Bravo and Sorlin’s aim was to investigate the ‘intersection of anthropology, geography and the history of science’ (p.vii) and thus create a new space for study. They chose to examine the Nordic countries’ relations with their hinterlands in an attempt to uncover patterns in these relationships. The cultural context of the creation of ‘scientific knowledge’ about the northern regions is at the core of this volume, examined through a narrative approach to the accounts of those who travelled into the region and the means by which their knowledge was transmitted. The volume is divided into three sections each with three papers: ‘Meganarratives of northern nations’, ‘Claims and controversies in the field’ and ‘Technologies of indigeneity’.

Bravo and Sorlin’s introduction is a masterful piece linking the articles to the central themes. They demonstrate how the examination of science, national identity and the Arctic presented in this volume has led to new knowledge about nation building and the postcolonial experiences of indigenous peoples today. However, while the editors comment on the problems of researchers focusing solely on their own areas, the papers they have gathered are parochial; discerning patterns and examining the spaces between falls squarely on their shoulders, and on those of the reader.

Michael Harbsmeier discusses the use of Greenlandic voices in Denmark. In the 1920s, the legendary Danish/Greenlander Knud Rasmussen penned some of the seminal ethnographies of the Arctic, making extensive use of first-person voices to create an aura of legitimacy. Harbsmeier argues convincingly that Rasmussen, rather than being an innovator, was part of a long-lived Danish tradition – used by missionaries and by the Danish state – of invoking indigenous voices to legitimate and justify actions. In this way Danes have subverted the voices of Greenlanders.

Sorlin and Per Eliasson present different aspects of the Swedish relationship to the north. They demonstrate the clear sense that northern Sweden was regarded by the core as a land of bountiful promise in which resource extraction could lead to great wealth for the Swedish economy. There was no sense of the romanticism that other papers (by Harbsmeier, Koch, Bravo and Thisted) make clear was inherent in Danish views of Greenland. While the Danish state maintained a paternalistic view of Greenlanders, the Saami were regarded by the Swedish state as problems and as sources of labour.

Christopher Ries’ article on Lauge Koch is a fascinating window on the intricate workings of the Danish academy and the desire of humans to cling tenaciously to traditions. In the 1920s, Lauge Koch, a well-known geologist, fell out of favour with the establishment over questions of academic standards and possible plagiarism. The result was a prolonged, unsatisfactory court case. This paper could stand alone as a cautionary tale about the academy and the flaws of ‘objectivity’ in the ‘hard sciences’. Ries also demonstrates the difficulties Danish academics had with the introduction of new travelling technologies. Greenland was no longer a land of romantic mystery in which scientists sacrificed themselves for their disciplines. It was a tamer place, where the land once traversed laboriously over many months by dog team could be crossed in hours by plane and maps of great accuracy could be created easily through aerial photography. Lauge Koch, a difficult and opinionated man and a champion of new technologies, can thus be seen as a victim of the cognitive dissonance created by the conflict between the realities of travel with airplanes and the romantic notion of Greenland as a land at the edge of the world.

The strength of this volume lies in focusing on the differences between the Danish and Swedish approaches to the north. Here are two countries
that both have significant stakes in the north and yet whose history of relationships with land, resources and, most critically, indigenous peoples are very different. In order to understand the present situation of indigenous peoples we need to understand the past – not only the simple historical past of contact between the two groups but the nature of the society within which each functioned. The authors have done an admirable job of providing us with information from the context of the coloniser. Unfortunately, the viewpoint of the colonised is untouched, removing any agency they may have had. This volume is a must-read for historians of science, students of the narrative approach and social scientists interested in the north; many of the articles present material rarely available in English. The editors are to be highly commended for bringing these papers together.

SUSAN ROWLEY

University of British Columbia


Life and society in the Hittite world and its older brother, The kingdom of the Hittites (1998), form a pair. In The kingdom of the Hittites Bryce wrote a more conventional historical synthesis. Life and society in the Hittite world has the ambition of opening up to us the social, economic and cultural world of the Hittites, showing as far as is possible what it was like to live in those times, take part in daily activities, festive occasions, celebrations, crises and conflicts, ‘experiencing its whole mix of sights, sounds, and smells’. Although there were residual Hittite states in the centuries following the collapse of the Bronze Age Hittite kingdom around 1200 BC, this period is omitted from the present book.

After an introduction (prefaced by a two-page synopsis of Hittite history), six chapters deal successively with king, court and royalty; the people and the law; the scribe; the farmer; the merchant; and the warrior. Then come four chapters devoted to the gods; the curers of disease; death, burial and the afterlife; festivals and rituals; and myth. Two final chapters address the capital city and ‘links across the wine-dark sea’ – the relationship between the Hittite kingdom and the peoples of the western coastlands of Anatolia, the islands of the Aegean and Greece.

Given that all the texts we have come from the palace, one of the main temples under royal patronage in the capital city, Hattusas, and – in smaller numbers – from two or three centres of provincial government administration, Bryce finds a good deal to say about king and court, the administration of the affairs of the kingdom and the administration of justice. Like a medieval kingdom in Europe, the Hittite kingdom recorded what it needed to record in writing. It is, though, very difficult to assess the proportion of the historical iceberg that remains submerged because records have not survived, or because the subject was not of concern to the central institutions of the state, was not documented in writing or is yet to be found. The question of how much we do not know is more sharply focused in the chapter on farmers. Bryce can cite records from the central administration about the allocation of small land-holdings to little people. And he gives us an account of the assets of a man recorded in a land-grant document that runs to nine lines of continuous text in the book. But one suspects that this was a moderately well-to-do family to have had such a substantial list of land, vines, orchards and livestock. What we cannot know is how representative such a farmer was, and how many small farmers and farm labourers did not merit a record and thus remain invisible. As an archaeologist, I find it unsatisfactory that the partiality and arbitrariness of the documentary record are not more clearly signalled; the documents we have derive from excavations, and very few Hittite-period sites have been excavated.

