'It’s the culture,' said the administrator, contemplating further evidence of resistance to change on the part of the humanities and social science faculty. This was an occasion when, ever helpful, I felt obliged to offer the advice of a ‘professional social anthropologist’, and point out that culture ‘as such’ could never be an explanation, but only the starting point for complex and dynamic analysis. The contributors to this volume, concerned with ‘the role that culture plays in mediating the impact of, and responses to public policy’ would undoubtedly concur.

Anthropologists in Northern Ireland, mainly but not exclusively in Queen’s University, Belfast, have engaged with local policy issues to a greater extent than in any other region of Britain, and probably Europe. This inevitably comes with their location. Though one could, just, imagine anthropologists elsewhere in Europe so oblivious to the world immediately around them as to focus exclusively on the Amazon or New Guinea, in Northern Ireland that has been neither possible nor desirable. Even without the ‘troubles’, the long-term difficulties of a province on the periphery of Europe, with an industrial sector in deep decline for over a generation and an agricultural economy subjected to fifty years of structural change, would have demanded the attention of local social scientists. But the enduring sectarian conflict (the Queen’s department came into existence shortly before the present troubles began) ensured that anthropologists based in Northern Ireland, as well as conducting research in Africa and South Asia (and in ethnomusicology), had strong incentives to think regionally, and tackle policy issues.

A previous volume by the same editors (Social anthropology and public policy in Northern Ireland, Aldershot: Avebury, 1989) argued for policy engagement in terms of the methodological advantages of the anthropological perspective. That case still needs to be made: qualitative approaches continue to be viewed with suspicion, not least in policy circles. Nonetheless, the debate has moved on, and Donnan and McFarlane’s excellent introduction, which inter alia provides an overview of policy-related anthropology in Northern Ireland, now offers a much fuller and substantive account of what ‘anthropology in the public arena’ means. In fact, the phrase is ambiguous, signalling a number of ways in which as there is a distinction between ‘anthropology of development’ and ‘development anthropology’, so there is an ‘anthropology of policy’, offering an anthropological perspective on processes of policy making and their impact, and varying degrees of closeness to or distance from policy making itself. Two contributions make the distinction clear.

Kay Milton, well-known for her publications on environmentalism, shows how debates in the 1980s about access to the countryside revealed two discourses of ‘land’ and ‘landscape’, which reflected different orientations towards ‘modernity’ and ‘postmodernity’, and which, as she shows, were in turn intertwined in complex ways with the language and experience of sectarianism. Her posterior reflections on public policy and its impact appear to be at some distance from the policy makers themselves. ‘Appear to be’, because, as Donnan and McFarlane point out, in the somewhat circumscribed world of Northern Ireland with its ‘small scale and dense networks’, relationships between intellectuals, politicians, policy makers and policy professionals are closer than elsewhere in Britain. Nonetheless, if I read her correctly, Milton is not in direct conversation with policy people, and this is true of most of the contributors to this volume, who are, rather, addressing matters of public concern in the hope – expectation even – that what they write will be read by, and influence, those who make policy.

Bryan and Jarman’s paper on ‘Parading tradition’, based on long-term research into an important but hitherto understudied phenomenon, the ‘marching season’, describes a more direct
engagement with a practical and indeed pressing issue: what to do about the sectarian parades which have been such a focus for violent confrontation in recent years. Parades have always been part of the Ulster scene, but in the 1980s they grew in importance and scale (especially the smaller ‘local’ events). Bryan and Jarman began research in 1990/91, and although their original intention was academic, by 1995 they could not ignore how fiercely contested parades had become. At this point, they secured funding (previously hard to obtain) from the Northern Ireland Central Community Relations Unit for a study of attitudes. Building on long-term qualitative research, and using ‘participatory’ techniques, they prepared a report which inter alia discussed a variety of practical ways in which the problem might be addressed. Issued at the height of the 1996 marching season, the report fed directly into ongoing policy debates, though its precise impact is unclear from what they say.

The volume therefore covers work having greater or lesser degrees of involvement with policy professionals. Only a minority of contributors have had their research sponsored by policy bodies, and most offer reflections on what ongoing anthropological fieldwork has revealed about the impact of policy in areas as diverse as rural development (Ian Macaulay), health (Rosanne Ceci) and employment (Kate Ingram), and Eithne McLaughlin, who draws nicely on Bloch and Parry to discuss the ‘meaning of money’). Although none are able to ignore sectarianism, its significance is sometimes less than expected (e.g. in Donnan and McFarlane on ‘Counselling the unemployed’).

