

**Collins, Samuel Gerald:** *All Tomorrow's Cultures. Anthropological Engagements with the Future.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2008. 140 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-408-1. Price: £ 16.50

“Anthropology is the study of humankind and all its manifestations in all times and places” (Sheldon Smith, Philip D. Young); “Cultural anthropology deals with the description and analysis of cultures – the socially learned traditions – of past and present ages” (Marvin Harris); “Cultural anthropology decenters us from our own cultures, teaching us to look ourselves from the ‘outside’ as somewhat ‘strange’” (Barbara D. Miller); “Anthropology is an intellectually challenging, theoretically ambitious subject which tries to achieve an understanding of culture, society, and humanity through detailed studies of local life, supplemented by comparison” (Thomas Hyland Eriksen). We all know these popular formulas. In this light, the anthropologists are studying other cultures and other peoples, always in the same time, in the present. From another perspective, historical anthropology offers interpretations of former ways of life. But what about the future? What about cultures and peoples in the future?

How will we live in the future? Are we moving towards global macdonaldization, cocacolonization and cultural, economic, social, and esthetic homogeneity? Or are there other possibilities? Samuel Gerald Collins – ethnographer and anthropologist who researches globalization and information society in the United States and South Korea – not only argues for the importance of the future of culture but also stresses its centrality in anthropological theory over the last century. “All Tomorrow's Cultures” has two major goals: “(1) excavating anthropology's ‘future work’ over the past two centuries and (2) suggesting where the future thinking about the future may be (and may be heading) in anthropology” (8).

Chapter 1 (Anthropological Time Machine. Setting the Controls for the Future) centers on future in nineteenth-century anthropology and a specific kind of cultural “time machine” (see the work of Johannes Fabian and his concept of “allochronism”). An examination of the works of prominent evolutionist anthropologists – George James Frazer, Edward B. Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan and others – suggests an important problem for anthropology: how can culture simultaneously exist in past, present, and future? In chapter 2 (Margaret Mead Answers [About the Future]) Collins analyzes the oeuvre of Margaret Mead in the context of speculations on the future of culture. Mead wrote extensively about a possible future, in fact, she was not only a classical anthropologist but also a serious futurist. Collins looks on Mead's development from a “social engineer” (30) in her wartime work with Gregory Bateson to her model of cultural “microevolution” (35). In the next chapter (Chad Oliver. An Anthropologist on *Star Trek*) the author presents Oliver as a truly unique person. On the one hand, he was an anthropologist at the University of Texas, on the other, he was an author of anthropological science fiction, saying that “the kind of rigor that anthropology has, conceivably has made me a better science fiction

writer” (42). Collins suggests that “Oliver's importance lies not with some ... concatenation of anthropology and science fiction, but with his ... deployment of one to develop, critique, and imagine the other. In this way, we might see Oliver as the critical foil for Mead” (43).

The next two chapters look at the legacies of Mead and Oliver for anthropology and anthropologists in the 1970s and 1980s. In chapter 4 (Close Encounters of the Anthropological Kind), e.g., Collins examines the searching and theorizing about extraterrestrial life. It was then the time, when anthropology engaged the paradigmatic Other in another way – in dialogue with such institutions as NASA, SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence), and others. Collins wrote that this was a kind of fascination with the “ultimate” Other, Other in situated in the future of the human. Chapter 5 (Playing Games with Futurology) concerns the “official” anthropological practice of cultural futurism. There are important questions about tempocentrism, modernity (“we have never been modern?”), and faces of the future on many levels.

In the next sections of this book (chap. 6: “The Surprising Future” and the conclusion: “The Open Future”) the author evaluates anthropological future work in the present. “In a recent collection, *Histories of the Future*, anthropologists set their gaze on ... California and the West ... [and] write: ‘this region became a laboratory, an imaginary, in which we explored the cultural and sentimental microdynamics of future making’” (93f.). Of course, this is only one example. In general, Collins presents a search for an anthropology for the future rather than of the future.

This book has taken anthropological theory into places with which it is ordinarily not associated: futurism, biogenetics, NASA, and so on. Collins explores how anthropological knowledge(s) of the past and present human cultures have been applied to speculate on its future. He emphasizes the great importance of future studies in anthropological thinking, especially in the light of the ongoing planetary pull between forces of global homogenization and local creolization. “All Tomorrow's Culture” is a very timely and accessible book; it is a well-organized and well-written study for readers interested in social anthropology, literary criticism, and everyone thinking about the future of cultures and the whole world.

Waldemar Kuligowski

**Dark, Philip J. C., and Mavis Dark:** *Vukumo. Art and Life of the Kilenge. A Personal Perspective;* Papua New Guinea. Adelaide: Crawford House Publishing, 2009. 289 pp., photos. ISBN 978-1-86333-330-6. Price: \$A 69.00

In 1974, Melanesianists welcomed the late Philip J. C. Dark's “Kilenge Life and Art” (London), based on his 1966–67 fieldwork in West New Britain. The book included only 32 pages of text (along with over 200 photographs), and offered little in the way of systematic analysis. Dark's academic training was in Art more than in Anthropology, and he was best known as an authority on Benin bronze heads. But at the time the Kilenge

were a little-known people, and even a broad sketch was valuable.

Now Dark's widow has overseen an expansion of the earlier work, with substantially more text and even more illustrations (including drawings as well as photographs), but it is less of a scholarly study than "a personal account, told through the diaries that we both made" (vii). According to Mavis Dark, "the purpose of our stay ... was to study art in its context, the role art played in the lives of the Kilenge people" (1). The Kilenge were especially attractive to the Darks because "they were still living their traditional lives, and most importantly before the concept of tourist art had been developed" (vii).

