

auf – und stehen damit “in einem direkten komplementären/konkurrierenden Verhältnis zu anderen ethnographischen Werken” (26), so Hans-Martin Kunz. Zum anderen identifiziert er Parallelen zwischen der ethnographischen Methode der teilnehmenden Beobachtung und der Herangehensweise der Autorin.

In der Auseinandersetzung mit den Realismus-Effekten, mit dem literarischen Zwischenspiel von Fiktionalität/Fiktivität und Faktizität sowie in der Konstruktion von auktorialer Authentizität, Objektivität und Autorität sieht Hans-Martin Kunz die Entsprechungen zur ethnographischen Autorschaft – jedoch, so seine Argumentation weiter, mit dem nicht vernachlässigbaren Unterschied, dass sie erstens kein wissenschaftliches Interesse verfolge und zweitens keine neutrale Haltung, sondern weitgehende Identifikation mit den von ihr repräsentierten Individuen oder ethnischen Gruppen anstrebe: “Darstellen und (Stell)-Vertreten – diese beiden Aspekte der Repräsentation stehen in Mahasweta Devis Werk in einem besonderen Verhältnis zueinander” (124). Mahasweta Devis Herangehensweise und Verständnis von Literatur mag zwar ethnographisch inspiriert sein – das Korsett einer Ethnographin oder gar Ethnologin kann man ihr nicht anziehen, und sie möchte es wohl auch gar nicht tragen: Bedingungsloses Engagement *für* die man lebt und *über* die man schreibt – das passt nicht ins Bild des zumindest theoretisch im neutralen Niemandsland zwischen Nähe und Distanz verorteten Ethnologen. Hans-Martin Kunz’ Resümee: “Sie ist keine Ethnologin. Doch sie nimmt teil an dem Projekt der ethnographischen Repräsentation (als einer Repräsentation des kulturell Fremden), das längst nicht mehr Eigentum der Ethnologie ist, wenn es dies überhaupt jemals gewesen sein sollte” (127).

Fallen ihre engagierten Texte deshalb aus dem Interessensgebiet der Ethnologie? Keineswegs, so Hans-Martin Kunz, und skizziert vor allem in der Auseinandersetzung mit Mahasweta Devis Werk “Pterodactylus” und in Anlehnung an die literaturethnologischen Ansätze Thomas Hylland Eriksons und Sylvia Schomburg-Scherffs seine Lesart narrativer Texte: als ethnographische Quelle, ethnographische Beschreibung und/oder alternative ethnologische Theorie – unter besonderer Berücksichtigung und Handhabung des zumeist subjektiven Charakters fiktionaler Textsorten und unter Berücksichtigung der Rezeption der Leserschaft.

Hans-Martin Kunz liefert mit seiner Publikation einen wichtigen und richtigen erneuten Impuls für die längst überfällige wissenschaftliche Etablierung einer “Literaturethnologie” – die wie Ethnolinguistik oder Medizinethnologie zum Spektrum des ethnologischen Kanons von Unterdisziplinen gehören sollte. Denn – und hier ist ihm unbedingt beizupflichten –, “vor dem Hintergrund ethnographischer Experimente mit literarischen Formen ist [es] erstaunlich – [dass] es nicht viele Essays und nur wenige Monographien [gibt], die sich [Literatur] zum Gegenstand genommen haben. Trotz der Versuche einzelner Personen, eine solche zu etablieren, gibt es bislang keine ‘Literaturethnologie’” (184).

In diesem Sinne: Neue Quellen braucht das Land – Hans-Martin Kunz hat in seiner Auseinandersetzung mit der Person und den Werken Mahasweta Devis eine weitere erschlossen.  
Dominique Stöhr

**Lassiter, Luke Eric:** *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. 201 pp. ISBN 978-0-226-46890-7. Price: \$ 12.00

There are many ways of doing fieldwork. Edward E. Evans-Pritchard once recalled his first attempts to learn about fieldwork in the early 1920s. He had asked a number of famous anthropologists how to do it and had received various answers. First, he asked Edward A. Westermarck, who told: “Don’t converse with an informant for more than twenty minutes because if you aren’t bored by that time he will be.” Alfred Haddon said “that it was really all quite simple; one should always behave as a gentleman.” Evans-Pritchard’s teacher, Charles Seligman, “told me to take ten grams of quinine every night and to keep off women.” Finally, Bronisław Malinowski himself told the novice “not to be a bloody fool.”

It’s not a joke, not only. There are no one, simple recipe for fieldwork and relationship between anthropologist (him- or herself) and informant, between “us” and “them.” Popular formulas from student’s dictionaries – like a “fieldwork is a data collection for any study, it involves talking to people or asking them questions about their activities and views, sometimes including attempts at systematic observation of their behaviour” or “informant, someone who offers information to a researcher” – are a specific kind of simplifying fiction. Anthropologists use a variety of specified, formal techniques for the collection of data. In former times, let’s say in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, empirical material was collected mostly by anthropologists, that is, people from the outside. In many cases, especially in Canada, they had native collaborators. For example, Franz Boas had a Kwakiutl assistant, George Hunt and Henry Tate, who was a literate Tsimshian. So native co-operation was secured from the beginning, but nevertheless the fact is that Hunt and Tate, and others worked under the guidance of the anthropologists. In consequence, they were turned into anthropologists themselves.

