und über Kooperationen zwischen den drei Institutionen wünschenswert gewesen. In einigen Beiträgen bleibt die Rolle, in welcher Frobenius oder auch andere Personen jeweils gehandelt haben, unklar. War er als Direktor des Museums oder als Leiter des Instituts oder im Namen beider Institutionen z. B. auf Sammelreisen unterwegs? Wurden z. B. die Felsbilder von Frobenius 1937 unter dem Namen des Instituts, im Namen des Museums oder in beider Namen im MoMA ausgestellt? (108). Diese Unklarheit lässt eine unterschwellige Konkurrenz zwischen den Institutionen vermuten.

Wie in diesem Ausstellungs- und Buchprojekt wieder einmal deutlich wurde, liegen in den drei Frankfurter völkerkundlichen Institutionen Schätze, die nur darauf warten, immer wieder ins Licht der Öffentlichkeit gemeinsam gehoben zu werden. Der Titel "Herbarium der Kulturen" bezieht sich zwar auf eine Idee von Frobenius, mit der er in Anlehnung an Goethes Pflanzenmorphologie seinen Förderer Wilhelm II. für ein Museum begeisterte – jedoch geht der vorliegende Band weit darüber hinaus. "Vom Institut zum Institut" könnte man den Kreis der Kapitel kurz fassen, der nicht nur aus der Perspektive der Mitwirkenden die wichtigsten Aktivitäten der Vergangenheit, sondern auch neue Forschungsansätze und Kooperationen im Austausch mit den ehemals erforschten Ländern beinhaltet. Gegenseitige Anerkennung intellektueller Zeitgenossenschaft sowie partnerschaftliches Denken und Handeln sind heute Programm des Frobenius-Instituts und das Fach Ethnologie bietet dafür spezielle Kompetenzen. An dieses und vieles mehr erinnert man sich nach der Lektüre dieses empfehlenswerten Buches.

Anette Rein

Kirch, Patrick Vinton: How Chiefs Became Kings. Divine Kingship and the Rise of Archaic States in Ancient Hawai'i. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010. 273 pp. ISBN 978-0-520-26725-1. Price: £ 27.95

Hawaii figures prominently in the archaeological and anthropological literature on the transition from chiefdoms to unified states. With or without contemporary written observations of this structural transition, anthropologists and archaeologists tend to conclude that economic modes of production are the key to understanding the transition from chiefdom to state. This emphasis is, in part, a reflection of their disciplinary assumptions on the processes driving the evolution of human societies, which in turn partly derive from the relative absence of written observations for the times and peoples they study, and the relative abundance of archaeologically accessible remnants of economic production such as field systems and buildings. There is also a voluminous literature on state formation written by sociologists, political scientists, and historians, which tend more to emphasize political accommodation and/or military domination as key processes, again, in part, a reflection of sources available and disciplinary assumptions. The conquest and unification of the Hawaiian Islands by Kamehameha I between 1782 and 1812 came at a time of increasing European contact and recorded observations, forming a potentially crucial link between these two bodies of literature and interpretation.

While most scholars acknowledge that sacred chieftainship was developed to sophisticated levels in Hawaii, there is still debate among them whether Hawaiians had developed what social scientists term archaic or embryonic states by the time Captain Cook arrived in the 1770s. In "How Chiefs Became Kings," Patrick Kirch argues convincingly that they had. According to Kirch, these archaic Hawaiian states were characterized by "the development of class stratification, land alienation from commoners and a territorial system of administrative control, a monopoly of force and endemic conquest warfare, and, most important, divine kingship legitimated by state cults with a formal priesthood …" (27).

Kirch and Marshall Sahlins are the two current giants in the field of Hawaiian studies. Kirch cements his reputation in this book with his most comprehensive overview of aboriginal Hawaiian social, economic, and political evolution to date. While there is little that is totally new in this work, it represents a rich and wide-ranging summation and elegant refinement of all his past themes – here we see the master at the top of his game. The new material includes a detailed overview of Hawaiian political history from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries as related in traditions recorded and written one to two generations after sustained contact and residence by Europeans, and an engagement with archaeological and anthropological literature around the world on the transition from chiefdoms to states.

Despite noting the almost unique treasure of primary written sources available to scholars due to the late transition from chiefdom to archaic state in Hawaii just prior to increasing European contacts, Kirch makes very little use of these sources. The only early contact sources referred to in the bibliography are Beaglehole's edited collection of observations from Cook's expeditions, which are virtually absent in the endnotes and text citations. This is in dramatic contrast to his earlier collaboration with Sahlins which focuses on the structural history of Anahulu on O'ahu in the generation after Cook's visit when the process of unification was completed. Indeed, by setting his objective as proving that Hawaiians had already developed archaic states by Cook's arrival, his gaze is by necessity taken back in time from the contact and postcontact eras, and must rely on traditions written down long after European contact, and archaeological and linguistic material. Such evidence is not unique to Hawaii as the recorded traditions of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti, Palau, and the Caroline Islands attest.

Kirch derides and yet largely ignores the works of historians of Hawaii and humanities scholars of political evolution. The very dated 1938 work of Ralph Kuykendall, one early 1968 work of Gavan Daws, and the 1992 book of Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa are listed in his bibliography, but rarely cited in the text despite Daws' superb analysis of the tensions within the priesthood at the time of Cook's death. This is unfortunate as a number of Pacific historians (including the reviewer) have published studies of eighteenth century Hawaii since Daws' 1968 clas-

sic "Shoal of Time" (which remains the best-selling book ever in Pacific studies) that support Kirch's contention about the transition to archaic states in Hawaii. Kirch is almost defensive when he states that he has not pointed to a time when chiefdoms can be said to be archaic states in Hawaii as this was a process rather than an event (178). Despite adopting this very historical approach, he also asserts that social scientists such as archaeologists are superior to historians and humanists because they seek underlying reasons for actions, while "[t]o historians or humanists content with a strictly narrative mode of analysis, this may be the end of the road" (176).