Generally, though, it is central (Colin Irwin on education, Gordon McCoy on language policy and Jude Stephen on the Green Party). Andrew Dawson (‘Identity and strategy in post-production agriculture’) draws many of the threads together in a convincing account of the ‘complex interplay’ (the editors’ phrase) of policy, culture, externally driven economic change and the sectarian divide.

All in all, this is a very valuable collection. With the possible exception of South Wales, I doubt whether anthropologists in any other region of Britain could offer anything as wide-ranging and rich.

R. D. GRILLO
University of Sussex


This book claims to shed light on the struggle and politics surrounding dam projects, and on their social and environmental impact. It has an intriguing and promising title, but is a disappointment to the anthropologist looking for detailed ethnography on social impact, for the culture and organisation of development consultancies or for an analysis of ‘Nordic development thinking’ as such. It is a collection of 11 essays presented at a workshop organised by the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation. The book is written in the style of critical journalism, and at times in that of a political pamphlet, using timely slogans of ‘patriarchal structures’, ‘ordinary people’ and ‘authentic cultural identity’ in ways that invite anthropological analysis rather than contribute to it.

Although the wrapping promises a scholarly book, it might not be fair to judge it as one, as it has only few references to anthropology or other social sciences. The best sections of the book are the four chapters written by Usher herself, who is an environmental journalist and who has at that level done good background research into the main actors involved in Nordic dam projects. However, the reader is given little insight into the ways these main actors think, except by implication ‘Business! Business!’ Of empirical interest to the anthropologist are some observations made about the close network of interest between the ‘experts’ and ‘the dam industry’. Some empirical comments on quick-and-dirty anthropological consultancies may also offer food for professional reflection.

GUDRUN DAHL
Stockholm University


All good ethnographies go beyond ethnography; they draw explicitly on theoretical ideas to interpret empirical observations, and draw explicitly on those observations to develop theoretical ideas. Eeva Berglund’s book Knowing nature, knowing science is in this tradition.
Potential readers should not be misled by the subtitle into expecting a largely descriptive work. Instead, they will find a thought provoking attempt to build an anthropology of science through ethnography.

The ethnography in question concerns environmental activists in a German town situated a few miles on the western side of the former border with East Germany, whose historical presence forms a backdrop to the events described. After an introductory chapter which establishes both the theoretical and the ethnographic background to the work, the book is divided into three parts, each of which deals with a case study in local environmental activism.

The first concerns a toxic waste deposit on the opposite side of the former border. A small exclusive group of highly committed activists has conducted a long-term campaign against the deposit. They are radical, confident, deeply suspicious of the establishment and resistant to cooperation. The second concerns proposals for a motorway, which provoked opposition both from local groups potentially affected by the plans, and from longer established ecology organisations seeking to conserve nature. An uneasy coalition of these groups seeks an independent basis for their protest by commissioning an expert study, which proves to be a source of internal conflict. The third case study concerns proposals for a power station, which are opposed by two groups of experienced and articulate environmental activists. Their priorities are different. One is concerned about the health hazards posed by ‘electrosmog’, while the other seeks a fundamental rethink of energy policy, an approach which renders fears about local health hazards redundant.

If I have one complaint about the book it is that these ethnographies do not tell me enough. They provide tantalising glimpses of a world about which both trained social scientists and naturally inquisitive readers will itch to learn more. What was the content and the outcome of the expert study on transport policy? What happened to relationships soured by conflict? How is the concept of Kultur constituted? However, if these omissions enabled more space to be devoted to theoretical discussion, then they are easily tolerated, for this is the book’s most valuable asset.

Each of the ethnographic case studies is itself presented in two parts: a more descriptive chapter followed by a more analytical, interpretative chapter in which insights from anthropology and other social sciences are brought to bear on the material. As expected in a discussion which explores people’s understandings of nature, environment, culture and science, the ideas of Douglas, Ingold, Strathern, Beck and Wynne, among others, are given a good airing. In particular, in the more analytical chapters, the ways in which scientific knowledge is understood and used by environmental activists are explored. One of the strongest messages to emerge is that, rather than being opposed to emotional and affective considerations, it is enlisted to support such motivations, the explicitness of this role depending on the context in which arguments are being made.

In the final chapter, Berglund draws on her earlier observations to develop her own anthropology of science which goes beyond the constructivist approach advocated by sociologists such as Wynne. Constructivism fails to reflect people’s experience of a world in which a real environment presents real dangers, a reality which Douglas and Wildavsky, for instance, acknowledge but fail to address. In escaping constructivism, Ingold’s concept of engagement provides a useful analytical tool. But an anthropology of science also needs to recognise the power of scientific knowledge as an idiom for describing nature. This quality is fully utilised by activists engaged in their own power struggles with various parts of the establishment.

