sprung der Dinge", eine populäre Darstellung der Ethnologie ihres verstorbenen Mannes, wodurch die fachliche Symbiose des Ehepaars deutlich wird. Dietrich Treide (1933–2008) ist mit der einführenden Darstellung "Die verschiedenen Seiten der Kultur" aus einer "Völkerkunde für Jedermann" von 1965 vertreten, während Wolfgang Liedtke (1937–2012), und Reinhard Escher (1952–2005) aktuelle nationalpolitische Themen afrikanischer Gesellschaften darstellen. Von Helmut Reim (geb. 1928) wird die ausführliche Einleitung in die Neuveröffentlichung des ethnologischen Klassikers "Die Sitten der amerikanischen Wilden im Vergleich zu den Sitten der Frühzeit" des französischen Jesuiten Joseph-François Lafitau wiedergegeben. Bernhard Streck (geb. 1945), hat als seinen Beitrag den Aufsatz aus dem Jahr 1997 "Ethnologie als differentielle Soziologie. Perspektiven und Refraktionen" beigesteuert, während Annegret Nippa (geb. 1948) den Aufsatz "Kontexte" von 1999 in einer grundlegenden Überarbeitung neu vorlegt und Ursula Rao ihren erst ein Jahr zuvor veröffentlichten Bericht "Neue Märkte der Entwicklung. Krankenversicherung, Computer-Technologie und das Risiko der Heilung in Indien" abermals veröffentlicht.

Die Einordnung in forschungsgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge und die thematischen Schwerpunkte dieser Leipziger Ethnologen, die mit Ausnahme von Krause alle am Universitätsinstitut für Ethnologie ihre Hauptarbeitsstelle hatten bzw. noch haben, umreißen die Herausgeber Streck und Geisenhainer in einem Vorwort und Nachwort. Strecks Periodisierung in die formative Zeit, die von Positivismus, Kolonialismus und dem Traum der verlorenen Kolonien geprägt war (Weule und Krause), in die Zwischenkriegszeit einschließlich der des Dritten Reiches (J. Lips, Reche und Lehmann), die Zeit der DDR (E. Lips, Treide und Liedtke) und in die Zeit nach der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands (Streck, Nippa, Rao), die allerdings auch einige Kollegen aus der vorangegangenen DDR-Zeit integriert und mit ihren damaligen Beiträgen präsentiert (Liedtke, Reim und Escher), in der es um "sozialökonomische", politische und "volksbildende" Aspekte ging, wird man ohne Weiteres zustimmen können.

Die Themen, wie sie in den ausgewählten Beiträgen zum Tragen kommen, sind allerdings nicht unbedingt die maßgeblichen und bedeutendsten ihrer Autoren und der Zeit in der sie wirkten. Für die erste Periode werden Forschungsgeschichte und Methodik vorgeführt, während eigentlich das Markenzeichen dieser Epoche die Ethnografie war. Für die Zeit des Dritten Reiches wird die Rassenkunde dargestellt, die man tatsächlich als das sensibelste und problematischste Forschungsfeld in jenen 13 Jahren ansehen kann. Für die Zeit der DDR sind es relativ diffuse Themen, die meist in trockener Berichterstattung der Popularisierung ausgewählter sozialistischer Länder in Afrika dienten, während die ethnografisch fokussierte Forschung, die es damals in Leipzig auch gab, nicht zum Zuge kommt und die damals im Vergleich mit Westdeutschland führende Museumspädagogik ebenfalls nicht, weil sie kein Arbeitsfeld universitärer Ethnologen war. Für die jüngste Vergangenheit steht die Präsentation der Vielfalt der Forschungsansätze und -themen durchaus im Einklang mit der generellen Situation des Faches, wobei Strecks Beitrag zur Stellung der Ethnologie gegenüber der Soziologie die immer noch vorherrschende, vielleicht sogar zunehmende Verunsicherung über den Standort der Ethnologie, seiner Grundlagen und seiner Perspektiven charakterisiert, die einen großen Teil gegenwärtiger Ethnologen seit fast 50 Jahren umtreibt. Demgegenüber präsentieren die beiden letzten Autorinnen neue Felder bzw. neue Perspektiven auf traditionelle Forschungsfelder im Musealen (Nippa) und in der Anthropologie komplexer Gesellschaften (Rao), womit sie hochinteressante Ansätze durchführen, die aber nicht den derzeitigen quantitativen Trend des Faches spiegeln.

