
The scholarly world has been flooded with writing on the former Yugoslavia in recent years. However, with some notable exceptions, anthropologists have contributed rather marginally to this body of work, and seem to have left the task of interpretation mainly to political sociologists, international relations experts and journalists. Thus, this collection of essays which contains almost five hundred pages of post-Yugoslav material, most of it written by authors who have long established their authority as social scientists with an interest in the region, should be welcomed. The volume brings together contributions by more than twenty authors from different post-Yugoslav states themselves and from western Europe and North America. As is often the case, many of the authors somehow span these two spheres in their personal biographies. The large majority of the contributions are (sometimes revised versions of) articles that appeared as a special issue of the Anthropology of East Europe Review in 1993, at the height of the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. This timing explains some of the tensions and controversies between the different contributions, but thankfully, the editors have not attempted to iron these out. At times, this appears to result in a lack of coherence. However, leaving certain contentious debates unsolved, as is done in the introduction by Halpern and Kideckel, is only realistic. The result is a volume that is as wide-ranging as it is copulent. Geographically, the book is one of the few that aims to consider virtually all regions of the former Yugoslav state, from the Slovenian-Austrian-Italian borderland to the Prespa Lake in Macedonia. This might disturb some local observers who feel uncomfortable with the western tendency to illuminate commonalities of post-Yugoslav experience. It should not, because the volume reflects adequately the great cultural diversity of the area. Another satisfying dimension of the book is its multidisciplinarity. Driven largely by anthropological perspectives, it borrows nevertheless, and this includes several of the anthropological contributions themselves from, amongst others, history, law and psychiatry. In this respect, the contributors display an awareness of the inability of any one discipline, and anthropology in particular, with its eye for the small-scale, to offer comprehensive answers to answers to large questions such as how a state with over twenty million inhabitants who had cohabited relatively peacefully for 45 years could have disintegrated so quickly and so violently.

Credit where credit is due then. Yet, one cannot shake off the feeling that the strengths of this volume are simultaneously its weaknesses. First of all, the volume is rather loosely edited. By this I do not mean that the editors ought to have made more strenuous efforts to iron out the contradictions within and between the different contributions, nor that they ought to have offered a more ‘authoritative’ and ‘objective’ introduction. However, reading of the volume would have been made considerably easier by the provision of a clearer framework through which to consider the many controversies that the contributions raise. As it stands, the loose ends of the volume sometimes precipitate confusion rather than the fertile discussion that they are undoubtedly designed to provoke. In defence of the editors, most work on post-Yugoslav issues struggles with this problem. And it is a problem largely of the intense politicisation of almost all issues pertaining to the region: how does one provide a framework without imposing a perspective that may be seen as too uncomfortably close to one of the diverging, and usually nationalist, lines of thinking in the area?

A second problem concerns the issue of representation. Precisely because of its desire to reflect the diversity of the former Yugoslav region, the book sometimes slips into the classic problems of what one might call the ‘round table syndrome’. This method of conflict resolution, well known on the post-Yugoslav political scene, carries as its unintended consequence a tendency to attribute
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representativity to the participants. While they do not represent the people of the post-Yugoslav states, amongst most readers with limited experience or knowledge of the region, many of them will be seen as representative of ‘their nation’, whether arguing along nationalist lines or not. This problem is, of course, partly beyond the control of the authors. However, in some cases they do not help. A certain national entrenchment was displayed by the reactions of Croatian anthropologists to the original special issue of Anthropology of East Europe Review, and it is stimulated again in this volume by chapters with titles such as ‘Serbia: the inside story’. Surely, there are millions of inside stories in Serbia. And they change all the time.

Finally, in my view, the multidisciplinary approach taken in the volume risks losing itself in its ambitiousness. While providing important information on the situations in the post-Yugoslav states from a variety of backgrounds, for anthropologists the most interesting and enlightening, and certainly the most challenging, insights in the volume remain the ones that are tightly related to fieldwork. I would specifically mention Bax’s superbly detailed analysis of the local conflict that led to violence in Medjugorje, Minnich’s life history of an elderly woman in the Slovenian borderlands and Schwartz’s study of the meaning of ‘civil society’ in Macedonia. It is in these few explicitly ethnographic chapters that we get a more evocative glimpse of the complexity of the issues, through detailed discussion of everyday life events. Unfortunately, fine accounts such as these remain all too rare. It is more than a decade since the wars broke out and more than half a decade since the Dayton Agreements. However, there is still the need for ethnographic accounts of post-Yugoslav reality during war.