In the chapters on the kings and the law, Bryce is on well-worked ground. He demonstrates a detailed knowledge and deep understanding of the specialist literature, yet his text flows easily and is full of well-chosen anecdotes. He works hard to make kings come alive for us, supporting almost everything he has to say with end-notes to the appropriate sources (24 pages of them for the whole book), supported by a scholarly bibliography that takes up another nine pages. But he has no space to set Hittite kingship in the context of what is known about other kingdoms of the Near Eastern Bronze Age, from which the Hittite kingdom is strikingly different.

There are plenty of administrative records that relate to crime and punishment, disputes
and arbitration, and court cases and judgments. A substantial part of the chapter on law and the people is, however, concerned with the texts commonly called the Hittite Laws. These texts were named laws by modern scholars in direct response to earlier discoveries of what were believed to be ‘law-codes’ in Mesopotamia. The Hittite Laws have a lot in common with the Code of Hammurabi, and other Mesopotamian codes, and share the same problems of interpretation for modern scholars (not least, that the ‘laws’ are never cited as precepts in any recorded judgments). Recognising the similarities in these various codes would help their elucidation, for it is clear from Mesopotamian examples that the formulation of such codes, each based on and developed from earlier codes, was a tradition that continued over centuries. Mesopotamian specialists have discussed the problem and come up with interesting – and non-legal – hypotheses. This is one of a number of occasions when it would help greatly if Bryce had had the space to integrate the discussion of the Hittite case into the wider Near Eastern world.

In the final chapter, ‘Links across the wine-dark sea’, Bryce shifts gear. He modestly displays breadth and depth of knowledge, and is highly informative as he discusses the underestimated significance of the role of this part of Turkey as the interface between European and west Asian civilisations. The transfer of knowledge, ideas, images, stories and traded goods, went in both directions. The Hittite civilisation and its immediate successors were the agency through which the early Greek world will have learned much of the accumulated wisdom and know-how of the Near East.

TREVOR WATKINS
University of Edinburgh


Pas assez ‘autres’ pour les anthropologues occidentaux et trop ‘anglais’ pour les historiens indiens, les Anglo-Indiens ont fait l’objet de peu de recherches, ce qui est curieux si on considère qu’ils incarnent à la perfection une certaine forme de mélanges raciaux et culturels propres aux sociétés postcoloniales et souvent célébrés dans la littérature contemporaine. Les Anglo-Indiens sont souvent décrits comme ‘doublément marginaux’, aussi éloignés des Anglais que des Indiens, représentation qui présuppose la réification des deux populations concernées. Caplan montre au contraire la complexité de la situation coloniale: aucun camp n’a jamais été homogène, et l’existence de groupes aux frontières poreuses et incertaines, souvent perçue comme propre au postcolonialisme, caractérisait déjà l’époque coloniale. Caplan montre aussi que l’hybridité n’est pas la même partout: en fonction des contextes politique et économique, la place occupée par les Anglo-Indiens a varié, ce qui justifie une approche combinant histoire et ethnographie. L’auteur concentre son étude sur Madras et, prudent, ne prétend pas embrasser l’ensemble de la situation des Anglo-Indiens dans le sous-continent.

Cette ethnographie souligne la pluralité des rôles occupés par les Anglo-Indiens. La figure de l’hybride en anthropologie a souvent été appréhendée, à la façon de Mary Douglas, comme une monstruosité qui, échappant aux catégories qui fondent l’ordre social, devient donc menace et objet de répulsion. Caplan montre au contraire que, si les Anglo-Indiens ont parfois été rejetés aussi bien par les Indiens que par les Britanniques, ils ont aussi fréquemment servi d’alliés à l’un des deux camps. Moins suspects que les Indiens aux yeux des occidentaux, ceux-ci leur réservaient des emplois sensibles et, divisant pour régner, encourageaient les groupes distincts. Mais les Anglo-Indiens contestaient cet ordre en soulignant leur apparence à une Grande-Bretagne qu’ils ne connaissaient pas, suscitant des commentaires ironiques sur leurs coutumes ‘pseudo-British’. Ce lien symbolique a alimenté une identité de type diasporique qui, si elle s’est révélée difficile à

L’étude des Anglo-Indiens débouche ainsi sur une analyse des processus identitaires à l’œuvre au sein de populations culturellement hétérogènes. Le dilemme est bien connu. La culture anglo-indienne est le produit de métissages constants et alimente ainsi la déconstruction des cultures qui caractérise en partie l’anthropologie contemporaine. Mais les Anglo-Indiens, comme toutes les populations hybrides, sont engagés dans des processus de réification de leur propre culture, qui influence leurs pratiques identitaires ou politiques. Cette coexistence d’une culture hybride et d’une rhétorique essentialiste est sans doute un des traits caractéristiques des populations métissées (voire de toute population), et un des mérites de ce livre est de montrer que, loin d’être propre à un monde ‘postmoderne’, ‘postcolonial’ ou ‘globalisé’, ce contraste a toujours existé.