Das Buch ist durch ein zuverlässiges Register und eine weiterführende forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliografie gut erschlossen. Es dürfte vor allem für Nachbarwissenschaftler, die sich ein Bild von der Ethnologie und den Ethnologen im Wandel der letzten einhundert Jahre machen wollen, interessant sein, denn die Leipziger Universitäts- und Museumsethnologie war und ist eine der führenden und am breitesten ausgefächerten in Deutschland.

Berthold Riese

González-Ruibal, Alfredo: An Archaeology of Resistance. Materiality and Time in an African Borderland. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2014. 381 pp. ISBN 978-1-4422-3090-3. Price: £ 59.95

In the most recent millennia of human history, individual freedom has increasingly become a precarious matter in the face of intergroup and intra-social predation, observably the more so the more institutionalised social hierarchies dominate the scene. González-Ruibal's "Archaeology of Resistance" reminds us – using the example of an intriguing contemporary cluster of "subaltern" ethnic communities in the Ethiopia-Sudan borderlands – that successful defense against predation has long been a collective affair of cultural and organisational choices, and that people and peoples often defend egalitarian and autonomist patterns to such ends as best they can. At a time, when international coalitions of transformation profiteers mount unprecedented pressure on areas like the western and southern fringes of the Ethiopian highlands – where that defense had worked for millennia even in the violent proximity of powerful expansionist ethnic and state systems –, he also reminds us that resistance to change can be progressive and that fashionable academic obsessions with change can make for biases utterly opposed to emancipatory attitudes their faithful like to parade.

This book by an archaeologist specialised in the deep history of violent power, its shapes, and checks has two basic strengths at levels that might come as a surprise to anthropologists. First, it offers a thorough comparative ethnography of a regional cluster of cultures and societies with different levels of cultural autonomy, and second, it is a very important and topical contribution to anthropological discourse and theory.

Anthropologists might have a hard time trying to give a more convincing account of a historically deep and phenomenologically rich landscape of cultural particularities, commonalities and interplay, of durable social strategies,

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2015-2-620 - Generiert durch IP 216.73.216.60, am 24.01.2026, 10:47:29. © 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.

material arrangements and developing power relations for a region like this. While historiography conspicuously privileges the expansionist hierarchical systems engaging societies at their ecologically and socially contrasting fringes for millennia in "resource wars," the latter are the empirical focus of this remarkable study. Sandwiched between expansionist powers from the Ethiopian highlands to their east and from the plains of the Sudan in the west, they did not develop state structures but instead paradigmatic cultural sets of material and mental strategies to cope with the threat of submission and exploitation by those powerful neighbours and invaders.

In depicting this region as historical shatter zone of communities striving to keep their economic and sociocultural autonomy, it explicitly resembles J. Scott's famous study of similar cases in Southeastern Asia yet benefits from the opportunities a tighter geographical focus offers. On the one hand, all depicted "indigenous" societies contrast, like in Scott's account, with the neighbouring expansionist polities in sociopolitical style (decentralised order with egalitarian ideals versus staunchly hierarchical models with ideologies of inequality) and economy (shifting cultivators with strong foraging traditions versus intensive agro-pastoralism with strong notions of contempt for "casts" with other occupations). On the other hand, the ethnic complexity of the former can here be grouped into four "ethnic" categories corresponding to distinct modes of "resistance" (and resilience). Sketching them out from among the large pool of culturally and politically diverse small-scale groups, the author synergises ethnography, history, archaeology, and political analysis to demonstrate different ways in which culturally defined polities protect collective interests with a complex web of social institutions across dimensions like materiality, spiritual ideas, and behavioural patterns.

In simplified terms, the four models corresponding to ethnic categories are as follows: The Gumuz or Bega (chap. 3) are a relatively large and coherently watchful population. Over millennia of exposure to brutal raids by mostly highland armies they have developed a combination of fierce defensive warfare and tactical compromise with unswerving adherence to egalitarian ideals and a conscious contrast culture as means of stabilising internal peace and cohesion for the sake of collective strength in holding on control over vital resources. The long cultivated sense for and insistence in rightful ownership of choices and of socially organised materiality finds strong purchase in their material culture, e.g., in excessive fencing, pervasive defensive designs, and near-universal (male) "love" for weapons, both modern and traditional, as well as in obsessions with rights, integrity, and spiritual threats of pollution.