STEF JANSEN
University of Hull


Clifford Geertz is privileged; he is the first and only anthropologist in the prestigious Key Contemporary Thinkers series, rubbing shoulders with Derrida, Barthes, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Chomsky, Foucault, Bauman, Habermas and Popper. Presumably too much has already been written about Lévi-Strauss. Evans-Pritchard, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown are presumably too parochial, but what of Edmund Leach?

There is probably no better intellectual biographer to present Clifford Geertz than Fred Inglis, Professor of Cultural Studies at the University of Sheffield. He is a fan without being obsequious, having first been introduced to one of Geertz’s major contributions, The interpretation of cultures (1973) some twenty-five years ago. Inglis tells us he ‘read it straight through, transfixed, on a Devon beach’ (p. ix). Yet at times Inglis does tend to be too fulsome in his praise. Geertz is undoubtedly one of the foremost anthropologists of our time, but he has had a better press in American cultural anthropology than in European structuralist circles. He towers over the anthropology and sociology of Southeast Asia; indeed, Indonesia and Geertz seem to me to be inseparable. It is quite clear that in Inglis’ hands culturalism comes out decidedly better than structuralism, or neo-Marxism for that matter. Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict receive generous treatment in spite of Derek Freeman, and George Homans and David Schneider get off lightly in spite of Rodney Needham.

Inglis wrote the book whilst a Fellow-in-Residence at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences in 1998–9. He had also previously spent several months at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton and a year at the School of Social Science there, Geertz’s home. The book is dedicated to the Institute. Inglis gave Geertz the manuscript of the book to read; Geertz corrected factual errors but ‘forbore commentary’ (p. x).

Seven chapters and ‘A Geertz bibliography’ provide an admirably comprehensive picture of the anthropologist thinking, doing, writing and developing.

Inglis gives us a sketch of Geertz’s early life and the main influences on his thought (‘the tenor of the setting’, ‘the idiom of the work’; English and American literature, as well as Ludwig Wittgenstein, George Geiger, John Austin, Gilbert Ryle, Kenneth Burke, William Empson, F. R. Leavis, Talcott Parsons, Clyde Kluckhohn, and Margaret Mead); then a sketch of his early career at Antioch College, Ohio and Harvard (‘making up his mind’); a two-chapter evaluation of Geertz’s three main field sites (Java, Bali and Morocco), nicely contextualised, and the major texts to emerge from these; Geertz’s approach, perspectives and methods (‘portrait of a method’ and the key notions in this; ‘thick description’, the ‘incompleteness’ of cultural
Agricultural involution.

Inglis' words, on Geertz's behalf, 'anthropology is the study of everyday affairs not Absolute Mind' [p. 140], Geertz's scepticism of the Bourdieuan Marxist 'habitus' in Algeria, Geertz following in the footsteps of Margaret Mead, Geertz keeping his nerve amidst the uncertainties of postmodernism; and finally a celebration of what Inglis sees as the 'noblest' of Geertz's 'Palladian villas', 'the summit of Geertz's thought'; Negara. The theatre state in nineteenth-century Bali (1980) ('the construction of a Balinese king', 'politics dissolved into culture', 'kingship as performance', and the general lesson that 'statecraft is a thespian art' [p. 166]).

It should be said here that Negara has come in for some pretty heavy criticism, and I do not see it as Geertz's best work, nor as that which has had the greatest impact, either in anthropology or Indonesian studies. In my view Geertz's work on Bali, including his study of kinship with Hildred Geertz, has always been less satisfactory and fulfilling than the earlier Javanese studies.

