

schichtsforschung in ihrem „Veröstlichungsversuch“ Griechenlands alle oben genannten Aspekte angemessen in wissenschaftlicher und politischer Hinsicht berücksichtigen, wird im Endeffekt von jedem Leser individuell entschieden.

Abgesehen von der jeweiligen synthetischen Rezeption ist der hier rezensierte Band, ein sorgfältig geschriebenes, sehr informatives, zum Nachdenken anregendes Werk, auf jeden Fall empfehlenswert für Wissenschaftler, Studenten und generell für Leser mit besonderem Interesse an dem „Sonderfall Griechenland“.

Anmerkungen:

- 1 S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York 1996, S. 223.
- 2 Nikos Demertzis, *Griechenlands zeitgenössische Politische Kultur*, Athen 1994, S. 42.
- 3 Ebd., S. 67.

Erik Kennes / Miles Larmer: The Katangese Gendarmes and War in Central Africa Fighting Their Way Home, Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2016, 289 pp.

Reviewed by
Inge Brinkman, Gent

Within a month of national independence in 1960, the mineral-rich region of Katanga seceded from Congo Republic to be re-united with Congo less than three years later. Some of the soldiers involved in the

Katangese secession were integrated into the Congolese army and others were eventually demobilised, but a number ended up in Angola where they were fought at the side of the Portuguese army and also came to be known as the “Tigres”. After Angola’s independence in 1975 these ex-gendarmes sided with Angola’s leftist MPLA government. Some of them formed a movement – the National Front for the Liberation of Congo (FLNC), launching various attacks on Mobutu’s Zaire. The ex-gendarmes took the side of Kabila in the overthrowing of Mobutu in 1997 and then finally returned to Congo.

This is the group of people that Erik Kennes and Miles Larmer set out to study over twenty years ago. It proved a very difficult task, not in the least because the membership of the Katangese gendarmes fluctuated over time. Furthermore, the gendarmes hardly fit any ideological scheme – as they changed from supporting a colonial army to a neo-Marxist regime. Their aims ranged from Katangese secession to “liberating” Congo, while at times it seems they acted like mercenaries with little political aim at all. Throughout “Katanga” remained the rallying-point for the gendarmes. As the authors write: “The gendarmes’ identification with ‘Katanga’ as a nation-state remained central to their self-identification and activities, notwithstanding the nonexistence of that state since 1963” (p. 2). Notoriously slippery, this fighting force continues to influence Katanga’s position in Congo, even if the gendarmes at present no longer form an active political or military force.

The relevance of the book is clear: for over fifty years the gendarmes played an as yet largely undocumented role on the Cen-

tral African political and military scene. Kennes and Larmer (p. 1) also point out that the gendarmes' existence challenges the notions of the postcolonial Congolese state, the basis of nationalism and state formation in Africa, and invite for a re-assessment of the relations between "autochthons" and "strangers" as well as those between ethnicity and postcolonial borders.

Of course, given the changing nature of the group called Katangese gendarmes or Tigres, the authors (p. 5) rightly wonder whether we should speak of one movement really or of a succession of separate groupings that have little less in common than the concept "Katanga". Yet precisely that issue makes for another reason to study the Katangese gendarmes: they see themselves and are imagined by others as an entity, yet socio-political change calls for an approach that study the Katangese gendarmes in all their complexity through time.

Through the history of the Katangese gendarmes, Kennes and Larmer are able to trace the processes of socio-political and military change in Central Africa. Structured in eight chapters, the book is chronologically organized covering the period between 1960 and 2015 with the first chapter offering the historical background to "Katanga" in the colonial context. The mainstream interpretation of the Katangese secession usually views African actors as mere puppets at the hands of colonial interests. Yet, the book's second and the third chapter show the secession and the events during its aftermath to be the result of a complex interplay between local and colonial interests.

Also in the following chapter, the authors critically assess earlier interpretations of the gendarmes as they are often reduced to

mercenaries in the Portuguese army. Yet, linking up with the Lunda king Mwaant Yav and the exiled Moïse Tshombe, the gendarmes were at once mercenaries for the Portuguese and seeking to continue their project of Katangese secession. Chapter 5 and 6 of the book take the reader beyond the Cold War framework as the aims and practices of the gendarmes never fitted neither of the camps' ideology.

After a period of fragmentation, described in chapter in chapter 7, the ex-Tigres reunited and participated in the overthrow of Mobutu in 1997. They were repatriated from Angola, and, although demobilised, they continue to influence Katangese political life and the wider Congolese context, not in the least symbolically.

For various reasons this book is a welcome contribution to Africanist scholarship. Firstly, because it is a well-researched and well-written study of a particular fighting force in Central Africa. Furthermore, the authors move beyond the usual national framework, linking Congo and Angola to the wider international context without succumbing to the generalised macro-perspective. Focusing on local actors in a regional conflict in a myriad of international relations, the authors also reason beyond a simple Cold War model. Instead of a simple opposition between ethnic-based regionalism and nationalist aims, the authors propose political allegiance to be far more layered and complex than any such opposition suggests.

Because of the nature of the sources of the book's theme, the authors regularly have to use constructions like "it seems that", "reportedly", "there is evidence that", etc. By and large, however, Kennes and Larmer are able to convincingly argue for their in-

terpretation of the Katangese gendarmes' past.

Aleksandar Bošković / Chris Hann
(eds.): **The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945–1991**
(= **Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia, vol. 29**), Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013, 392 S.

Reviewed by
Sergey Alymov, Moskau

The book under review is a continuation of a project of writing a history of scholarly traditions associated with nowadays dominant field of socio-cultural anthropology in “non-central”, socialist, or East European countries, undertaken by the Max Plank Institute for Social Anthropology. These traditions are usually labeled as folklore, ethnography, or ethnology. The other volumes in the series covered the history of these disciplines in “people’s democracies” of Eastern Europe and the ethnographic studies “on the edges” of the Soviet Union in the Caucasus and Central Asia. The theme of “marginality”, already present in the title of the previous volume¹, becomes central for the conceptualization of the present one. This is further stressed by the map of the region under study on the cover, which highlights a narrow strip of land in the south-west of the Balkans. The countries included in the collection are Greece, Macedonia, Albania, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia.

The main idea behind the whole series, in editors words, is “to map the changes and challenges in anthropological theory and practice throughout the postsocialist world between the end of the Second World War and [...] the fall of the Berlin Wall” (p. 2). The roots of the differences in knowledge production between Euro-American metropolitan centers and Eastern Europe are, of course, older than the socialist period. In his introduction Chris Hann addresses the differences that arise from nation-building aspirations of Central and East-Southern Europe intellectual elites and empire-building projects of colonial superpowers. “National” science, although inspired by German Romanticism and Völkerkunde studies, became indigenous intellectual tradition that has to coexist and compete with cosmopolitan socio-cultural anthropology from dominant centers. The situation is further complicated by the fact that Marxism, another intellectual import to these countries, appeared dominant under the aegis of socialist regimes. Although local ethnologies managed to come to terms with this ideology, they had to adapt to its dogmas, especially in the case of Albania. The hegemony of any kind is based not only on purely intellectual factors. Three ideal types are suggested in the introduction: country A, which is a capitalist center those anthropologists usually study colonial or semi-colonial country C, while anthropologists from semi-peripheral country B usually study their own population. Most papers in the book engage with the relations between A and B and attest to the fact that these relations were never easy. The main thrust of the book is not only to describe developments in the post Second World War anthropologies of the region,