

ute to “new dimensions of social awareness.” Thus, the chapter serves to emphasise the need for more research into the area, offering a starting point for further studies.

Chapter 7, which combines a nuanced approach to dementia with a focus on how digital technologies can serve to enhance the faculties not affected by the illness as well as support those that are. Pointing to the many forms the illness may take, both across different disorders and between individuals, the contribution urges to take the “activities people carry out” as a starting point for the development of assistive technologies, rather than the disruptions caused by dementia. Based on fieldwork, the chapter goes on to discuss how such a bottom-up approach to the development of assistive technologies may be taken.

Chapter 9, which on the basis of ethnographic field work in Spain challenges the understanding of home-based tele-health technologies as “plug-and-play.” That is, as artefacts easily placed in the home environments of older adults without much consequence for the wider home environment and social situation. Rather, the authors argue, that technicians are forced into the role of unrecognised care workers in order to succeed with their work, precisely because the installation of the technology for the individual older adults have widespread consequences beyond the mere technical. The chapter urges that much more attention, both within research as well as on policy and practice level, needs to be given to the “hands-on-tech care work” that takes place when tele-health and welfare technologies are introduced into the homes of older adults.

Sara Mosberg Iversen

Price, David H.: *Cold War Anthropology. The CIA, the Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2016. 452 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-6125-1. Price: \$ 29.95

For more than 20 years, David Price has been exposing American anthropology’s dark side: a largely hidden history that reveals complex connections between the discipline and military and intelligence agencies. In previous books, Price examined the activities and ethical dilemmas faced by anthropologists during World War II (*Anthropological Intelligence*. Durham 2008) and the FBI’s surveillance of “activist anthropologists” in the early 1950s (*Threatening Anthropology*. Durham 2004). His latest book is a fitting sequel to these works. In it, Price critically analyzes the rapid growth of American anthropology during the Cold War – a period characterized by the influence of the military-industrial complex.

Among the themes developed by Price is the notion of “dual use” anthropology. For Price, “dual use” refers to the ways in which basic scientific research can be applied to the needs of military or industrial organizations. It can also refer to how technologies originally developed for military applications (like the Internet or GPS navigation systems) can later take on civilian uses. Early in the book, he notes that “American anthropology has been slow to acknowledge the extent to which it is embedded in dual use processes, preferring to imagine itself as somehow independent not only from the militarized political econ-

omy in which it is embedded but also from the traceable uses to which American academic geographic knowledge has been put” (xvii). Naïveté appears to be a recurring phenomenon in American anthropology.

The book’s theoretical framework relies heavily upon a political economy approach, which is appropriate given the subject matter. Methodologically, Price is as eclectic as ever, using an array of sources including declassified government documents, American Anthropological Association (AAA) archival materials, anthropologists’ letters and obituaries, and interviews, including a remarkable 1995 interview with the late Clifford Geertz. According to Price, Geertz’s involvement with the so-called Modjokuto (Indonesia) Project in the 1950s “fits a dual use model of the half-unwitting scholar who was not directly concerned with the forces and politics of the Cold War, even while contributing to the intellectual discourse in ways that supported American hegemony” (98).

Price does a thorough job of revealing the ambiguous and often contradictory positions held by other influential anthropologists. For example, George Foster, who as AAA President in 1970 typically aligned himself with those opposing anti-war anthropologists, was a staunch critic of US military policy twenty years earlier. He reported that those leading the post-WW II occupation of Japan were taking an “almost unbelievable” approach “predicated on the assumption that American institutions are perfect and that success in the occupied countries consists only in recasting them more nearly in our own image” (41).

Another interesting story is that of anthropologist (and RAND Corporation counterinsurgency expert) Gerald Hickey’s work in Vietnam during the height of the war. Hickey enthusiastically helped the US military “improve” its Strategic Hamlets program in the 1960s. Price notes, “there is no reason for contemporary anthropologists to not learn from his experiences. Some might claim the moral of Hickey’s story is that we must work harder to make the military understand what anthropology has to offer, but such an interpretation ignores the importance of institutional culture and the possibility of larger contingencies governing the use of military knowledge ... motivations can have little impact on outcomes” (322). Price contrasts Hickey’s work with that of Delmos Jones, an anthropologist who conducted village research in Thailand during the same period. Unlike Hickey, Jones realized that the military could easily coopt ethnographic knowledge and began to publicly warn colleagues about these dangers.

The book chronicles many crucial moments that shaped the relationship between American anthropology and US military and intelligence agencies. For example, in the early 1950s, the CIA secretly collaborated with the AAA’s Executive Secretary, Frederick Johnson, to produce a questionnaire for Association members. The questionnaire was designed to identify anthropologists’ areas of expertise, but the CIA was nowhere mentioned on the document.

Another fascinating episode occurred a few years later, when the Human Ecology Fund and the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology – two CIA front orga-

nizations – provided funding to unwitting social science and medical researchers whose work might potentially be applied to CIA projects such as the infamous “Kubark Counterintelligence Interrogation” manual, described by Alfred McCoy as a “manual [that] spelled out a revolutionary two-phase form of torture” (cited on p. 196). Anthropological research on cross-cultural grieving practices and stress were funded by these organizations, presumably to give the CIA information about how to most effectively induce stress – or perhaps to help its own agents learn to minimize it.