Ironically, the historian he cites most in the book, Fernand Braudel, was a leading advocate of the *longue durée* as the ultimate causation behind events, and changed the face of history decades ahead of the social scientists Kirch cites as his influences. In proposing that the ultimate causation of the transition from chiefdoms to states was population pressure, intensification, and surplus, as opposed to the proximate causation of status rivalry, alliance and conquest, Kirch is not as far from modern Pacific historical analysis as he asserts (176, 178 f.). In a 2001 critique of anthropologist Derek Freeman, fellow anthropologist Serge Tcherkézoff noted that "Anthropology deals with 'collective representations', however old-fashioned this Durkheimian term may sound today." This approach is at the core of systemic history, and tends to marginalize the influence of individual persons and specific decisions they make and specific events they become involved in. We need to restore the randomness of history alongside the more structured order of systemic history. "How Chiefs Became Kings" and Kirch and Sahlins' collaboration on the Anahulu project represent the highpoints of systemic history, but how wonderful it would have been to have Daws offer a historian's perspective alongside theirs.

As a longtime admirer of Kirch's scholarship and someone trained in Pacific history as well as archaeology, it somewhat frustrated me that this study could have had an even greater impact on world scholarship by engaging more with the humanities literature on state formation which is voluminous and has developed sophisticated methodology for analyzing gaps in the written record. Furthermore, proving the case for pre-existing states in Hawaii surely also involves disproving the dominant paradigm in the literature that they occurred only after contact, and that European influences and goods had a significant influence on this process. In "How Chiefs Became Kings," the early contact era is only briefly outlined as a political narrative devoid of analysis of structural changes and underlying reasons behind actions, as this era is not of interest to his objective because it is tainted by European contact according to Kirch (116–121). However, Kirch already covers an enormous amount of material in this book and to take on more may have disrupted the coherence of this major contribution to Pacific studies and hopefully also global studies of political evolution.

Paul D'Arcy

Knorr, Alexander: Cyberanthropology. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 2011. 189 pp. ISBN 978-3-7795-0359-0. Price: € 19.90

Mit "Cyberanthropology" hat der Münchner Ethnologe Alexander Knorr ein anregendes Buch über eine neue "Spielart der Ethnologie des 21. Jahrhunderts" (161) geschrieben, dass für Ethnologen wie Nichtethnologen, für Fachleute und Laien, Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene gleichermaßen interessant sein dürfte. Erreicht wird dies u. a. durch den wohltuenden Verzicht auf sowohl Fachsprache als auch die Abbildung fachspezifischer Debatten, sowie die allgemeinverständliche Formulierung von Kernüberzeugungen der Ethnologie. Dem Autor gelingt es auf überzeugende Weise, ein wichtiges neues Forschungsfeld für die Ethnologie zu konzeptualisieren. Dabei greift er auf eines der klassischen ethnologischen Themen zurück – den Umgang mit den Dingen, das er aber radikal neu fasst, nämlich im Hinblick auf den Umgang mit den zentralen Technologien der Gegenwart, wie sie sich etwa im Internet, in Computerspielen oder auch den technischen Erweiterungen des menschlichen Körpers niederschlagen. Dabei handelt es sich um Lebenswelten, die (nicht nur) vielen Ethnologen fremd erscheinen, obwohl sie eine stetig wachsende Anzahl von Menschen umfassen. Der Anspruch der Ethnologie, fremde Lebenswelten zu ergründen und verstehbar zu machen, ist hier also methodisches Angebot und intellektuelle Verpflichtung zugleich.

Wie Knorr in seinem Einführungskapitel "Sinn" ausführt, steigt die Notwendigkeit einer "Cyberanthropology" angesichts der Konsequenzen der Globalisierungsprozesse, in deren Verlauf sich technische Artefakte und die dazugehörigen Technologien über den gesamten Globus verbreiten und unsere Lebenswelten zusehends beeinflussen. Zudem verweisen gerade Computer und Internet nicht nur auf die weltweiten ökonomischen Verflechtungen, sondern auch auf die politischen, wie etwa die Vorgänge um den "Arabischen Frühling" jüngst gezeigt haben. Verstehen kann diese Entwicklungen entsprechend nur, so Knorr, "wer sich mit jetztzeitiger Technologie befasst". Die ethnologische Beschäftigung mit einzelnen Aspekten dieses Forschungsfeldes – vor allem im Hinblick auf Onlinegemeinschaften – ist nicht völlig neu, dem Autor gelingt es aber auf plausible Weise, die verschiedenen Bereiche in einem ganz neuen Fokus zu verknüpfen. In der Auseinandersetzung mit Arturo Escobar, der bereits 1994 in *Current Anthropology* das Konzept einer "cyberculture" skizzierte, versucht er, das Phänomen im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes bei seinen Wurzeln zu fassen. Escobar bezieht sich mit seinem Begriff auf das Zusammenspiel von Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien und Biotechnologie, die in zunehmendem Maße die menschliche Lebenswelt bestimmen, verzichtet aber auf die weitergehende Kontextualisierung dieser beiden Technologien ebenso wie auf eine definitorische Klärung des Begriffes "Cyber". Knorr verweist nun auf deren gemeinsame Wurzel in dem in den 1940er Jahren von dem Mathematiker Norbert Wiener geprägten Neologismus "Cybernetics". "Cybernetics" oder deutsch "Kybernetik" bezeichnet die Wissenschaft von Kommunikation und Kontrolle in Systemen, die vor allem in den