What is Geertz best known for? The interpretation of cultures. Selected essays and Local knowledge. Further essays in interpretive anthropology (1983) are the key works; and the very fertile cluster of ideas surrounding the concept of 'culture' – as system, as public action, as symbolic action, as values, above all as 'webs of significance', the elements of which were brought together from various sources in the development of Geertz's thought and, in his masterful and overpowering use of prose, given a Geertzian twist. Culture then is his 'most persistent interest', and it is anthropology's task to search out, reveal, interpret and explain the 'symbolic dimensions of social action' (1973: 30). Humans are above all 'symbolizing, conceptualizing, meaning-seeking' creatures (p. 140). The task is even more straightforwardly expressed in Local Knowledge, when we are told cultural anthropology tries 'to determine what this people or that take to be the point of what they are doing' (1983: 4).

For me, then, in contrast to Inglis, in order of importance come Geertz's detailed ethnography The religion of Java (1960) and the ecological-historical masterpiece Agricultural involution. The processes of ecological change in Indonesia (1963). Both have excited much attention and criticism. The religion of Java is certainly one of the most outstanding ethnographies of a Southeast Asian culture. What is more, critical commentaries on Agricultural involution have become an academic industry in their own right. Curiously, it seems to me that it is no longer very important whether or not Geertz's interpretations and conclusions about the trajectory of Javanese culture and society were correct; instead the book has had a powerful influence on the ways in which Indonesians have been historically constructed and interpreted, and it makes as compelling reading now as it did when it was first published. Peddlers and princes (1963) and The social history of an Indonesian town (1965) are in comparison with the other two members of the Javanese quartet rather minor classics. Mention should also be made of Geertz's first-class essay 'Notes on the Balinese cockfight'; it deserves to be read by all students of anthropology as an example of how to present good, entertaining, arresting anthropology (for Inglis 'it is accessible to the commonest reader, vivid, pungent, moving and profound' [p. 85]).

Although brief, Geertz's depiction of the contest between the Balinese witch, Rangda and the 'endeering monster', Barong in his 'Religion as a cultural system' displays the same qualities. Whether or not one likes Geertz's prose, he manages almost effortlessly to bring cultures to life. Inglis could have said more about Geertz's Javanese quartet and the criticisms of them, some of which are very testing, and the reactions to his work of Indonesian social scientists. He does not really relate Geertz's analyses of Javanese society and culture to earlier Dutch work and J. S. Furnivall's interpretations of Netherlands East India, which had a significant influence on the way in which Geertz presents Javanese reactions to change and the consequences for them of modernization. And what of Geertz's legacy in Indonesian studies? The work of Robert Hefner and Andrew Beatty, among many others, would have merited a mention here.

How does Inglis sum up Geertz's vision of humankind? Rather well I think: 'He sees everywhere the “infinite plasticity” of human nature, and sees it as given form and substance, solidity and essence only by the studied reiterations of culture and history' (p. 149). For anyone who wants to get into Geertz's head and have a succinct, lively and entertaining account of his work, then Inglis is required reading – though I am bound to say it is not easy reading.

VICTOR T. KING
University of Hull
In the last decade of his life, Eric Wolf was a faithful participant at the conferences of the European Association of Social Anthropologists. For many of us he became a friend and a mentor. It is some comfort, a year after his death, to have this book in which one hears his voice again, sane, scholarly, calm and witty, worldly and yet engaged, reminding us, as ever, how much can be done with our repertoire of ideas and methods.


He renews our interest in these matters, makes them fresh and exciting, above all through his insistence on context and change, and in particular the interaction of colonial interventions and indigenous responses.

The main theme of these case studies is that customary practices and ruling ideologies grow out of conflicts of interests and battles of ideas, so that no approach that is dominantly idealist or materialist is adequate to explain them. The same logic leads him to interrogate his sources for their ideological messages, and to situate the interests they serve. But Eric Wolf refused to accept that all accounts of cultural processes are necessarily ideological. On the contrary, he insists that it is our duty to strive for objectivity. 'The anthropologist’s task should be neither to exalt nor to condone but to explain.'

To be sure, this directive is very hard to accept in the case of Nazi Germany, and particularly since Wolf’s own life was blighted by the rise of the National Socialist movement. And when it comes to this final case another concern must be admitted, more parochial but still worrying enough. Surely every possible theoretical perspective has been brought to bear in the attempt to understand the Holocaust? What can the anthropologist offer? I find it inspiring that at the very end of his life Eric Wolf drew upon the anthropological tradition in order to reconsider the transforming tragedy of his generation. And he succeeds in making the case for a fresh perspective, one that is bravely analytical and distinctively anthropological.

