

wear can now probably be pushed back to ~40,000 years ago, which is about 9,000 years older than previous estimates. Other characters that place Tianyuan 1 between anatomically modern humans and older archaic humans are: 1) the anterior to posterior dental proportions place it between modern humans and Neandertals; and 2) the probable presence of a small retromolar gap that occasionally is present in early modern humans and often present in Neandertals. Shang and Trinkaus interpret this evidence to indicate that Tianyuan 1 is an early modern human; not quite fully modern, but clearly not archaic. The Tianyuan 1 morphology is thought to be the result of some degree of admixture between modern humans moving into the region and indigenous archaic human populations.

The interesting finds from the Fernandez-Jalvo and Andrews taphonomic study is that they found a great deal of evidence on the other animal bones that indicates humans were the primary accumulators of the associated faunal assemblage. Although no photographs of percussion marked bone were included it is interesting that the authors were able to identify a wide diversity of cultural marks, despite the complete absence of any stone artifacts. The Hu and Richards piece is interesting because they found evidence in the isotopic record that Tianyuan 1 probably consumed large quantities of freshwater fish, despite the absence of any fish remains at the site. Presence of fish at penecontemporaneous Zhoukoudian Upper Cave is used as indirect evidence that fish were abundant in the region at the time and was likely regularly consumed by the Tianyuan human.

The Shang and Trinkaus study is one of the first comprehensive metric analyses of a modern human skeleton from eastern Asia that derives from solid context and age. In addition to the studies of the fossils from Zhoukoudian Upper Cave, Minatogawa, and Niah Cave, the analysis of the Tianyuan 1 human will make a very nice addition to the literature. This monograph will definitely be of interest to any senior researcher or graduate student working on questions related to the evolution of modern human morphology.

Christopher J. Bae

Shapira, Reuven: Transforming Kibbutz Research. Trust and Moral Leadership in the Rise and Decline of Democratic Cultures. Cleveland: New World Publishing, 2008. 397 pp. ISBN 978-0-9776818-1-5. Price: \$ 21.95

In the foreword to Reuven Shapira's "Transforming Kibbutz Research," the senior Israeli anthropologist, Emanuel Marx, comments that, despite what the voluminous research on the kibbutz took for granted, the kibbutz was never a utopian enterprise. This is partly misleading, for in a fundamental way even the book under review (whatever the author understands) still smacks of a venture in utopia. Shapira's positively critical emphasis on "high-morality" as a condition of the success of such communities echoes, unmistakably, the kibbutz movement's original ideological goal of creating a "new man" (*Ha'adam Hahadash*). The expectation was that the collectivist organization of these communities would effectively resocialize individuals, acculturating them anew,

adults and children alike, as supremely moral, and therewith as perfectly suited to the exhaustive democracy projected by the ideology. Without attending to this utopian ideal, a student of this community risks missing a fundamental, explanatory element of quotidian kibbutz social life as well as crises or other exceptional events that arise in the course of that life. Even so, Emanuel Marx's observation undoubtedly finds solid ground in another hard to miss element of the kibbutz, one to which Martin Buber drew attention decades ago, namely, the conspicuous pragmatism of these communities. Shapira's argument may be read to bring into relief both sides of this seeming contradiction, between pragmatism and perfectibilism.

At its broadest, Shapira's argument is threefold: first, he sets forth an explanation of the "decline" of the movement and its democratic ideal; second, on the basis of this explanation, he proposes a solution to the decline; third, he runs a polemic against most if not all previous research on the kibbutz, in light of his finding that that research ultimately failed to grasp the reason for the decline. The reason, he argues, is "oligarchization," as brought about at the level of the kibbutz federations. Because the federations are run autocratically rather than democratically, and because they enjoy critical control over their constituent kibbutzim, the democracy of the latter was systematically undermined by a trickle-down effect, to the point of inauthenticity. In other words, the leadership at the top being anything but democratic, the idyllic democracy at the bottom, in the collectives themselves, suffered a slow death. As a solution to this state of affairs, Shapira proposes a different, and intriguing, system of succession to positions of leadership in the movement, one that in practice would obviate the emergence of power elites. In making this argument, he draws painstakingly on an impressive array of social scientific literature on the kibbutz proper and beyond.

