In his lifetime, Franz Boas, the pioneer anthropologist who has been called “the father of American anthropology,” produced a remarkable total of 725 publications of widely varying length. These include 87 works that deal with the Inuit or the Arctic, of which 47 were written in German. Ludger Müller-Wille points out that, not surprisingly, these latter works are largely unknown and have tended to be overlooked by Anglophone scholars. His aim in the present work is to bring these works to the attention of that readership and also to recall some lesser-known aspects of Boas’s life.

All Boas’s works on the Inuit and the Arctic, including his seminal work The Central Eskimo (Boas, 1888), derive partly or wholly from his research and travels in Cumberland Sound and area in 1883–84, when he and his servant/research assistant Wilhelm Weike were based at the Scottish whaling station at Kekerten or were traveling with the Inuit. Boas’s experiences during that year have been made readily available to the Anglophone reader by Müller-Wille through two earlier books (Müller-Wille, 1998; Müller-Wille and Gieseking, 2011).

A major aim of the present volume is to at least make the Anglophone scholarly community aware of the existence of the substantial and rich source of geographical and anthropological material on the Arctic and the Inuit represented by Boas’s writings in his native language.

Müller-Wille has presented an outline of Boas’s background and early life: the son of a well-to-do German Jewish merchant in the town of Minden (Westphalia), he attended various universities (Heidelberg, Berlin, and Kiel) and emerged with his PhD in Physics in 1881. Thereafter, following his obligatory year of military service, his career took a drastic change in direction. News of preparations for an expedition to Germany in March 1885, he gave a further series of lectures at various scientific institutions. In January 1886, he filed his application to be considered for the Habilitation qualification with the Faculty of Philosophy at Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin. Complying with the regulations, along with the application he submitted his PhD dissertation, 12 of his publications, a list of three topics for two compulsory lectures, and his curriculum vitae. This documentation was perused by two assigned assessors, and in due course, he presented the two compulsory lectures, both, strangely, on physical geographical topics. He received his Habilitation certificate in early July 1886, entitling him to the title Dr. habil. and qualification as Privatdozent, which would allow him to teach geography and ethnography at any university in Germany. By the fall of 1886 he had submitted a detailed teaching programme to the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin. But he never taught any of the courses he listed. On 27 July 1886, he landed in New York and applied for immigrant status. In late January 1887, he began his first paying job as assistant editor at the journal Science and on 10 March he married Marie Krackowizer.

Why, having jumped through all the hoops required for his Habilitation, with the strong possibility of an academic career in Germany, did he abandon that career and emigrate to the United States, with no immediate prospect of employment? The decision was probably due in part to his
inability to accept the rigidity of the German academic system, but undoubtedly the anti-Semitic attitudes already prevailing in Germany also played a role. Very significant is the fact that in 1933 he wrote an open letter to General Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg, the President of the German Reich, expressing his concern and outrage at Nazi policies, especially those aimed at the Jews. This letter had a wide clandestine distribution.

In presenting a synopsis of Boas’s early career, Müller-Wille has stressed this rather puzzling abrupt change in direction in Boas’s career path. While this discussion is an important contribution, it is overshadowed, in terms of importance, by his detailed listing of Boas’s publications, in both German and English, pertaining especially to the Arctic and the Inuit. Müller-Wille’s book complements wonderfully his earlier works on Boas and his year on Baffin Island.
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In Where the Wind Blows Us, Natasha Lyons examines the Inuvialuit Archaeological Partnership (IAP), a community-based archaeology program she has collaborated on with the Inuvialuit of the lower Mackenzie River and adjacent Beaufort Sea in the Northwest Territories of Canada. The approach to the community-based archaeological practice described by the author strives to be both inclusive and critical. Lyons has applied critical theory to a rigorous research design, which is subjected to ongoing questioning, reflection, and revision based on the different standpoints of Inuvialuit and their Euro-Canadian research partners on Inuvialuit history. Critical theory, as applied by Lyons, has its roots in the mid-20th century philosophers of the Frankfurt School, who sought to map the rise of global capitalism and counter the threats of nationalism and totalitarianism (see Kincheloe and McLaren, 2000). She has modified the methods of critical theory to critique and “…unearth the ways that historical writings have naturalized the asymmetrical relationship between Inuvialuit and colonizing forces [and] how bringing this knowledge to light is part of the larger process of decolonization that helps this community move forward” (p. 2).

Approaching her topic, Lyons has divided the book into eight chapters under three broad headings: Critique, Practice, and Reflections.

The Critique section broadly looks at alternative approaches to archaeology, seeking a community-based way forward that moves past the propensity of New Archaeology to treat Native peoples as objects and Robert McGhee’s (2008) statements questioning the accommodation of a scientific discipline (archaeology) to the desires of the non-scientific community…(indigenous people) (p. 10). In this approach, excavation has been de-emphasized in favor of oral history and museum-based material culture evaluation. The core of the Critique is tied to examining the basis for alternative representation of the Inuvialuit in the historical and archaeological record.

Practice relates to establishing the condition for “communicative action” to open the “communicative space” between people that allows participants to establish trust and respect within a group process to reinterpret the Inuvialuit past. Lyons is laying the groundwork for archaeology as social action. The central vehicles for IAP application of critical theory in this book relate to a collection of elder life histories and subsequent examination by Inuvialuit elders of the MacFarlane Collection at the Smithsonian Institution collected by Hudson’s Bay Company factor James MacFarlane along the Anderson River near Fort Anderson, east of the Mackenzie River, in the early 1860s. “Artifact interpretations, and their relationship to Inuvialuit history, have been a central thematic focus through the course of the IAP” (p. 67). Where the Wind Blows Us is focused on the dynamics of the interpretive process rather than an actual discussion of the interpretation of the artifacts. Collectively, the IAP process was designed to document elder historical knowledge and Inuvialuit interpretation of material culture. Artifact interpretation and storytelling are conjoined as a means of establishing historical context to understand the state of Inuvialuit cultural heritage. This context is used in conducting workshops with school children and community groups.

Project deliverables from both the IAP and the Smithsonian included a summary report, a community feast, an artifact replica kit, project transcripts, skin clothing patterns and reproductions, a sewing brochure, lesson plans, a board game, and putting the MacFarlane collection online. These productions, along with the oral histories, were