The Nazis cannot be dismissed as madmen. Nor did they just work out the logic of a millennium of Teutonic anti-semitism. Nor were they rational agents of a capitalism in crisis. Rather, German National Socialism should be ‘understood as a movement akin to the cargo cults and ghost dances studied by anthropologists’. Here, in this terrible set of events, Eric Wolf identifies not just the force of beliefs but also the kinship of this apocalyptic modern ideology with other, world-wide movements of reaction, of destruction and self-destruction, in the face of uncomprehended crises. This analysis deserves to be widely discussed. Eric’s voice will echo in our lecture halls and seminar rooms for many years to come because he taught and practised an anthropology that could face up to any challenge. His was an anthropology for grown-ups.

**ADAM KUPER**

*Brunel University*
It is hardly surprising that in an era when both the migration of people and the diversity of their places of origin are increasing exponentially that output of published material on the subject has in recent years, as has periodically been the case throughout the twentieth century, intensified. In this context, Brettell and Hollifield’s edited volume Migration theory. Talking across disciplines may appear to be some somewhat superfluous. More particularly, the same could justifiably be said about multidisciplinary approaches to the subject. However, such criticism is misplaced here, for what marks this volume out is its quality and the realisation of its aspirations. On one hand, it offers eight chapters that coherently summarise the state of the art in a fairly comprehensive range of disciplines: history, demography, sociology, anthropology, political science and international relations, law, and two chapters on the economics of migration. The chapters on sociology, political science and, above all, anthropology, by Brettell herself, are particularly strong. On the other hand, and importantly, the volume manages to offer much more than a pot pourri of different disciplinary perspectives. More than multidisciplinary, it is interdisciplinary. The introductory chapter provides an excellent summary of ways in which different disciplines have intersected and diverged in terms of their theoretical and empirical approaches to migration. Each contribution addresses, though to differing degrees, these similarities and divergences from the perspective of their own particular discipline. What this leads to is an unusual degree of critical disciplinary reflexivity. For example, and not untypically, Hasia R. Diner’s chapter on ‘History and the study of immigration’ offers the startlingly honest conclusion that in comparison to sociology and anthropology, history’s contribution to migration theory is almost non-existent.

At the outset of this volume the editors claim to offer a ‘dialogue’ between disciplines so that migration can become a ‘unified field of study’. A very bold claim indeed, but this volume has gone some considerable way to achieve fulfil it. Brettell and Hollifield’s volume should be regarded as essential reading for scholars interested in migration, and particularly those, who (sensibly) appreciate the need to look beyond the confines of their own discipline for insight into the subject.

DOLORES GALAN MARMOLEJO
University of Seville


This second, updated and enlarged edition of the Bibliography on ethnic relations in Eastern Europe includes major writings by sixteen contributors that address in fulsome complexity the issues of ethnicity, nationalism, ethnic conflict, conflict resolution, institutions and the political participation of minorities, and new initiatives in managing multiethnic co-existence. It offers a selection of relevant literature in English, Russian, German and local languages. Most contributions focus on particular national contexts, but often have wider regional and theoretical relevance.

The bulk of the material was gathered by the local contributors, each of whom attempted to compile the most significant work relevant to the themes of the book and published after 1989 pertaining to their particular country or sub-regional specialism. The second resource on which the book draws is the library of the Central European University in Budapest. In the case of the English books and journal articles referred to, there is a heavy, but appropriate reliance on the library’s regional collection relating to the study of nationalism and ethnic relations. A third strand of the material is drawn from the Sociological Abstract and, to a lesser extent, a range of other bibliographies.

The contributors to the bibliography have clearly worked to a standardised and well-delineated list of thematic and geographic keywords, and this lends it considerable coherence. The structure of the bibliography is thematic, and all items are introduced on the basis of their first, and most important subject keyword. The secondary order within each thematised chapter is alphabetical by author and editor. Use of the bibliography is made easy by the help of its various indexes. The index section contains (1) an authors and editors index, (2) a thematic index, (3) an index of journals, and (4) a geographical index, including regions, countries and ethnic minority names. In classifying the regions, a number of
general categories are used, such as Central Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary), Southeast Europe (Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Albania, Bulgaria, Romania), the Baltic (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), the Commonwealth of Independent States (for the whole former Soviet Union excluding the Baltic States), CIS – the Western Republics (Russian Federation, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova), CIS – the Transcaucasus (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan), and CIS – Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan). Eastern Europe is the collective name used when more and all sub-regions are referred to.