ANTOINE PÉCOUD
Université de Poitiers


This insightful book should be read and appreciated by a wide audience because it makes an important contribution to the sociological study of the media. Coul dry rejects romantic notions about the primacy of face-to-face communication and of social unity sui generis that underlie Durkheimian understandings of media. He criticizes the influential work of Daniel Dayan and Elihu Katz, which posits that rituals enacted in the media evoke core social values, thereby creating ‘mechanical’ solidarity that ameliorates the divisions characteristic of ‘organically’ structured societies. Coul dry sees this as an articulation of the governing myth of media in modern societies, which is “the myth of the mediated centre”: the belief, or assumption, that there is a centre to the social world, and that, in some sense, the media speaks “for” that centre (p. 10). By centre he refers not to any location of governance in a literal sense, but rather to the notion that societies are defined in theory and practice by a set of essential cognitive values mapped out for each and every member of society through collective representations evoked in ritual. Coul dry’s analysis of media rituals – formalised practices carried out in relation to, but not necessarily by or on behalf of, media institutions themselves – provides a means through which both the neo-Durkheimian claim that media merely represent an underlying ‘reality’ of social cohesion and the post-modern insistence that mediation produces a condition of mere hyper-reality may be avoided. He shows how different practices such as fans’ visits to media theme parks, participation in television talk shows, and the avid consumption of ‘reality’ game shows such as Big Brother, to name only a few examples, are rituals through which the central monopolistic claims of media to act as the sole conduit through which the central values of society are reaffirmed, and, following Foucault, regimes of governmentality are made manifest.

Coul dry draws on the writings of Victor Turner, Maurice Bloch and Catherine Bell to develop an innovative theory of ritual practice, focusing in particular on how rituals ‘frame’ and regulate categorisations of the world. He uses this theory to support the more radical claim of his argument, that privileged social experience is increasingly defined by media in their own terms and supports their continuing monopoly over the definition of ‘reality’: that is, what things are considered to be politically or socially important. A boundary dividing ‘ordinary’ people, places and behaviour from the works of the ‘important’ minority that creates media for the majority’s consumption is thereby constructed and naturalised. Much of the book is devoted to deconstructing this boundary and other seemingly natural facets of media practice, as well as to considering how ‘new media’, particularly internet technologies, may contribute to the construction or deconstruction of these myths. Despite the author’s self-confessed cynicism, this book is a work that is ultimately optimistic about how inventive thinking in social theory can make a progressive contribution to the search for social equality.

Given Coul dry’s innovative, ‘post-
Durkheimian’ approach and his primary aim to convey his theory, it would be surprising if readers did not experience some frustrations. The empirical material presented is used to reinforce the theoretical exposition, as opposed to being explained in all its complexity by the theory of media ritual. Couldry suggests many avenues for future research, but understandably draws back from exploring these in detail. I suspect that the true value of the critical analysis of media rituals will only become apparent in the light of detailed comparative empirical analysis of different mediascapes, that is through the use of anthropological data as well as theory. Such comparative work needs to be done because one area of Couldry’s theory remains under-examined in this particular work: the extent to which ‘the myth of the mediated centre’ is an artefact of media-saturated societies alone. Implicit in Couldry’s text is an acceptance that he is working in societies living through ‘a media age’ (p. 37); this is perhaps indicative of the fact that he is using anthropological theory in the service of the sociological study of media.

Couldry has shown anthropologists that their own theoretical inheritance provides an exciting framework through which media can be analysed. Nevertheless, it remains to be seen whether it can be successfully applied to the anthropological study of media, especially to analyses of how globalisation is transforming societies on the fringe of the modern world system, particularly where historical experience challenges ethnocentric preconceptions about the consequences of modernity. I suspect the answer is that we shall, indeed, find his work of great value in the future.

MICHAEL WILMORE
The Open University


Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony has in the last two decades come to be anthropology’s most important tool for discussing the relationship between power and culture. However, as Kate Crehan points out in her new book *Gramsci, culture and anthropology*, most anthropologists ‘get their Gramsci second hand’ (p. 1), from Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall, John and Jean Comaroff, or other Gramsci popularisers. Crehan believes that this has led to the mistake of using hegemony as a synonym for ideology. Referring to this as ‘hegemony lite’ she argues that this approach reifies culture as an independent variable, and makes social class and the ‘materiality of power’ that is the soul of Gramsci’s work disappear (p. 176). Drawing heavily on extended quotations from Gramsci’s writings, Crehan presents a bold, passionately argued and clearly written manifesto for a praxis-oriented political anthropology in which ‘history’ replaces the culture concept and hegemony means far more than the Weberian, class-flavoured stand-in for ideology favoured by so many Gramsci-interpreters. Such a project is long overdue, and will hopefully replace the paragraph in the Comaroffs’ *Of revelation and revolution* that students commonly refer to for a quick introduction to hegemony.

Crehan’s first section, ‘Contexts’ gives an overview of Gramsci’s life and communist commitment and an exposition of what she believes are the three primary assumptions of anthropology that Gramsci’s work can address: that cultures are ‘in some sense systems’; that cultures ‘in some sense constitute discrete and bounded entities’; and that there is a ‘fundamental opposition between tradition and modernity’ (p. 37). Her discussion is clear and concise, and contains a useful and interesting critique of the notion of ‘hybridity’, which she views as old reifications in new packaging.

Her second section ‘Gramsci on culture’ presents the core of what Crehan believes is Gramsci’s view of the relationship between culture, history and politics, the value of subaltern culture, and the role of ideas and intellectuals in social transformation. The Gramsci that Crehan adduces from the extended quotations that fill this section is convincing and compelling, but shockingly different from the one that progressive social scientists have typically used as authority for an almost single-minded focus on ‘spaces’ in civil society to the exclusion of political parties and state-level processes, quasi-populist celebrations of local knowledge and community, and a political gradualism connected to a view of culture as a retarding terrain of struggle. Crehan’s version of hegemony instead describes broad and conscious political history making projects in which culture is dependent on, and relational to, social class. This is a Gramsci that is more Machiavelli than Marcuse, and more Lenin than Laclau.