This book has the potential to make an important contribution to anthropological and sociological debates on nature, culture and science. It is also an exemplary demonstration of creative interaction between theory and ethnography. It will be a shame if its availability in hardback only leads to it receiving less attention than it deserves.

KAY MILTON
Queen’s University, Belfast


This is a book that is fascinating and frustrating in turn. Fascinating in so far as it describes an important religious movement that has hitherto been largely un researched, and frustrating because the author is not only an enthusiastic supporter of the groups studied but has, to some extent, been co-opted by them.

Miller and his research assistants, Brenda Brasher and Paul Kennedy, have been studying
three post-denominational or new-paradigm churches originally established in Southern California in the 1960s: Vineyard, Calvary and Hope. They have carried out substantial fieldwork and have taken the sociological principle of triangulation seriously, administering hundreds of questionnaires, both to members and pastors, taping and transcribing 200 interviews and participating in over 200 events in California and elsewhere.

These churches, ‘new-paradigm’ and ‘post-denominational’, are neither fundamentalist or pentecostal, nor mainline (Episcopalian, Baptist or Methodist) but are situated, in terms of their faith and practice, somewhere between these more commonly researched groups. Miller’s findings make interesting reading. Each church has spread rapidly throughout the United States: there are 406 Vineyard congregations (as well as 173 in other countries), 614 Calvary congregations (97 in other countries) and 50 Hope congregations. Several of these include mega-churches with memberships of over 7,000, while the average congregation is around 150. The first thing to note, then, is the vigorous growth of each of these churches as well as their global trajectory.

What, then, are the salient characteristics of these post-denominational churches? First, members are predominately young and lower middle-class. Second, drawing on William James, Miller argues that for members of these new paradigm churches, experience is central. Life stories are presented which indicate the centrality of conversion to most members. Equally important is their familiarity with, and dependence on, the Bible. Worship itself consists of singing up-beat religious songs (often written by members of the worshipping groups) and listening to Bible exegesis, as well as speaking in tongues, healing, prayer and ‘holy laughter’. Miller is right to underline the embodied nature of much of this participation and furthermore its emotional as against its cognitive quality.

Miller turns to Weber in an attempt to understand the popularity of post-denominational churches. Each of them has a very flat formal bureaucratic structure and church leaders adopt a number of strategies in an attempt to stall routinisations. Congregations support the minimum of paid employees and avoid complex committee structures. Although junior pastors opting to establish fledgling churches receive spiritual support, they are generally not given substantial financial support – if they ‘have the gift’ they can expect their growing congregation to support them. Although each congregation has a senior pastor who is likely to have the last word when large decisions need to be made, pastors and lay leaders retain a considerable amount of autonomy. Decentralisation is further encouraged through small worship groups, which meet regularly in the homes of members.

New paradigm churches utilise modern technology to maximum effect. Music performed by resident rock bands is recorded and CDs are sold at church stores; sermons are taped and sometimes videoed and made immediately available to members. Many of the larger churches operate their own radio stations and times and places of meetings are widely broadcast. Their services are informal with a minimum of traditional ritual. They are often held in premises purchased primarily for their large capacity – old warehouses, sports centres, supermarkets, cinemas and theatres. Those attending, including pastors, dress informally – baptisms are often held at the beach.

Although I like Miller’s slightly ‘racy’ style, I have two major quibbles about this book. First, the author makes great claims for the future of post-denominational churches and probably exaggerates his case somewhat in labelling this movement a ‘Third Great Awakening’. It is understandable that Miller, a professor of religion and committed Episcopalian, should want to talk-up the development of ‘successful’ churches, but his sympathy towards them detracts from his overall analysis. He is at pains throughout the text to point out the benefits that await mainline churches should they copy aspects of the post-denominational ‘package’. This causes him to gloss over several important issues. These congregations are still first-generation and it remains to be seen whether they will contrive to maintain a state of permanent renewal when the present leaders are replaced. He admits, for example, that one church, Vineyard, is already becoming increasingly institutionalised and denominational. Despite remarking briefly that congregations are overwhelmingly Republican, are against abortion, homosexuality and extra-marital sexual relations, that they believe ‘only the followers of Jesus Christ and members of his church can be saved’ (p. 108), and that women rarely become senior pastors, Miller the apologist quotes a Vineyard pastor preaching tolerance without demur (p. 129).

