muslims right? One thing seems certain for Jenkins that the religion will play a more and more intense role in public debates. From this point of view the advent of Islam might be a good news for European Christianity, as the European states will have to take into account the presence of Christianity together with the renewed interest in the Christian roots of their culture. "'God's Continent' still has more life than anyone might have thought possible only a few years ago."

Seldom have I read a book with such an intellectual pleasure and lively interest as Jenkins' "God's Continent." Written in a clear style and supported by solid arguments it helps to understand the processes happening in Europe and the European world we live in. The author shows convincingly the complicated political, social, cultural, and religious situation in Europe and at the same time escapes any easy generalizations. He also demonstrates, among other things, that paradoxically Islam – the traditional enemy of Christendom – could be a desired ally for Christianity in the fight with a common enemy: the secularization. Andrzej Bronk

Kan, Sergei: Lev Shternberg. Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. 550 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-1603-7. (Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology, 15) Price: £ 45.00

This long-awaited intellectual biography of the founder of the Leningrad School of Ethnography, Lev Shternberg, by Sergei Kan is a landmark study both as a biography of an influential scholar and as a foundational work in the history of Russian anthropology. Through both interviews and an exhaustive use of archival material, Kan documents both the scholar's debut as young revolutionary activist, pioneer fieldworker on Sakhalin Island, and most significantly as the patriarchal founder of professional ethnography at the end of the imperial period and start of the Soviet period. The book is published within a series devoted to the history of anthropology from an American publisher and is one of the first to document the history of a European scholar. The volume fully documents previous biographies of Shternberg, and as the title suggests, departs from the established literature by giving equal weight not only to his political activism as a member of the Populist "terrorist" organisation the People's Will but as a prominent and committed member of the Jewish community in St. Petersburg.

The biography follows a standard chronological format with chapters, or rather sections, organised according to major periods of the scholar's life. There is a very short section on his early upbringing in Zhitomir, a surprisingly short section on his fieldwork on Sakhalin, and far more developed sections documenting the sometimes shocking turns of fortune as he built a school of ethnography through the Russian civil war, the Bolshevik "coup," and institutionalisation of Soviet power in the NEP period. The book reads well also as a testimony, and political argument, about the founding of Soviet power. Kan spends a lot of space explaining the various struggles and organisations during the civil war period and also devotes a lot of energy scrutinising the archival record to deduce which side Shternberg may have taken. It should be noted that the latter chapters of the book have a rather dark

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2010-2-655 - Generiert durch IP 216.73.216.56, am 02.12.2025, 21:02:42. © Urheberrechtlich geschützter Inhalt. Ohne gesonderte Erlaubnis ist jede urheberrechtliche Nutzung untersagt, insbesondere die Nutzung des Inhalts im Zusammenhang mit, für oder in KI-Systemen, KI-Modellen oder Generativen Sprachmodellen.

tone as Kan documents the various arrests accompanying the rise of Stalin and ends with the flat conclusion that if Shternberg had not have died in 1927, that "he most certainly would have perished" in the GULAG camps of the 1930s.

The dark denouement is used by Kan as part of his interpretation of the history of Russian/Soviet ethnography to explain why Shternberg's name is not traditionally cited as part of the pantheon of the founders of social or cultural anthropology. Kan's account speaks very strongly to the "unravelling" of Shternberg's efforts to create a space for ethnography in Russian academia at the start of the Soviet period due to the politicisation and cleansing of the academy of sciences. The dominant tone of the biography is one of a lost opportunity. The beginning of the work establishes Shternberg, somewhat repetitively, as a person who invented theoretically inspired anthropological fieldwork some thirty years before Malinowski. The book is particularly good at demonstrating Shternberg's extensive correspondence and debates with prominent European and American anthropologists such as Alfred Haddon and Franz Boas. I was particularly surprised at the extent to which Shternberg tutored and encouraged an entire generation of Siberian fieldworkers either directly or through correspondence, including Sergei Shirkogoroff, Grafira Vasilevich, and Konstantin Rychkov. Although some of those also met tragic ends, some also adapted to the strict conditions of Soviet science. To my reading this book is instead a testament instead to scholarly integrity and pedagogy that even a cynical and encircled authoritarian regime could not destroy. On the contrary, I would place a question mark next to the desire to find the one man who "invented" fieldwork.