Crehan’s third and final section, ‘Gramsci and anthropology’ is a scorched-earth polemic against
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the culture concept and what she believes to be its conservative thrust. Deriding John and Jean Comaroff’s Weberian reading of Gramsci and hegemony as misleading, poorly contextualised and ‘lite’, Crehan argues that they have ‘trimmed’, ‘shaped’ and ‘domesticated’ Gramsci ‘to fit so comfortably within anthropological mappings’ (p. 176). According to Crehan, these mappings are the philosophical idealism of the culture concept and the refusal, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall, seriously to engage the Marxism inherent in Gramsci’s work.

Having shown how the Comaroffs distort Gramsci, she suggests why Marxists in the tradition of Eric Wolf need to read him. Wolf, she asserts, was reluctant ‘to theorise class in a way that fully incorporates culture, ultimately remaining committed to the concept of culture as a distinct, albeit shifting and fluid domain’ (p. 186). Comparing Wolf’s last two major works, Europe and the people without history and Envisioning power she suggests that taken together ‘they conjure up an Escher-type paradox, where it seems impossible to keep both class and culture equally in view’ (p. 188). Crehan’s criticisms of Wolf’s reluctance about class are well taken and suggest the dangers of the culture concept, even for a Marxist scholar and harsh critic of the culture concept like Wolf. However, her assertion that ‘a careful reading of Gramsci can perhaps help us get beyond this theoretical impasse’ (p. 188) is ultimately unconvincing.

Attempting to show a way beyond this ‘impasse’, she presents a thought-provoking Gramscian re-reading of Mathew Guttman’s The meanings of macho and Roger Keessing’s ‘Colonial and counter-colonial discourse in Melanesia’. However, her argument with Wolf, unlike the one with the Comaroffs, seems to be about strategy and tactics rather than political principles: that is, where to intervene and with how much of the Marxist programme. The Gramscian reading of the relationship between culture and class in Crehan’s mini-ethnographies does not obviate the need for a fully realized discussion of why her approach to the intellectual ‘war of position’ is more suitable to current conditions than the one that Wolf developed during the Cold War.

She ends with a stunning quotation from Gramsci that gives authority to her liquidationist approach to the culture concept. However, even if we agree with Crehan about the obscurity and conservative character of the culture concept, we are still left wondering about strategy and tactics. Why not go one step further and simply liquidate anthropology (or for that matter academe generally), instead of wading back into ‘culture’ as Eric Wolf did at the end? The problem is that the assertion that drives this book – that anthropologists can benefit from reading Gramsci – is never really in doubt. What remains in doubt and worthy of more discussion are the specific contours of the relationship between the anthropological enterprise and social change. Crehan is quite right; Gramsci’s discussions of hegemony, subaltern culture, praxis and scholarship, the relationship between ‘traditional’ and ‘organic’ intellectuals, and the dialectics of class, party and state present crucial insights for intellectuals. There is probably no better place to begin reading Gramsci than with Kate Crehan, but what might occur after that reading is the more interesting problem.

ANTHONY MARCUS
The University of Melbourne

Emoff, Ron, and David Henderson (eds.).

Fieldwork when written up, the editors argue, has too often involved homogenisation into some cultural whole. Moments are elided, events might be left buried in notes and memories. The editors regret that ethnography may be treated as something exclusively composed of information and knowledge, while neglecting creativity and imagination. By contrast, this collection aims to explore the production of ‘truth’ through the acts of writing and reading, and to create the sense of being there. The means by which the editors work to achieve this is through out-takes – the equivalent of what is left on the cutting-room floor – using the self as the mediating body. Regrettably, they still feel the need to reassure the reader that this is not meant to constitute ‘self-indulgent exercises in reflexivity’.

My alternative reservation is that, although there is a brief mention of experiencing distant places not only in the world out there but also ‘here at home’, the emphasis is on the experience on ‘foreign ground’. There are always possibilities in out-takes from territory presumed to be ‘here’. Similarly, the empathetic understanding of difference need not be learned in foreign exoticised
climes. Dreams and hallucinations can terrifyingly or inspiringly occur anywhere. The ‘other’ is not always elsewhere. The collection does indeed include one account by Kumar who treats the United States as the ‘other place’ when coming as postgraduate from India.

The means of exploring incidental events and experiences take many forms. Narrative styles predominate. The reader gradually realises that Feinberg has presented himself as a somewhat macho Mexican. The fictionalising of a ‘character’ in the field is perhaps the most challenging for the usual social scientist taught to avoid invention. There are vivid details but the depiction of women through this character’s voice is sometimes perturbing as individualised traits risk being stereotyped as much as group values.

Narayan produces a most engrossing account that explores the interconnections embedded in the encounter of fieldwork. She involuntarily feels the parallels between the different circumstances of the events in India and her own existence. Personal life and relationships surface in the midst of others’ experiences, and there is subtle movement from the recording observer to the self-abandoned participant who releases herself through dance. As with Narayan, Henderson juxtaposes, but more fully, cultural artefacts from the west and globalisation. The indigenous response includes bombing and riots against attempts to impose the Walmart brand of cultural imperialism in Nepal. The narrator is not culturally isolated but fully familiar with American impositions.

Behar explores ethnic crossings by an Afro-Cuban nanny who sacrifices an offer of marriage and love to give care to the dying child of her bourgeois Jewish employers. Here is a poignant and individualised portrait of the subordinate who nurtures the child of her dominant other; a recurrent practice under colonialism, but best conveyed through individual narrative detail. Hansen presents a sobering and vital account of local official surveillance and intervention in her study of poverty in Zambia. She was eventually forced to acknowledge the political implications of her research emphasis, and the intellectual dialogue and challenge provided by the police commander.