The Bertha (chap. 4), in contrast, immigrated from the plains of the Western Sudan as a strong community evading submission by even stronger opponents and conquered a refuge along the foothills by defeating smaller indigenous groups. Both for preying on the latter and for resisting predatory rivals, they banked on empowerment through alliance with "the (at a specific moment) more attractive" macro-cultural regional force, Islam. The price for thus resisting the threat of being overpowered by others, however, was increasing internal tension and division. The segments most intensively acculturated to Arabo-Islamic models used their transethnic relations to set themselves up as a powerful class that would not stop at coercing and selling darker and "more pagan" co-ethnic neighbours into slavery or join invading powers in marauding, wilful destruction and massacring "fellow Bertha" with the interested contempt typical for surrounding "predator societies."

Mao and Komo (chap. 5) represent two alternative choices of groups too weak to successfully resist by open confrontation. "Mao" is, most of all, a generic term coined by highland invaders for those indigenous groups who chose "invisibility" through ostensible compliance, while keeping a subtle moment of "uncanniness" in protected traditions central to perpetuated collective identity, not least relating to their remembered past as free and self-sufficient "owners of the forest." "Every time they gather to hunt, they are showing their power: every act of communal hunting is a camouflaged threat of war" (320). "Komo" is the term used by the conquering groups for those indigenous groups evading domination by retiring further into "the wilderness" – an option that has now ceased to exist as the expansion of the trans-regional system of asymmetrical integration has reached a point of "no escape."

González-Ruibal's book shares the wealth of and sense for ethnographic detail with "classical" ethnographies, but can build on a broader basis of existing historical and anthropological research (W. James, C. Jedrej, A. Wolde-Selassie, V. Grottanelli, E. Haberland, R. Pankhurst, etc.). The author pays systematic attention to "material" features like settlement and building patterns, decoration and dressing style, but also to "mixed" ones like music and dance or livelihood as well as nutrition patterns, and to "non-material" culture like marriage norms and spirituality, all of which not least serve to keep distinctiveness from and social distance to the hegemonic orders of expansionist neighbours like Amhara, Oromo, and Sudanese "Arabs."

On the side of theory, this monograph intrepidly attacks a tendency that, as he lays out convincingly, has become near-hegemonic in sociocultural anthropology in recent decades: "a modernist and historicist bias … visible both in their insistence on constant change and global connections, and in their abhorrence of 'the archaic'" (16). Yet in spite of the scholastic attitudes and moralist pretensions associated with it, anthropologists under attack by such "modernist" zealots are often "much closer to anticolonial, emancipatory discourses than those who reclaim 'history' for all non-Western communities and who might be unwittingly backing neoliberal agendas" (17).

As an epistemologically interested archaeologist by default a specialist in these dimensions, González-Ruibal's reasoning on this point is built on theoretical arguments on *temporality* and *materiality*. They substantiate his critique of protagonists and partisans of ideologies presently forming strong magnets of herd instincts and

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2015-2-620 - Generiert durch IP 216.73.216.60, am 24.01.2026, 10:47:29. © 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.

mainstreaming in the social sciences. He points out that those predicating on the primacy of change over resilience, of connections over autonomy, and on avoiding "savage slots" like the plague actually reject taking a form of temporality seriously that has been crucial for humans over most of their history as defense against submission and exploitation. In a time of ever more pervasive expansion of exploitative structures, the devotees of this academic fashion implicitly bolster this expansion in the name of "change" instead of recognising and supporting cultural patterns serving those under attack as structural footholds of resistance. They thereby reinforce – probably often unconsciously – the ideological pretension of political and economic predators against traditions and people that have managed to resist them for millennia to this day.