The small multiethnic regions (for example, Kosovo and Transylvania) are included in the ethnic minority index. The numbers in the indexes are identical to the serial numbers of the records in the bibliography.

It is clear that this bibliography is far from comprehensive. However, the editor did set out solely to assist those in search of basic and foundational works, analyses and interpretations of Eastern European ethnic phenomena. In this respect, the choice of contents is judicious. This bibliography will undoubtedly prove to be an invaluable aid to policy analysts, those engaged in reform-oriented projects and scholars interested in Eastern Europe.

FARUK OSMANBEGOVIC
Tuzla University


Marie-Bénédicte Dembour’s reflections on colonialism and its memory have produced an elegant, well-written and delightfully honest book. Her engagement with a group of former Belgian colonial administrators epitomises a dilemma of fieldwork in general and of the historical ethnography of colonialism in particular: the fact that, in a discipline that has condemned ethnocentrism for so long, it is difficult to deal with those who have always been said to represent it (missionaries, colonial administrators) without prejudice and preconception. Dembour frankly confesses to the desire of wanting to make the administrators ‘confess the unspeakable’ – the cruelty and violence of colonial rule – yet is equally meticulous in charting how, in their conversations, this desire ran up against the administrators’ interpretation of their work, and their stress on its legality and order, and its moral complexity.

The interplay of these incommensurabilities makes for useful reading. It produces what one could call an ethnography of oral history that Dembour takes far beyond earlier work on the issue by allowing the former administrators to comment on the inadequacies of her text – exploding, by concrete example, the methodological fiction that anthropological descriptions reflect what interlocutors say. This argument of reflexive anthropologists was often obscured by the fact that they tended to interpose themselves, by a too frequent reference to the ‘I’ of the writer, between reader and people studied. Dembour cannot be accused of that. Her honesty prevents her from obscuring the voice of the administrators she interviewed. This results in a particularly vivid description of some of the pitfalls of the ethnographic relationship.

Yet it at the same time uncovers the weakness of the book; its concentration on the moral debate between Dembour and her interlocutors reinforces another methodological fiction of anthropology, that anthropology exists primarily in the dyadic relationship with one’s interlocutors. Africanist ethnography, whether one likes it or not, is always informed and complicated by a relationship with a third party – a national government, colonial rulers, a group of missionaries. In Dembour’s case, it is the Africans who are absent, by which the colonial situation becomes only a shadowy presence refracted in moral argument. Dembour is, I feel, so pessimistic about oral history, so economical with descriptions of the Belgian Congo, so concentrated on the task of affirming or disproving the moral condemnation of colonial violence, that one tends to agree with the administrators she interviewed that she fails to grasp the moral complexity and ordinariness of the colonial situation (see p. 190). This reduction of the research relationship becomes particularly clear when she reflects on the ‘allochrony’ – or ‘distancing-through-time’ – of her relationship with the administrators (p. 199). Of course, this was a practice of allochrony based on and totally saturated by the practice of another allochrony, namely that produced by administrators about Africans in the colonial situation and its legitimations itself. This reminder, however, of the triadic relationship between ethnographer, administrators and African is subsumed by the fiction of dealing with researcher and researched
only. Thus, the book shows – albeit surreptitiously – that for reflexivity to become a truly integral part of research, one needs an epistemology of (post)colonialism rather than a morality of fieldwork.

PETER PELS
University of Amsterdam

**Pieces of mosaic.** An essay on the making of *Makedonija*. By Jonathan Matthew Schwartz.

*Pieces of mosaic* is something of an anthropological anomaly. Neither essay nor full monograph, it is instead a slim volume of whirlwind writing. Stating concisely its substantive terms is no easy task. As the title implies, the book is concerned primarily with the ‘making’ of multi-cultural Macedonia and possibilities for ethnic co-existence. A deceptively diverse piece of work, sub-themes include the development of civil society, migration, the role of NGO’s and diaspora. The fieldwork upon which it is based was carried out mainly amongst the Turkish-speaking population of the multi-ethnic town of Resen, Macedonia. There is also reference to data from Denmark, Canada and Greece.