Kendall reproduces the recorded testimony of a tragically abused and beaten young Korean wife, using her status as outsider and witness to reinforce her statement of feelings about her injustice. My only surprise is that the anthropologist asserts the need to counter ethnographic typifications of subjects as ‘distant and strange’ and third-world women as ‘passive’ and ‘subservient’. Twentieth-century anthropology long aimed to familiarise and explain the strange, and Phyllis Kaberry was already countering such gendered stereotypes of passivity in the 1930s. Gloriously, Causey describes wild storms and croaking frogs in Samosir Island, internalising indigenous beliefs about ghosts alongside local Protestantism. We are swept away by his terror and imagination. This is far from Texas, he intones, but ghosts and imaginings might exist even in this strange place.

The volume takes us further in the recognition of the specific and imaginative, and lessons of the incidental, in conveying the multi-faceted experience of anthropological fieldwork across the globe. There and then anthropologists have to use all their resources: body, spirit, intellect, emotional sensitivity, poetic and narrative imagination. The contributors to this volume recreate some of those spheres lost from many conventionalised and mono-formatted publications.

JUDITH OKELY
University of Hull


Cet ‘Essai de mythologie kanak’ propose une lecture originale et novatrice d’un corpus de mythes de Maré (Nouvelle-Calédonie, Mélanésie) recueillis par Charles Illouz et, principalement, par le père Dubois. La grande force de ce travail est de nous rapprocher, par l’esprit et la lettre, des gloses que certains érudits kanak proposent des récits – et des mots – de leurs langues. La complexité du texte interprétatif ciselé par Illouz fait écho à celle des réflexions et interprétations de ces interlocuteurs kanak quand ils commentent des faits de langue impliquant leur société et leur monde, et dont on s’étonne que linguistes et anthropologues n’y prêtent pas plus d’attention. Un brin provocateur, Illouz, lui, nous invite à penser ces récits à rebours de Descartes: ‘je scrute, je tends l’oreille et tous mes sens, je garde à l’esprit toutes les images des choses corporelles et chaque fois je les tiens pour vraies; et ainsi souscrivant aux manifestations du monde extérieur, je tâche de me le rendre plus connu et plus familier’ (p. 129).

L’introduction propose une critique, très bien

Un thème analytique fécond est celui de la dualité de points de vue et de leur réversibilité – principalement étudié en rapport au mariage. C’est ici, appliquée aux mythes, la prise en compte par l’analyste de perspectives différentes, une démarche qui, pour les objets océaniens, trouve des échos chez des auteurs aussi différents que Stephen Chauvet dès les années trente et Alfred Gell dans son dernier ouvrage. Toujours au plan de la méthode on observera que notre vocabulaire de la stylistique peine parfois à rendre compte de la rhétorique kanak. Une part du projet de l’ouvrage, comme de sa difficulté, tient, me semble-t-il, à cette volonté de combler l’écart entre les dispositifs de significations des langues et récits kanak et les nôtres. Toutefois, des analyses comme celle de Gérard Genette sur la réversibilité des mondes aquatiques et aériens – à propos de Saint-Amant (pp. 82–3) – suggèrent qu’aux plus créatifs et imaginatifs des critiques littéraires la modalité poétique impose des démarches parfois guère éloignées de celles mises en avant par Illouz pour rendre compte des mythes maréens.

On notera aussi la pertinence des analyses du lexique, avec un accent mis sur les polysémies et les condensations. Là encore on peut légitimement se demander si les concepts les plus généralement utilisés par l’anthropologie rendent compte de façon adéquate des déploiements de sens de certains mots. Un exemple parmi d’autres, qui a des échos nombreux en Mélanésie, celui de ‘zine: terre cultivable/origine de l’épouse’ dont l’analyse amène Illouz à faire la proposition suivante ‘tout ce qui advient sur le plan agricole advient également sur le plan matrimonial’ (pp. 41–3). Nous nous éloignons ici de l’idée d’un sens premier qui sous–tend nombre de conceptions concernant tropes et métaphores. Enfin, à l’exemple des gloses kanak, les transformations sonores des mots sont scrutées, avec des résultats étonnants (pp. 55–6).

La liste des apports de cet essai est loin d’être close. Il s’agit d’un travail important, original qui ouvre nombre de perspectives fécondes aux spécialistes de l’Océanie. Ce livre me semble indispensable à toute bibliothèque littéraire, anthropologique et bien sûr Océaniste. Mais pourquoi nous priver de conclusions, de synthèses? Est-ce le prix à payer à la forme de l’essai, où résonnent si bien les avancées de l’intuition? Le risque est que l’essentiel se fonde aux détails dans une même jouissance de la langue. Et au-delà, on ressent comme une hésitation à s’impliquer plus avant dans les débats de la discipline à travers des propositions méthodologiques clairement affirmées là où le texte, bien souvent, se contente de précieuses suggestions.

DENIS MONNERIE
Université Marc Bloch, Strasbourg


Anthropologists concerned with the environment and natural resource management tend to focus on work by anthropologists, and so miss other ways of thinking about these issues. This collection is a useful point of entry into recent sociological thinking about, and studies of, environmental issues. The case material is drawn primarily from
Australia, reflecting the origin of this work in the 1999 meeting of the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management in Brisbane.

The collection has 17 substantive chapters, preceded by an introduction that lays out the importance of attending to the social aspects of resource management and provides a general overview of the collection. The substantive chapters are divided into four sections of four chapters each, which cover the place of social science in resource management, planning and impact assessment, the idea of sustainability, and general ways of approaching and thinking about environmental management regimes. Anthropologists are likely to find sections 2, 3 and 4 the most interesting.