Price masterfully contextualizes these transformative years in anthropology. Approximately half of all American anthropologists had participated directly in WW II, widely perceived as a “good war,” and some may have had a difficult time understanding the ethical dilemmas that could arise when collaborating with US military and intelligence agencies. Another important part of the context is the fact that a significant amount of money was available to help fuel anthropology’s growth: the GI Bill, multimillion dollar grants for interdisciplinary research centers, and CIA front organizations with harmless-sounding names (for example, the Asia Foundation) that funded basic social science research. Price also describes the impact of the lingering effects of McCarthyism and a system of carrots and sticks that rewarded those who supported the national security state while punishing those who criticized it. Taken together, this context helps us understand how so many social scientists either enthusiastically embraced the weaponization of their disciplines or unwittingly contributed basic scientific research in support of military and intelligence efforts.

While the depth of engagement between Cold War anthropologists and military and intelligence agencies is astonishing, Price provides evidence that there were some who adamantly refused to participate and even voiced criticisms. Apart from Delmos Jones, others such as John Embree (who criticized governmental applied anthropology), Jerome Rauch (who understood the connections between foreign area research and efforts to establish “world hegemony” [quoted on p. 107]), and Elizabeth Bacon (who described spy agencies’ methods for recruiting anthropologists in Iran and Afghanistan) demonstrated an unusual willingness to critique the machinations of power at a time in which it was risky to do so.

Price concludes with a thoughtful chapter on why Cold War anthropology matters today. He notes that disagreements and debates within the discipline, anthropology can still provide unique knowledge and insight to policy makers. At the same time, anthropologists should continue searching for ways to “develop standards to maintain some independence from militarized agendas and remain aware of how our work can be abused ... Resistance is not futile” (368). As military and intelligence agencies have taken a renewed interest in the social sciences over the past decade, this book will serve not only as a resource, but as a warning call to contemporary anthropologists.

Roberto J. González

Regi Waton, Fidelis: Die Provokation des Guten. Arendts philosophische Untersuchung zur Frage nach Schuld und Verantwortung unter der totalitären Herrschaft. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2016. 280 pp. ISBN 978-3-643-13128-7. (Religion – Staat – Kultur. Interdisziplinäre Studien aus der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 6) Preis: € 34,90

Das Buch ist die überarbeitete Fassung der Dissertation des Steyler Missionars Fidelis Regi Waton aus Indonesien bei Volker Gerhardt an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin im Wintersemester 2014/15. Es ist erstaunlich, dass sich ein Indonezierer der Frage von Schuld und Verantwortung des Deutschen Volks angesichts des Holocausts im sogenannten Dritten Reich annimmt. Die Person und Schriften Hannah Arendts bieten sich dazu an: Geboren 1906 in Linden bei Hannover wuchs sie in einer jüdischen Familie in Königsberg auf, wechselte kriegsbedingt 1914 nach Berlin, wurde wegen rebellischen Verhaltens von der Schule verwiesen und bereitete sich autodidaktisch auf das Abitur vor. Mit 14 Jahren las sie Immanuel Kants “Kritik der reinen Vernunft” und “Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft” sowie Karl Jaspers’ “Psychologie der Weltanschauungen”. 1924 begann sie das Studium der griechischen Philologie, Philosophie (bei Martin Heidegger) und protestantischen Theologie (bei Rudolf Bultmann) in Marburg. Über das Philosophiestudium bei Edmund Husserl in Freiburg promovierte sie 1928 bei Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg. 1929 heiratete sie den jüdischen Philosophen Günther Stern, der sich später Anders nannte; die Ehe wurde 1937 geschieden. 1933 emigrierte sie nach Paris, wo sie sich in der zionistischen Bewegung engagierte und Jugendliche der Alija-Bewegung betreute. 1940 heiratete sie den deutschen Emigranten Heinrich Blücher, Mitglied des Spartakusbunds und der Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands. Nach der Besetzung Frankreichs durch das Nationalsozialistische Deutschland wurde sie 1940 in das Internierungslager Gurs in Südfrankreich geschickt, von wo aus ihr drei Monate später die Flucht gelang. Zusammen mit Heinrich Blücher emigrierte sie 1941 über Lissabon nach New York. Von 1948 bis 1952 war sie Geschäftsführerin der *Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction*, veröffentlichte 1951 ihr erstes Buch “The Origins of Totalitarianism” (Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft. Antisemitismus, Imperialismus, totale Herrschaft), 1958 folgten “The Human Condition” (Vita activa oder vom tätigen Leben), 1963 “On Revolution” (Über die Revolution) und “Eichmann in Jerusalem. Ein Bericht über die Banalität des Bösen”, 1970 “On Violence” (Macht und Gewalt). 1963 nahm sie eine Professur an der University of Chicago an und 1967 an der New School for Social Research in New York. Sie starb 1975 in New York. Posthum wurde 1978 ihr letztes größeres Werk “The Life of Mind” (Das Leben des Geistes) veröffentlicht.

Arendts Hauptanliegen war, die Elemente des Totalitarismus zu entdecken und daraus die Ursprünge totalitärer Herrschaft zu erklären, aber nicht im Sinne einer geschichtlichen Kausalität, sondern einer in der Rückschau erklärenden Analyse der einzelnen geschichtlichen