*Pieces of mosaic* is a jumpy and slightly diffuse account. Not surprising, given that it was written ‘in a sprint’ (p. vii), and completed merely three months after Schwartz’s return from the field. The prose, however, seems decidedly unhurried. While some passages make for truly beautiful reading, others seem overwrought and rely too heavily on the use of overextended metaphor. A similar metaphorical excess colours early sections on method. This is particularly true of the section explaining the relevance of the ‘mosaic’ in the title of the book. Readers will be pleased to learn that *Pieces of mosaic* is not intended as a metaphor for distinct cultural units, but rather for the ‘fragments’ of ethnographic data collected during fieldwork. A similar metaphorical excess colours early sections on method. This is particularly true of the section explaining the relevance of the ‘mosaic’ in the title of the book. Readers will be pleased to learn that *Pieces of mosaic* is not intended as a metaphor for distinct cultural units, but rather for the ‘fragments’ of ethnographic data collected during fieldwork. Despite these criticisms, this first chapter does serve as a handy springboard for more engaging discussions about recent, dangerous metaphorisations of ‘The Balkans’ in scholarly and other domains.

Extended discussions about the politics of representation are indicative of Schwartz’s explicitly political stance on ethnographic practice. The author describes himself as an intervention anthropologist and a civil iconoclast. Grand sounding labels indeed, but ones that in reality hide quite modest aims. The ‘intervention’ here is against portrayals of ‘The Balkans’ which characterise the region as a hotbed of essential hatreds. The ‘iconoclasm’ comes in the process of ironicising supposedly irreconcilable differences. Specifically, Schwartz believes that the public airing of ‘hard and hateful histories’ may help dissolve their potential power. This push to make politics central to practice is arguably *Pieces of mosaic*’s greatest contribution to contemporary anthropology.

Substantively, the data presented in *Pieces of mosaic* is wide-ranging, if a little impressionistic. To Schwartz’s great credit, and especially given the political aims of the piece, he does not shy from showing the less appealing facets of life in Macedonia. Nor does he paint an overly rosy picture of ethnic co-existence. Instead, he adeptly highlights, through the use of descriptive anecdotes, some of the processes of differentiation and co-operation between and within ethnic groups. The anecdotes which most powerfully support his tentatively hopeful impressions of the present are those which outline ethnic convergences, the existence of similar (if variegated) myth-histories and reciprocal practices surrounding festivals.

In insisting on Resen as a modestly ‘functional’ community (p. 130), though, Schwartz may provoke the wrath of committed anti-functionalists. His argument must be understood as allied to a more general belief in the need for an anthropological defence of ‘viable forms of community’ (p. 130). This, he cogently argues, is even more pertinent in the wake of the wholesale destruction witnessed in the former Yugoslavia. Whether or not any community, as he goes on to argue, can be understood as ‘more or less discrete and coherent’ (p. 128, my emphasis) is entirely another matter. His reasoning here runs a little ahead of itself, and is not necessary for the more general terms of his argument.

Indeed, it runs rather counter to his defence of the multi-sited nature of the study. Aside from Resen, *Pieces of mosaic* also draws on data from Toronto, Copenhagen and Florina. The Danish data on shifting homelands in the diaspora and on new-co-operative multi-ethnic ventures sits easily with the rest of the book. The Canadian data is less well integrated and seems a little superfluous here. While being of undeniable comparative value, it is not at home in this volume and would perhaps benefit from a separate treatment.

Viewed as a whole, the book is lacking internal
consistency and an easily discernible narrative structure. This said, it is not entirely fair to judge *Pieces of mosaic* according to the same criteria as works longer in gestation. Given the importance of its themes and the lack of any similarly thoughtful work on this particular area, *Pieces of mosaic* is certainly a candidate for expansion into a carefully structured, fuller ethnography. In the meantime, some rich rewards await those who are willing to look imaginatively at these fragments from the field.

**NERYS ROBERTS**  
*Melbourne University*