But the times they are a-changin’. Gone are the days when anthropologists could, without any contradiction, present “the native point of view.” Now they find themselves barred from access to research sites because “the anthropologist” – as James Clifford wrote – has become a negative alter ego in contemporary indigenous discourse, invoked as the epitome of arrogant, intrusive colonial authority.

In “The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography” we can find new models for anthropological fieldwork and relationship between ethnographer and informant: it’s a collaborative research. Luke Eric Lassiter argues that “Ethnographic practice ... has always

included collaboration on some level, but the collaborative ethnography to which I refer promises to extend that collaboration more systematically throughout both fieldwork and the writing process" (x). Collaboration between anthropologists and informants has long been a product of the close relationship. Increasingly, the collaboration act is no longer viewed as merely a consequence of fieldwork – collaboration now preconditions and shapes research design.

This book is about the history, theory, and practice of collaborative ethnography. Lassiter presents a historical, theoretical, and practice-oriented road map for shift from incidental collaboration to a more conscious and explicit collaborative strategy, from authoritative (modern) monologue to polyphonic (postmodern) form, and from "reading over the shoulders of natives" to "reading alongside natives." In part I Lassiter writes about the history of collaborative ethnography in his own training and development as an anthropologist. He centers the discussion on the U.S. project in ethnography, but he does not exclude other regional developments. Lassiter locates the roots of ethnographic collaboration in the work of anthropological classics like Malinowski and Franz Boas. In this context, he writes about some American researchers: Lewis Henry Morgan ("League of the Ho-dé-no-sau-nee" from 1851 as a first "true ethnography" of American Indians), Alice Fletcher (credited James R. Murie, an educated Pawnee as an assistant to the author "The Hako: A Pawnee Ceremony." 1904), Paul Radin ("Crashing Thunder," the biography of a Winnebago Indian. 1926), and more.

In part II he outlines the steps for achieving this more deliberate and explicit collaborative ethnography. Lassiter discusses collaborative research projects involving over seventy-five faculties, students from Ball State University, and members of the African American community of Muncie (Indiana). He writes about ethical dilemmas – "ethics in anthropology is like race in America: dialogue takes place during times of crisis" (84) –, experience and intersubjectivity; he asks about who has the right to represent whom and for what purpose, and about whose discourse will be privileged in the ethnographic text. He suggests that without clear ethnographic texts an open dialogue about interpretation and representation is seriously hindered, and collaborative ethnography cannot be produced.

Lassiter argues that the interrelationship of ethical and moral responsibility, ethnographic honesty, accessible writing, collaborative writing and editing creates the basis for truly collaborative ethnography. "I believe the collaborative model has enormous potential, and though it may indeed be emerging as mainstream, truly collaborative ethnography – where researchers and interlocutors collaborate on the actual production of ethnographic texts – may be appropriate for neither all researchers nor all types of ethnographic projects" (xi).

Lassiter is right when he calls for a more collaborative research in ethnographic fieldwork: in the late 1960s a collaborative (or may be reflexive?) model of research in cultural anthropology emerged as a central concern.

This came partly out of a postcolonial awareness of the neglect by earlier anthropologists of the effects of colonialism both on the people they had studied, and on the process of research itself, and an ethical concern with the possible role that anthropologists may have played in colonial oppression. What a pity that we don't find in "The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography" many names of European anthropologists and their assistants/informants/collaborators, e.g., Maurice Leenhardt and his fifteen transcribers, Marcel Griaule and Ogotemméli, Victor Turner and Muchona, Johannes Fabian and Tshibumba.

It's a very important and timely, comprehensive and accessible book, not only for American ethnographers.

Waldemar Kuligowski

**Özyürek, Esra:** *Nostalgia for the Modern. State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2006. 227 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-3895-6. Price: \$ 21.95

Esra Özyürek's "Nostalgia for the Modern. State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey" is an important new contribution to political anthropology, memory studies, and the anthropology of Europe. The focus of the book is the Turkish modernization project embodied in the figure of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic. Özyürek argues that recent challenges to the secularist ideology of the Turkish state by Islamists and the implementation of neoliberal economic policies resulted in the privatization and commoditization of Kemalism as secularists organized to defend values nostalgically associated with the early Republic of the 1920s and 1930s.

Chapter 1 centers on oral history interviews Özyürek conducted with "the children of the Republic," individuals raised in the 1920s who performed important roles in the public sphere in fields such as education. According to Özyürek, particularly in the nostalgic atmosphere of the 75th-year celebrations of the founding of the Republic, these individuals came to embody the state, and their life-story narratives focused on their contributions to Turkish society as part of the modernizing elite. In chapter 2, Özyürek analyzes several exhibits commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Republic in 1998. Named "Three Generations of the Republic" and "To Create a Citizen," these exhibits were organized by private organizations with financial support from the state. Özyürek argues that public intellectuals used these exhibits to demonstrate that Kemalist values are internalized and privatized by Turkish society. In chapter 3, Özyürek links the privatization of politics to neoliberalism by showing how symbols of Atatürk such as statues and photographs are commoditized and personalized. In chapter 4, she discusses the privatization of Republican day celebrations through the organization of parades and events by civil groups. In chapter 5, analyzing the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Republic in the media, Özyürek argues that Islamists challenge the legitimacy of their secularist competitors in the