The book's principal argument is keyed to Robert Michels' well-known "iron law of oligarchy," in which democracy is undercut by bureaucracy and in turn the development of power elites and self-interest. In this regard, particularly imposing is Shapira's analysis of *rotatzia* or the kibbutz rule of equal and relatively rapid rotation of all positions of authority among the members of the community. In relation to his findings and observations about "patronage" (appointments given by power elites to loyal supporters) and "parachuting" (the circulation of individuals who have served competently in a particular office into positions for which they lack the requisite qualifications, thus occasioning mediocre leadership at best), this analysis makes a robust contribution to kibbutz studies. Shapira maintains that together these two common but perverse practices at once belie the spirit of *rotatzia* in the kibbutz and suggest that the very implementation of the rule of rotation served to mask the resulting corruption.

Shapira's critique of the previous research on the kibbutz is comprehensive, directed at the work by both "insiders" and "outsiders." As sociologically remedial as his argument about power elites is, though, his polemic strikes me as excessive. His basic charge is that this research missed the negative influence of the movement's

federations and their power elites on the practice of democracy in the individual kibbutzim themselves. But even if this charge is sound, there can be good reasons for such oversight. For purposes of interpreting empirical data pertaining to the corruption of kibbutz democracy, Shapira is duly concerned with their context, which he identifies as the kibbutz movement's federative order. But there are all manner of contexts that bear on the operation of kibbutz democracy. For example, as intercalary organizations, the kibbutz federations were vitally tasked with representing the communes to the state. It stands to reason that this critical function, in conjunction with the establishment and politico-economic evolution of Israel as a modern bourgeois nation-state, was highly conducive to the development of powerful politico and oligarchical organization within the federations and the kibbutzim themselves (not to mention the extent to which the state gradually outgrew its vital need for these communities). Shapira mentions this consideration but fails to delve analytically into just how it constrains the character of leadership in the federations. To take another example (a context so taken-for-granted that it goes unnoticed as such), the particular theoretical bent and problem-set of the researcher are crucial to interpretation of data. In taking up the question of the movement's success or failure (a question that presents itself as matter of course to "insider" students especially), and finding an answer in a particular theory of power elites, Shapira gives the (infelicitous) impression that there are no other fruitful questions one can ask, not simply about the democratic practices in these communities, but even about the nature of the communities all told.

Moreover, in the context of a social movement that finds its reason for being in a collectivist democracy, there is something askew about Shapira's exclusive stress on leadership: it is the value on equality, not the value on leadership, that enjoys moral primacy in this definitive direct democracy. To be sure, Shapira's description of what constitutes good leadership is keenly observant of this fact. He is single-minded in arguing that what is needed are creative or "transformational" (as opposed to "charismatic") leaders, ones whose exceptional integrity and deeply principled character foster a "high-morality and high-trust culture." As distinct from bureaucrats, these leaders are, he holds, always and genuinely open to and participant with those whom they center. In support of his argument, he presents a number of empirical cases documenting successes and failures of leadership. Deriving from his extensive historical and sociological research (and, to be sure, from his vast experience as a lifelong and dedicated member of a prominent kibbutz), these cases focus on the founding leaders of the kibbutz movement as well as on five individual kibbutzim. On the basis of these empirical data, he arrives at proposals for establishing concrete institutional measures meant to thwart the emergence of oligarchic or mediocre leaders and ensure the election of the profoundly democratic kind of leaders he extols.

These measures (too involved to catalogue here) would importantly rework the system of succession to leadership in the kibbutz movement. They are inventive and theoretic-

cally plausible. Even so, it remains hard not to wonder if they are indeed feasible when it comes to contemplating the likelihood of putting them into practice. One might well ask if it is not the case that in order to institutionalize them, there must already be in place the very kind of leader they are designed to produce. More broadly, bearing in mind Foucault's observation that while not everything is bad, everything does have its dangers, it's also worth asking if leadership, of all things (and any kind), can be excluded from this sage maxim?

