

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,

but to facilitate the dialogue between these two major types of discourse. Hann uses the metaphor of a single “anthropological field” cultivated by several practitioners: although their tools and skills might differ, all of them can profit from sharing their experience with each other.

The structure of the book is as following. The first four papers are devoted to Greece, the next three discuss Albania, Slovenia and Croatia each have two papers. Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina are each covered by one article. The book also contains a contribution from an American-born Norwegian anthropologist Robert Gary Minnich relating his experience in Slovenia and an afterword by Aleksandar Bošković. The institutional and educational background of the authors is also worth mentioning in view of the book’s subject matter. In most cases they offer an insider perspective. All Greek contributors work in Greece but hold PhDs from British universities. Two Albanian scholars are educated and work in Tirana, and the third one is educated and work in France. Slovenian authors are educated and employed at home as well as their Croatian colleagues. Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina are represented by both type of scholars, but all of them, as far as one can judge, come from the region they study.

The Greek case, as Papataxiarchis argues, shows the resilience of “social science” of *koinoniki anthropologia* as a viable alternative to the “national science” of *laographia* (folklore). In an overview of the development of both disciplines after World War II he describes the situation which left room for both of them. While the USA-backed modernization and foreign

American fieldworkers were instrumental in promoting cosmopolitan functionalist anthropology, post-war conservative political regime favored philological science of folklore that certified the continuity of national tradition from the Ancient Greece, thus contributing to the dominant nationalistic ideology. Subsequent twists and turns of Greek political life affected the fortunes of both disciplines, but as several authors conclude, their rapprochement is still a goal to be achieved. Nitsiakos’ contribution, nevertheless, makes it clear that the study of folklore could be not only a conservative enterprise, and the discipline renewed itself after the restoration of democracy in 1974 on leftist Marxist basis.

The Albanian case differs dramatically from the Greek one. The Stalinist version of Marxism merged quite happily with the nationalistic discourse to form the only permitted variant of ethnography, analyzed by Kodra-Hyza and Bardhoshi. The Albanian set also features the most pronounced objection to the metaphor of a single “anthropological field”. Doja claims that “cultural studies in the Balkans” cannot be characterized as “an anthropology on the margins”, they are too deeply immersed in politics and “particularly likely to be entangled with nationalism and totalitarianism” (p. 162). The following contributions, especially Slovenian and Croatian ones can be read as an attempt to meet this challenge. All in all, they present a much more lively scene than the Albanian science in the grip of dictatorship. Gradišnik shows that the drive to study contemporaneity and perceive “society” as a problem was quite possible under socialism. Potkonjak relates an impressive history of the Croatian feminist ethnology.

The volume under review should be considered a valuable contribution to writing “a more polycentric history of the anthropological discipline” (p. 31). As an institutional and biographical itinerary of the field, it will be indispensable for further in-depth studies. Critical remarks, of course, can be made. Some contributions rely probably too heavily on programmatic statements at the expense of the analysis of actual practice of researchers. Relations between agricultural reforms, especially in socialist countries, and ethnographical expertise would be an interesting subject. One may expect the “national question” to figure more prominently in a book that describes the history of the discipline that specializes in ethnic matters in a region like the Balkans. Hopefully these and other issues will be analyzed in subsequent studies, inspired by the present volume.

Notes:

- 1 F. Müllfried/S. Sokolovskij (eds.), *Exploring the Edge of Empire*, Berlin, 2011.

Oscar Sanchez-Sibony: *Red Globalization, The Political Economy of the Soviet Cold war from Stalin to Khrushchev*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 278 S.

Rezensiert von
Uwe Müller, Leipzig

Das Buch behandelt die Außenwirtschaftspolitik der Sowjetunion, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf den Jahren zwischen Sta-

lins Tod und der Machtübernahme durch Leonid Breschnew liegt. Die Darstellung beruht auf der Nutzung mehrerer Moskauer Archive, die die Auswertung von Dokumenten vor allem des Ministerrats, des Zentralkomitees der KPdSU, von GOSPLAN, des (Außen-)Handelsministeriums sowie des Nachlasses von Anastas Mikoyan, der über vier Jahrzehnte die Außenwirtschaftspolitik maßgeblich prägte, ermöglichte. Positiv hervorzuheben ist, dass sich Sanchez-Sibony auch darum bemüht, die Ziele der jeweiligen Handelspartner zu rekonstruieren, wobei er zumeist auf Sekundärliteratur zurückgreift.

Das erste der sechs Kapitel behandelt die 1920er und 1930er Jahre und schildert zunächst die vergeblichen Versuche, im Rahmen der Neuen Ökonomischen Politik und auch noch am Beginn des ersten Fünfjahrplanes zum Goldstandard sowie zu einer Wiederbelebung der Agrarexportpolitik der Vorkriegszeit zurückzukehren. Gerade auch Stalin habe erst seit 1931 durch den anhaltenden Verfall der Agrarpreise auf den Weltmärkten sowie unter dem Eindruck eines generell kollabierenden Welthandels und Kreditmarktes während der Weltwirtschafts- und Finanzkrise sowie einer antikommunistischen Koalition unter Führung Großbritanniens und Frankreichs auf Importsubstitution gesetzt. Die sowjetische Autarkiepolitik der 1930er Jahre entsprang also nicht etwa eigenen wirtschaftspolitischen Leitbildern, sondern war – ähnlich wie bei vielen anderen Ländern der europäischen Peripherie sowie Asiens und Lateinamerikas auch – eine Strategie zur Krisenbewältigung. Im zweiten Kapitel über das erste Nachkriegsjahrzehnt betont der Autor, dass die Sowjetunion zunächst auf westliche Kre-