Section two, on planning and impact assessment, considers how social groups and localities ought to, and can, be involved in planning and evaluating resource management regimes so as to displace specialist domination (described for Western Australia by Wallington and Barns). Identifying pertinent groups can be difficult, however, as changes in rural economy mean that people are increasingly linked to villages or towns beyond their own in regional webs (Taylor, Fitzgerald and McClintock). Even when groups are identified, it is not always easy to elicit their orientations and values or to assume that members of different groups communicate effectively with each other (Irons). Finally, the position of scientists as experts can be problematic in resource management debates (Jakku).

Section three evaluates the move by governments away from production-oriented, centralised models of resource management and toward biodiversity, matching management units with ecological areas, local participation and knowledge. The reality behind the rhetoric is often problematic, and may mark the emergence of the sort of governance described by Foucault, not to mention the sacrificing of local participation in favour of scientific-ecological constructions of biodiversity (Bates and Tucker). Similarly, introducing regimes based on watersheds or catchment areas rather than existing political subdivisions, and management systems that incorporate amenity and related values rather than just extraction goals, may mean that existing capitalist interests maintain, and even increase, their control over resources, marginalising other interests in, and approaches to, the environment (Beilin, Geno). Likewise, state efforts to facilitate local knowledge and sustainable practices among Australian farmers can mean that the knowledge and practices are valorised only to the extent that they conform to state interests in commercial agriculture of a certain sort (Higgins, Lockie and Lawrence).

The final section, ‘Institutions and regulations’, considers the ways that resource use and management occurs in contexts that are far more complex than normal management systems recognise. The first chapter reviews a range of descriptions of resource management systems to challenge the simplistic model of the ‘tragedy of the commons’, apparently still important among resource managers (Coop and Bruncshornt). The next chapter advocates the use of ‘complex systems’ models in planning and assessment, models that are based on the interaction of a broader range of variables than is common in resource management (Brinkley, Fisher and Gray). This complexity is laid out in more analytical terms in the next chapter (Moon), which argues that poststructuralist research indicates that the socio-political and policy worlds are much more complex and uncertain than what is portrayed in resource management training programmes and guidelines. The final chapter (Herbert-Cheshire) rounds out this critical orientation by analysing the community-based, ‘bottom-up’ orientation that is increasingly popular in First World state environmental policy. It argues that this amounts to encouraging people to accept and adapt to the existing importance of profit maximisation in resource management, rather than allowing them to propose alternative approaches to their environments.

As my summary indicates, the collection focuses on government institutions and policies in First World countries, different from what is commonly studied in anthropology of the environment. In doing so, it is helpful for highlighting the governmental and political-economic issues that are important in environmental management around the world, but that may attract less attention among anthropologists than socio-cultural and identity issues. The result is a collection that can stimulate those who are prepared to read beyond the specific national contexts at issue, and look instead to the broader processes being described.

JAMES G. CARRIER
Indiana University and Oxford Brookes University
In recent years a proliferation of anthropological books with an explicitly gay and lesbian focus have been published, firmly establishing research on homosexualities as a legitimate topic of enquiry within the domain of socio-cultural anthropology. This edited collection is the product of a session on ‘Anthropology and homosexuality’ at the 1996 American Anthropological Association conference in San Francisco. Ellen Lewin and William L. Leap, its editors, continue a process that they have started in earlier publications of tracing the visibility of lesbian and gay anthropologists, and assessing their impact on the discipline as a whole. The list of contributors includes, among others, such influential figures as Evelyn Blackwood and Gayle Rubin.

The volume identifies the historical trajectories that led to the emergence and development of gay and lesbian anthropology (chs. 1–2), but also outlines current concerns and preoccupations in this relatively new anthropological sub-field. Thus, articles range from a discussion of the development of gay and lesbian community studies in anthropology (ch. 3) and an examination of the relationship between feminist anthropology and lesbian/gay studies (ch. 4), to the study of bareback sex, risk and eroticism in the post-Aids era (ch. 7), the critique of a singular, monolithic gay identity (ch. 8) and questions about anthropology’s queer future (ch. 11). Although the book deals primarily with issues of socio-cultural anthropology, it also includes articles on archaeology, specifically the relevance of homosexuality in archaeological investigations of past societies (ch. 6), and on linguistics, looking at the emergence of lesbian/gay language studies (ch. 5) and the multivocal use of the word ‘transgender’ (ch. 8).

One of my criticisms of this volume is its parochial outlook. All of its contributors are American academics working in universities, so the book largely reflects their theoretical and ethnographic interests, with very little attempt to engage with similar work undertaken outside the United States. In this respect, a more pertinent subtitle for this volume would have been ‘The emergence of lesbian and gay anthropology in the United States’. A more fruitful (and perhaps ideal) approach would have been to pursue a wider internationalist outlook with contributors from universities outside the United States, in order to offer a more complete picture and to highlight the concerns of lesbian and gay academics elsewhere.

On the other hand, one of the main strengths of this volume is its attempt to avoid being ‘of lesbian and gay interest only’ by speaking to a wider audience. Its editors state that ‘the collection… highlights efforts to move beyond a strictly lesbian/gay inquiry and situate discussions of same-sex desire in broader terms’. This has been successfully accomplished. It is a well-researched, well-written and forward-looking book, and should be included as essential reading in every gender/sexuality and anthropological theory syllabus. The collection deserves a wholehearted recommendation.