About half of the book is given to the context of Kilenge art, i.e., a series of descriptions and anecdotes pertaining to daily life, with the rest devoted to personal decoration, festive dancing, and the masks and other objects important to ceremonial life. Most of this is limited, however, to what the Darks were able to observe and photograph. For example, the book's title refers to *vukumo* (*bukumo* in the earlier book), a mask that was used in male initiation ceremonies. No such ceremony was held during the Darks' stay, although such a mask was constructed for them, and we are given a few pages of text and three photographs of it. It is difficult to know what is meant by the "traditional lives" the Kilenge are said to have been living when the Darks were there. Not only the apparent lapse of ceremonies such as that involving *vukumo*, but the ubiquitous Western dress and housing styles shown in the photographs and the discussions of a local government council, a school, and a Roman Catholic mission all suggest a rather different reality.

Those who want a deeper and more scholarly understanding of the Kilenge would do well to consult the numerous publications by their later ethnographers, Marty Zelenietz and Jill Grant, whose work is neither mentioned in this book nor cited in its bibliography.

Terence E. Hays

**Daubenmier, Judith M.:** The Meskwaki and Anthropologists. *Action Anthropology* Reconsidered. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008. 416 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-1732-4. Price: £ 36.00

Von 1948–1958 führte das Department of Anthropology der Universität von Chicago unter der Leitung von Sol Tax ein Feldforschungsprojekt bei den Meskwaki (Fox) in Tama/Iowa durch, das in der ethnologischen Literatur unter dem Namen "Fox Project" bekannt geworden ist und gemeinhin als Beginn der "Action Anthropology" gilt. Konzipiert war das Projekt als Trainingsprogramm für Studierende, die in den Semesterferien bei den Meskwaki erste ethnologische Feldforschungserfahrungen sammeln sollten. Die Studententeams waren sehr frei in der Wahl ihrer Forschungsthemen und dem Grad ihrer Beteiligung an Gemeinschaftsaktivitäten mit den Meskwaki. Sie sollten durch ihren Aufenthalt in Tama vor allem lernen, wie man mit Menschen einer anderen Kultur umgeht und welche Fragen sich ergeben. Dieses Fehlen eines festumrissenen Forschungsprogramms er-

laubte es den Studenten, sich sehr offen auf die Kommunikation mit den Meskwaki einzulassen. Es wird rückwirkend als ein wesentlicher Grund dafür gesehen, dass sich aus den Gesprächen zwischen Sol Tax, den Studenten und den Meskwaki der Ansatz der Action Anthropology entwickeln konnte. Grundlegende Evaluierungen des Projektes gab es bislang ebenso wenig wie eine Auswertung der Feldtagebücher der Studententeams und der Unterlagen von Sol Tax – zumindest nicht in publizierter Form.

Es ist Daubenmiers besonderes Verdienst, mit ihrer Arbeit diese Lücke geschlossen zu haben. Basierend auf den umfangreichen Feldnotizen, Briefen und Tagebüchern der Studententeams und den Unterlagen von Sol Tax aus dem Chicagoer Ethnologie-Department wirft sie einen sehr genauen Blick auf die Beziehungen aller Beteiligten. Sie liest die Aufzeichnungen der Studenten – in ihren Worten – "rückwärts", d. h. sie wertet die Unterlagen nicht mit Blick auf ethnologisch verwertbare Daten über die Meskwaki, sondern bezüglich der Reaktionen der Studenten auf die "Native Americans" aus.

Mit ihrer lebendig geschriebenen, detaillierten und historisch genauen Aufarbeitung der Geschichte des Fox-Projektes bietet Daubenmier neue und erhellende Perspektiven auf die Umstände, die zur Entwicklung des Konzeptes einer engagierten ethnologischen Wissenschaft geführt haben, die nicht nur *über* andere Menschen forschen, sondern auch *mit* ihnen zusammen an der Lösung ihrer Probleme arbeiten will. Um die Rolle der Meskwaki beim Fox-Projekt zu erforschen, führte Daubenmier zusätzlich zur Auswertung der Feldtagebücher zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhundert mehrtätige Interviews mit 25 Meskwaki, die als Kinder oder junge Leute Zeugen des Fox-Projektes gewesen waren. Sie legte ihnen auch Ausschnitte aus den damaligen Feldtagebüchern vor und nahm ihre Reaktionen und Meinungen dazu auf. Gab es überhaupt noch Erinnerungen in der Gemeinde an das Projekt? Wie ernst hatte man die jungen Leute von der Universität damals bei ihren ersten Forschungsversuchen genommen?

Daubenmier kommt zu dem Schluss, dass die Studierenden keineswegs die "colonial masters" waren, als welche die Wissenschaftler/innen häufig in ethnologischen Feldforschungssituationen beschrieben wurden, noch waren die Meskwaki reine "Forschungsobjekte" für die Studenten. Die Meskwaki kontrollierten und manipulierten die jungen Forscher/innen vielmehr genauso im Sinne ihrer Interessen wie es diese umgekehrt taten und waren darin nicht selten erfolgreicher als die Studenten.

Dass die Meskwaki in den meisten Fällen die Kontrolle über die Kommunikation und die soziale Interaktion mit den Forscherteams behalten konnten, führt Daubenmier darauf zurück, dass sie bereits durch vorangegangene Forschungsprojekte Erfahrungen im Umgang mit Ethnologen gesammelt hatten. Sie hatten gelernt, dass sie über ein Wissen verfügten, das für die Wissenschaftler/innen wertvoll war und dass sie im Gegenzug einiges dafür verlangen konnten – zumindest kleine Geschenke, Geld oder Dienstleistungen wie Autotransporte, Hilfe bei bürokratischen Anträgen u. a. m. Diese Erfahrungen setz-