This book's major contribution is a summary of the material held in the St. Petersburg archives and most importantly in the Shternberg collection of the St. Petersburg section of the Archive of the Academy of Sciences. The text and footnotes give a good overview of the richness of the collection and is a great service to future researchers who may want to explore Shternberg's life further.

As a history of anthropology, rather than a political argument, Kan gives us only sketches of Shternberg's engagement with Giliaks on Sakhalin or even with the various Jewish societies and newspapers with whom he worked. Shternberg's Sakhalin fieldwork is illustrated with clips from letters or published accounts emphasising the author's romantic engagement with people. We learn very little of the social position of his main guides and informants. Shternberg's account of Giliak kinship, which influenced both Morgan and Lévi-Strauss, is somewhat too hastily dismissed as "evolutionist." Evolutionist it certainly is, but when judged against other works sitting on a late 19th-century bookshelf it is certainly the *quality* of the evolutionary argument that counts. I would dare to say that Bruce Grant's recent publication of the English edition of Shternberg's work shows a rather more lively account of Giliak society than one would find in Tylor or even Morgan. Given what we know about the development of Soviet ethnography and the development of the contested *ethnos* theory, what I would like to know is how Shternberg's mosaic interwoven kinship terms ended up being reduced to a smooth and seamless ethnological sameness of Giliak-ness (or Nivkh-ness). There certainly are not many clues to that tendency in the early monograph and not many clues in this biography as to what position Shternberg may have taken on ethnological typing in the early 1920s.

The history of Shternberg's Jewish activism is also fascinating. The exposition of Shternberg's Jewishness is rightly cited as a correction to 80 years of short biographies which for one reason or another downplayed this aspect of his life. However in this account, his interest in Jewish cultural matters is almost always described in parallel to his ethnological professionalism. In one or two places Kan goes to say that as much as his political activism his Jewish activism, often prevent him from doing his anthropology. Kan also argues that Shternberg's view that Jewish monotheism represented a higher and somewhat ahistorical force in human history stood uncomfortably in contradiction to Shternberg's published accounts of cultural change and evolution. A reader who has not struggled to read Shternberg's handwriting has pretty much to take this argument on faith since it is embedded in the presentation of the material. It is certainly possible for a man to compartmentalise parts of his life in such a radical manner. Nevertheless given Shternberg's passionate character it seems unlikely. Reading between the lines of this biography I am struck again by Shternberg's encouragement of local (native) scholars – often through working-class educational societies – to do what we would recognise today as "anthropology at home." This engagement with one's own kin and people – as Shternberg himself did – is certainly an enduring feature of Soviet and Russian ethnography today and it was certainly not a quality that Shternberg would have found among his European correspondents. If one must find an approach that Shternberg invented, this quality of nuturing local scholars is certainly an interesting one.

The book is blessed with a wonderful index and an extremely rich bibliography in Russian and English (although it would have been nice to have the archival classmarks listed together in one place). There are some small problems with the editing which may be due to the publisher's inexperience with works outside of North America. In places the text is repetitive and very occasionally there are striking spelling errors (my favourite is the reference to Kets travelling on a "Enideir Rover" [344 – Enisei River]). Kan also has a tendency in footnotes to document that one scholar or another has made an error of interpretation but does not specify exactly what that error is.

As Kan himself explains in the preface to this book there have been no works in English or Russian which have examined the development of Russian anthropology at the end of the imperial period. This book is certainly a serious and welcome start to this project.

David G. Anderson

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2010-2-655 - Generiert durch IP 216.73.216.56, am 02.12.2025, 21:02:42. © Urheberrechtlich geschützter Inhalt. Ohne gesonderte Erlaubnis ist jede urheberrechtliche Nutzung untersagt, insbesondere die Nutzung des Inhalts im Zusammenhang mit, für oder in KI-Systemen, KI-Modellen oder Generativen Sprachmodellen.