PANOS DENDRINOS
University of Glasgow


Development sociology is a interesting and useful collection of previously published papers by an important figure in development studies, but a book that suffers from serious flaws. Individually a number of the papers provide a detailed and fascinating perspective on terms that are often over-used and vaguely defined in the development world, such as value chains and social capital. Together the papers form something of a guide to Long’s development of the ‘actor-oriented’ approach, his application of a social constructionist view of change and continuity to development studies. What the collection lacks is a sense of being a collection and a broader engagement with the theoretical literature from either the social sciences or development studies.

The book consists of ten papers, many of them co-authored, organised into three themes: analyses of planned interventions and development in its broadest sense; more detailed accounts of processes of commoditisation and the growth of small-scale enterprise in Latin America; and commentaries from the field on the subject of knowledge interfaces and globalisation, looking particularly at agricultural extension. The material is drawn in the main from fieldwork carried out over several decades in Latin America, specifically in Mexico and highland Peru. In a number of cases, such as
the chapters entitled ‘Building a conceptual and interpretative framework’ and ‘Globalisation and localisation: recontextualising social change’, there are attempts to summarise and expand Long’s coherent approach to fit a new and rapidly developing world.

Perhaps the most interesting sections of the collection are those papers that provide detailed, almost ethnographic, examples of processes and terms that are of current interest. The paper, ‘Webs of commitment and debt’ describes the links between small-scale agricultural producers and workers in Mexico, and traders and family-run firms amongst the Latino population in California. Long provides a fascinating perspective on the complex networks of relationships and credits that make up these webs across the border. Equally interesting is the paper, ‘Networks, social capital and multiple family-enterprise: local to global’, in which the fortunes of the Jimenez family’s small businesses are explored from the 1930s to the 1990s. These papers provide concrete and contextualised examples of what is meant by terms such as social capital, something that is missing in much development literature.

While the collection is portrayed as an ‘exciting and challenging work’, it is in fact rather poorly integrated. The division into sections suggests a progression, from an exploration of the theoretical approach, through a grounding in detailed field material, leading on to a commentary on topics of current interest such as globalisation and localisation. The reality is that it is difficult to see what new material has been added to these papers to turn them into a collection. In a number of cases, such as the papers ‘Knowledge, networks and power’ and ‘The dynamics of knowledge interfaces between bureaucrats and peasants’, there is a great deal of unnecessary repetition of data and arguments.

What is perhaps more disappointing is the narrow perspective that Long has taken in his collected work. James Ferguson, in a short piece on ‘Development’, makes a distinction between development anthropology, an applied sub-field working for development agencies, and the anthropology of development, where academic anthropologists ‘train an anthropological lens on the very ideas and institutions on which “development anthropology” often uncritically relies’ (in A. Barnard and J. Spencer, Encyclopedia of social and cultural anthropology, London: Routledge, 1996, p. 159). Long, it would seem from this collection, falls somewhere between these two categories. The actor-oriented approach used in the various papers is too complex and requires too much of an historical perspective to be of value to the practitioner of development anthropology. At the same time, the work lacks the theoretical rigour and comparative perspective that would characterise a useful anthropology of development.

Despite Long’s roots in the anthropology of change in Africa, the papers draw almost exclusively on material from Latin America and miss potentially valuable comparisons with work from, say, South Asia.

It would seem, though, that Long is aware of the limitations of his own work. In the final paper he suggests that ‘the biggest challenge for an actor-oriented/social constructionist approach to the study of development and social change concerns how to re-conceptualise the relations between knowledge, power and social agency within this global informational world’ (p. 239). Unfortunately, the papers in this collection do not provide an answer to this vital challenge.

FRANCIS WATKINS
University of Edinburgh


The conjunction of indigenous knowledge (IK) and development promises better development efforts and an interesting future for anthropology. The promise, and its limitations, are apparent in this volume of papers from the 2000 meeting of the Association of Social Anthropologists.

The promise is laid out in Sillitoe’s introductory chapter. He sees anthropology as being caught in intense and possibly paralysing self-reflection, and as increasingly perceived as irrelevant both within and without academic life. He argues that the discipline has a chance to escape this state of affairs through the shift in orientation of the development industry towards participatory approaches, manifest especially as a concern with IK. If anthropologists turn their attention to development work, they will be able to engage in empirical and practical work that can change the world and make the valuable skills of the discipline more apparent than they are now. To a degree, the body of this collection is a test of his claims. There are two sets of key chapters: the first concerned
with identifying and describing IK, the second with the practicalities of development projects and their relationship with IK.

That first group of five chapters addresses both the I and the K in IK. As one might expect, there is a lot of terminological ground-clearing in these chapters, as authors take stances concerning the nature of being indigenous, local and the like, and the nature of IK, especially in contrast to western scientific knowledge (WSK). One of the characteristics of IK that recurs in these chapters is that it is more ‘holistic’ and sees the world as more ‘interconnected’ than is common in WSK. This theme is pursued at some length in the chapters by the late Daryl Posey, by Croal and Darou, and by Sillitoe. Given that these are chapters rather than books of their own, it is inevitable that they show a degree of orientalism and occidentalism, perhaps explicable in part as a reaction to the tendency in development projects to demand relatively simple, speedy answers to incredibly complex questions.

Two other chapters in this section pursue the same general point at greater length through descriptions of individual societies’ conceptions of what might be called ‘ethno-development’: people’s conceptions of what would make for a better life. One of these chapters is Clammer’s description of these conceptions in Japan, where many people frame ‘development’ in ways that differ markedly from the materialist and economist frames that are so important in conventional western discourse. This thread is continued in Kassam’s chapter, which considers approaches to both the processes and goals of development among the Oroma in Ethiopia, as exemplified by an Oroma NGO.