Shapira's analysis and monadic emphasis on leadership are built entirely around a theory of power. In effect, like so much of modern Western thought (including what Shapira calls the "culture" of capitalism) and current anthropology, this theory tends to presume that what chiefly comes natural to humans is self-interest. Ironically, then, insofar as his analysis posits moral order, it does so on the basis of structural mechanisms geared primarily, not to any critically innate faculty of other-regard, but to the containment of the sovereign self. Here Shapira's anthropology is too thin, as it misses the work (e.g., M. G. Smith on pre-industrial stratification systems or Pierre Clastres on leadership) that suggests that what is ultimately presupposed by his ideal is a social reality different from any modern predominantly Western model, whether capitalist or socialist. Such a reality may be understood to entail a sense of self that is preeminently heteronomous rather than autonomous, one in which the self *naively* grasps itself as more fundamentally *part of* than *apart from* others. Spiro's anthropological focus on the "children of the kibbutz" can be read as a test of the extent to which kibbutzim could create psychologies characteristically predisposed to other-regard as a first behavior. In the kibbutz I studied, I was told more than once – with unspoken utopian envy – that if I wanted to see the kibbutz ideal truly realized, I should study one of the communes belonging to the religious kibbutz movement (*Hakibbutz Hadati*). Plainly, behind this perception was the (doubtful) presumption that in a kibbutz ultimately based on belief in an absolute other, an encompassing figure of God, other-regard might be guaranteed absolutely.

There is no room here to lay out the various reasons for thinking that, even if Shapira's proposed remedial measures are logically sound, they may still evoke, to some substantial degree, castles in the air. His critique continues to reflect the original kibbutz project of forging a community dedicated to the creation of morally superior individuals, men and women who are predominantly willing to forgo (à la Judeo-Christian morality, "ascetically") self-interest, on behalf of the social whole and the nation. In arguing that Michels' "Iron Law of Oligarchy" is not ironclad after all, is Shapira offering yet another solution to what I take to be, in the context of human social life, an existential ambiguity, an innate ethical dynamic of individual-and-society, that can be variously shaped but not wholly removed? Instead of one based on a sociopolitical contract, though, as in, say, Hobbes, he is proposing a solution allegedly anchored in a ground that is better but not more powerful than power – which is to say, a primarily moral order keyed to selection of leaders who are as wise

and creative as King Solomon yet, in sharp contrast to this notorious rake of a biblical monarch, moral to a fault? In this connection, I'm reminded of a remark made to me by an erstwhile colleague during an informal conversation about the hierarchical organization of academic institutions: cautioning against the presumption that merit will always rise to the top, he assured me that "mediocrity gets up very early in the morning to make certain that that does not happen." That being said, I cannot help but admire Shapira's fierce and determined critique of the deleterious rise and use of power in this extraordinary 20th-century social movement. As a movement insider, the socio-political costs to him must have been considerable. And, whatever my reservations about his argument, I also cannot help respecting deeply the high idealism driving the intensive pragmatism of his study.

T. M. S. Evens

Skarżyńska, Beata: *Mircea Eliade w Polsce. Recepcja religioznawczo-kulturowa [Mircea Eliade en Pologne. Réception culturelle et en sciences des religions]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2010, 207 pp. ISBN 978-83-75430-85-1. Prix: PLN 38.69.

Malgré qu'il existe une riche littérature relative aux différents aspects de l'oeuvre de Mircea Eliade, ses idées, ainsi que sa création littéraire et artistique, restent difficiles à classer : elles ne se laissent pas cerner par les schémas de classement traditionnels. Eminent philologue, ethnologue, chercheur en sciences humaines et culturelles, historien des religions, Mircea Eliade (1907–1986) fut membre actif participant aux réunions d'American Society for the Study of Religion, société fondée à Chicago en 1958 (*Chicago School*) ; il fut également fondateur, en 1961, du périodique *History of Religions*, et rédacteur de la monumentale "Encyclopedia of Religion" (1987). Il se considérait comme Roumain aussi bien que Français, Américain ou encore Hindou, mais il est toujours resté profondément enraciné dans la tradition chrétienne orthodoxe. Il parlait et écrivait couramment huit langues dont roumain, français, anglais, italien, hébreu et persan. Au cours de sa vie longue et particulièrement active, il fut journaliste, romancier, diplomate, enseignant à l'université, et avant tout, maître à penser suivi par de nombreux disciples. Son érudition hors paire lui a permis d'aller au-delà des lignes de démarcation entre les sciences et de mener des recherches interdisciplinaires. Parallèlement, Eliade écrit des romans fantastiques, de brefs essais et des monographies exhaustives. Il se consacre à l'étude de l'histoire des religions, ou, plus généralement, à la science des religions: il étudie les religions archaïques, les religions orientales, l'alchimie, le chamanisme et le yoga, il recherche les voies du nouveau pratique de la culture occidentale.