The temporality that "allagists," i.e., those idolising change as *the* appropriate focus of research and thought, whom the author casually refers to as "modernists," "reject on epistemological and moral grounds is actually the nonmodern time of the subaltern (including indigenous people and marginalized communities)" (16). These grounds, which contemporary scientists, agents of "development" and "progress" partly share with history's bluntly violent and ruthless conquering systems of human exploitation, are themselves infected by ideologies of inequality and implicitly self-serving biases of contempt for "backwardness" and "outdated ("archaic") forms."

For the author as an ethno-archaeologist of societies that have been at least *partly* successful in resisting political and cultural expansionism, it is evident that "some of the essential characteristics of materiality (durability, ability to stabilize collectives, resistance to change) are crucial in constituting nonmodern temporalities and in effecting resistance" (16). In both the case of the people under study and the employed approach, the insistence on cultural autonomy that coincides with resistance to changes that would perceivably result in a loss of economic and social self-determination becomes a struggle for equity, collective and individual liberty in an environment, both regional and global, fraught with predation of the more powerful on those they are able to coerce or lure into playing along.

But how can resistance to change be "progressive" if *the very notion* of "progress" is defined as a specific – i.e., a "positive" – kind of *change*? The answer is simple: When the impending change – from the perspective of the concerned (individual or collective) human subject – cannot be considered "positive." Examples are the coercion into slave status or other serious violations of established rights (e.g., to crucial resources like land, or socioculturaI order, or to participation in decision-making on crucial matters) by powerful invaders, authoritarian states, reckless commercial enterprises, and other predatory rackets. Resisting *this* kind of change for the sake of preserving higher levels of equity, codetermination, and tried sustainability, is plausibly labelled "counter-hegemonic" by the author. If "true progress" is to be measured in relation to *these* dimensions (and not just to temporarily extracted revenue or hierarchical complexity), societies with more "sophisticated" and diverse material culture and economic structures might well have a hard time "catching up" with – from a metropolis point of view – "marginal," "archaic," and "backward" communities. To show this with an innovative power-conscious archaeology of the present, one that is anthropologically "deeper" than many rather ethnocentric Foucault-styled projects, is a merit González-Ruibal can be proud of. Learning from "subaltern" and cultural *Others* is a potential to which anthropology has long developed cutting-edge keys. He shows us that the edge still cuts if not blunted by exaggerated "progressist" (or rather *allagist*) biases.

Immo Eulenberger and Ameyu Godesso Roro

Goodman, Davis S. G.: Class in Contemporary China. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014. 233 pp. ISBN 978-0-7456-5337-2. Price: £ 15.00

"Class in Contemporary China" offers a timely and extensive review of the evolution of class both as analytical concept and experienced reality in the People's Republic of China. As Goodman rightly points out in the beginning of his book, class remains "central to the understanding of social and political change" (1) despite the absence of *jieji*, the Chinese term for class, in both official discourse and everyday conversation in the post-reform era.

The importance of class cannot be overemphasized in Mao's China. Goodman traces the historical development of class since the foundation of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in the 1920s and highlights the mobilizing power of revolutionary class analysis based on Marxist-Leninist ideology for the party-state to establish its sociopolitical control from the bottom level. In land reforms carried out in the countryside in the early 1950s, the label of "landlords" was often created in places where the pattern of landholding was far from being exploitative. Work teams also organized villagers to attend denunciation meetings and learn the language of class struggle, which effectively helped eradicate the power of the local elites.

After Mao's death, class defined by ideology has lost its political currency. The party-state has shifted away from class struggle to economic development, where its current political legitimacy lies. The CCP, the alleged vanguard of China's workers and peasants went as far as welcoming entrepreneurs to apply for its membership from 2000 on. The ideology-laden *jieji* consequently gave way to the politically neutral *jieceng* (stratum) in Chinese publications to acknowledge drastic social stratification and tone down criticism of stark inequality after three decades of market reform.

Agreeing with the general trend within sociological studies that combine Weberian and Marxist perspectives on class, Goodman adopts a tripartite framework to analyze the class structure in today's China: dominant, intermediate, and subordinate classes. His classification is based on "economic configuration, political behaviour, social mobility and symbolic construction" (29). The dominant class includes officials (including high-rank managers of state-owned enterprises), managers of large private or foreign-invested enterprises, and successful en-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2015-2-620 - Generiert durch IP 216.73.216.60, am 24.01.2026, 10:47:29. © 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.