The four chapters of the second section of this collection are concerned with the practicalities of development projects and IK, and contrast sharply with the rhetoric of the earlier chapters. Whatever their aspirations, anthropologists in development projects are constrained by time, resources, and political and conceptual divergences among interested parties, as Schönmuth argues in his chapter. These will not go away simply by shedding some sort of ill-defined, old-fashioned disciplinary blinkers. These constraints are illustrated in Campbell’s discussion of a project in Botswana, shaped by the practical politics of government agencies and project management that led to a stress on hard, scientific data and the ignoring of social data and local perceptions and concerns.

The two other chapters in this section are concerned with practical ways of bridging the supposed gap between IK and WSK. Purcell and Onjoro describe two popular, semi-standardised field techniques that have emerged to facilitate equitable, sustainable development strategies. They point to the techniques’ shortcomings and suggest an alternative: a model of ‘equitable integration’ of local and scientific knowledges and orientations. In their chapter, Cleveland and Soleri investigate the gap between IK and WSK in respect of maize varieties, contrasting Mexican farmers and western plant breeders. They find that there is not much of a gap. Rather, the breeders assume agricultural conditions that are very different from those experienced by farmers whose failure to adopt new plant varieties reflects practical concerns rather than divergent epistemologies.

The collection ends with a concluding overview by Ellen, which situates the IK question within broader trends in anthropology and development. While Ellen is sensitive to the ethical and epistemological issues that IK raises, he reminds us that there is a range of practical aspects of the relationship between IK and development that anthropologists can address, and do so in ways that benefit the local people who are involved in development projects.

JAMES G. CARRIER
Indiana University and Oxford Brookes University


Les livres d’ethnologie de nos jours ayant...
rarement pour titre ‘le monde des’, *Gypsy world* pourrait paraître désuet. À notre sens, deux raisons scientifiques justifient ce titre. Premièrement la vision proposée par Williams s’inscrit dans le sillage d’une approche structuro-fonctionnaliste. L’implicite épistémologique de l’auteur est la métonymie – la partie explique le tout – puisque Williams veut restituer la totalité manouche par le biais de la mort. Deuxièmement, nous constatons la mise en avant d’un point de vue culturaliste puisque l’auteur essaye de trouver des traits, de lier culture et identité. Les Manouches seraient ceux qui pratiquent *le silence envers les morts*.

Les récits, la description des tombes, l’usage des objets, montrent que la relation avec les morts est définie par le ‘respect’. Dans une gestion qui implique à la fois séparation et union, on ne va pas négliger, maltraiter, abandonner, hériter, vendre ou perdre les objets appartenant autrefois aux morts et on va éviter de prononcer les noms des morts. Il en résulte une communauté amnésique, car la mémoire, basée sur le culte de morts, est une affaire de famille. Elle fonctionne comme support pour un discours du et dans le privé. Comme les *mule* (objets ou places des morts, en dialecte manouche) peuvent être partout (ainsi que les Gadje, les non-Tsiganes), le sens, lui aussi, peut émerger de partout. Comment gérer cette plénitude? Le silence opère le dépassement des oppositions mémoire/oubli, sacré/profane, transcendant/immanent (car il créé un permanent décalage) et une grande liberté est laissée aux individus face à l’interprétation des signes. Les morts sont pour les Manouches ce que ces derniers sont pour les Gadje: on n’en parle pas, mais on leur accorde une place essentielle dans l’ordre cosmique. Une ambiguïté semble pourtant demeurer: le silence, est-il une catégorie indigène ou une catégorie provenant de l’ethnologue? Si les Manouches ne pensent pas le monde en catégories opposées (ils dépasseraient les oppositions, notamment grâce au silence, entre autres choses), tel ne semble pas être le cas de l’ethnologue: ‘In order to constitute their real presence, they have chosen to refer to real absence. Silence becomes the guarantor of incorruptibility of identity, of the immutability of the group’ (p.55).

Williams attire l’attention sur le fait que quelque soit le registre culturel – le deuil, l’anecdote, l’onomastique, la production de biens – une dialectique entre le groupe et l’individu est constamment à l’œuvre. S’il arrive à articuler individu et groupe pour parler de la culture, ses efforts pour placer cette culture dans une dimension historique sont moins convaincants. En lisant le chapitre consacré au devenir des Manouches dans les années de l’urbanisation intense en France (pp. 56–84), nous ne remarquons pas l’impact de la sédentarisation, le changement d’activité pour se procurer des ressources, l’abandon des roulottes pour les caravanes et des chevaux pour les voitures, l’adhésion pentecôtiste aux coutumes liées à la mort. Williams insiste sur ce qui demeure en passant sous silence ce qui change.

Le monde manouche se construit à travers une grande créativité et variation individuelles contenues dans l’effort de distinction du monde des Autres, et tout en étant à l’intérieur de celui-ci. Ceci est possible, selon la thèse un peu abrupte de Williams, de par le silence et le registre de l’invisible, le ‘dealing with nothingness’ (p.84). Une vingtaine de photographies en noir et blanc complètent une écriture inspirée. La lecture est pourtant alourdie par de nombreux textes en langue vernaculaire. On se doit également de remarquer que la traductrice a su surmonter les difficultés de traduction. Le ton poétique nous fait penser que l’auteur se laisse malgré lui emporter par le romantisme contre lequel il se dresse par ailleurs. Le caractère exemplaire, pédagogique et militant, du livre est accentué par la réponse affective implicite (tacite) donnée par l’auteur: ils sont Manouches aussi parce que Patrick Williams les aime beaucoup.

Iula Hasdeu  
*Université de Genève*