Il possède de nombreuses qualités de l'esprit : grandeur et finesse de la pensée, vive intelligence, curiosité scientifique indomptable, persévérance au travail et excellente mémoire. Son intuition et son vaste savoir lui permettent de porter sur les objets de son étude un regard profond et ouvert, libéré des entraves du temps et de

l'espace. Ses thèses, souvent controversées, furent révélatrices des nouveaux horizons à découvrir. Eliade n'envisageait pas de créer son propre école, il a pourtant rassemblé autour de lui de nombreux disciples venant d'Europe, des deux Amériques et d'Asie.

Malgré de nombreuses discussions autour de son oeuvre, il est indéniable que Mircea Eliade se considérait lui-même avant tout comme historien des religions et chercheur en quête des traces du *sacrum* et de la présence de l'esprit dans le monde entier, au cours de toute son histoire. Selon Eliade, le plus grand succès de l'humanité au XX^e siècle ne consistait pas dans les découvertes scientifiques, ni dans les transformations sociales révolutionnaires, mais dans la redécouverte du rôle primordial du *sacrum* dans la vie humaine. Il était persuadé de l'importance des recherches sur les religions au sein de la culture contemporaine, non seulement parce que la connaissance des religions archaïques et exotiques facilite le dialogue interculturel, mais avant tout parce que l'histoire des religions est porteuse d'un savoir profond sur l'homme, susceptible de devenir fondement d'un nouvel humanisme. Opposant fervent au matérialisme et à toutes les idéologies ultra-rationalistes, Mircea Eliade devint précurseur du nouveau religieux à la charnière du XX^e et du XXI^e siècles. Il est évident aujourd'hui que les études d'Eliade ont largement contribué à ce que, à partir de la fin des années soixante du siècle passé, les intellectuels occidentaux recommencent à considérer la religion en tant qu'un sujet d'intérêt sérieux. Il a fallu remettre en question les opinions en vigueur depuis la Révolution Française, selon lesquelles la religion n'était qu'un phénomène passager dans le développement de la culture, le processus de laïcisation était universel et irrévocable, la religion n'englobait que la sphère des comportements privés qui ne jouaient dans la culture qu'un rôle accidentel et le plus souvent négatif, en tant qu'obstacle au développement de la culture et de la civilisation, et, enfin, qu'un conflit insoluble opposait la religion à la science. Dans le domaine aussi subtil que la religion, tout pronostic s'avère risqué.

L'ouvrage de Beata Skarżyńska, docteur en science des religions, "Mircea Eliade w Polsce. Recepcja religioznawczo-kulturowa" (Mircea Eliade en Pologne. Réception culturelle et en sciences des religions) publié en 2010 dans la maison d'édition Neriton à Varsovie, avec subvention du Ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation Supérieure, s'inscrit dans la problématique susmentionnée. L'ouvrage constitue un développement de la thèse de doctorat soutenue en 2003 à l'Université Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński à Varsovie. L'auteur se concentre sur l'un de principaux sujets de l'héritage intellectuel d'Eliade, et propose une analyse de sa réception en Pologne. En plus d'une énumération méticuleuse des textes relatifs au sujet traité, l'ouvrage offre une étude de l'influence exercée par les idées d'Eliade sur les auteurs polonais de la deuxième moitié du XX^e siècle. Cette influence est examinée sous deux aspects: culturel et de science des religions, un tel approche résultant de la spécificité des principes adoptés par Mircea Eliade dans ses recherches en histoire des religions. Cette interdisciplinarité se manifeste aussi