Finally, although he accepts the new paradigmers’ claim that they ‘deny the sacred-profane split’ as unproblematic (p. 125), he fails to show how this works out in everyday life, and it is at this point that one yearns for a more thorough ethnography.
My second major problem with Miller’s account is the extent to which he draws on market metaphors. The text is littered with terms such as: ‘the religious economy’, ‘brand loyalty’, ‘market share’, ‘market analysis’, ‘new market constituency’, ‘consumer loyalty’, ‘customer bases’, etc. Miller explicitly accepts the danger of taking this analogy too far when he admits (p. 170) that pastors are entrepreneurs only up to a point – it is, after all, the profit motive, above all else, that drives our captains of industry. It is likely that he has merely assimilated the vocabulary of his subjects, but if this is the case then this reviewer would prefer him to be significantly more self-conscious about it.

Despite these problems this remains an important book. Miller writes clearly and generally supports the claims he makes with empirical evidence. Indeed, the results of his survey work are recorded in three lengthy appendices. As teachers, we advise our students to read critically and that advice is particularly relevant in the case of Reinventing American Protestantism. That said, anyone interested in contemporary American religion and its influence on the practice of Christianity elsewhere should read this book.

PETER J. COLLINS
University of Durham


This stimulating volume on anthropological and theological dimensions of religious experience in Africa weaves a number of analytical strands together in a novel fashion. Shifting constantly from a unified pan-African plane to the local community of the Waso Boorana (Oromo) of northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia, the author presents a coherently argued case for a serious rethink of the analytical categories normally employed in dealing with the experiential and processual elements of religious practices among African populations. In this case the peoples in question are predominantly those characterised by various forms of syncretism and acculturation resulting from conversion to Christianity and Islam. Although somewhat brief in relation to the theoretical task tackled, the text succeeds in inculcating a hypercritical attitude towards our own heavily laden terminology, as well as in opening up a new angle focusing the active, positive and malleable nature of western theological discourse on traditional African religions.

How are the three major stands woven? Firstly, former ethnographic studies of sub-Saharan groups are dealt with but subtly chided for in most cases granting privileged time and space to descriptive approaches to ritual, thereby ignoring, or at least making more difficult, intimate access to local varieties of religious experience at the individual and family levels. The ‘totalistic immediacy of empiricism’ and recognition of ‘realities inaccessible to purely sociological points of view’ are repeatedly mentioned, indicating that what the author seeks to stress is a more reflexive–cognitive or even somewhat hermeneutic view of Africans’ perceptions of African and world religions. Ritual itself cannot suffice; rather, we should be more attentive to the meanings of the experience of rituals and the implications of both of these (meanings/experience) for communication between the human and the divine. Major attention is granted to the complex interactions and tensions between ‘religions of the book’ and earlier forms of indigenous piety, and in particular to the role of missionaries as surprisingly parallel to those of anthropologists, colonial administrators and African theologians. Treatment of these themes seems balanced, well-grounded in bibliographical terms and (albeit a bit timidly) theoretically novel.

The second strand might be labelled an anti-monolithic interpretation of Christianity and Islam and the roles of the latter’s local representatives. Congratulations are due to the author for an interesting section on missionaries as agents of change and on the institution of the mission as a strategic entity: not one citation of Bourdieu or Goody! The entire thrust here appears diametrically opposed to the notion of a kind of monster-Church coined in Goody’s 1983 tract, developing in Western Europe over the centuries via the strategically planned devouring and accumulation of local property. The notion of contextual theology as similar but not identical to anthropological reflection on religion delightfully places both western as well as African theologians in the spotlight – these are neither cold strategists nor mere reproducers of ecclesiastical ideology, but agents of long-term and variable daily human dialogue and contact with prospective converts. The latter can and do relate simultaneously to two religious systems and two Gods, sustaining virtually perennial tensions between (new) religious affiliation and (old but continuing) ethnic, familial
and ritual links. Among the Waso Boorana, after a Muslim funerary ritual, the deceased may thus encounter Muslim and traditional spirits. Similarly, a key concept utilised by Aguilar is *inculturation* (we should be wary of incorrectly translating the Spanish *inculturación* into English as ‘enculturation’). The meaning alluded to here suggests a complex process of reinterpretation whereby both converts as well as the Church itself (priests and other higher-order agents) accommodate, adjust, and remodel liturgical as well as ‘popular’ elements of religion. Citing Horton, Fisher, Icke-Moller, Mudimbe, Beidelman, Strayer and Van der Geest on conversion and missions, the author concludes that the former process need never be viewed – nor do the converts themselves necessarily view it – as final or definitive.

The third strand invokes a refreshing reconsideration of dangerously laden terms such as *animism*, *change*, *tradition*, *Christian*, *strategy* and even mosque. Employing the Spanish word *anima* – referring to the soul of the deceased living on after biological death – would in fact be preferable to distorted constructions deriving from the connotations of ‘animism’; African religions, as well as entire countries and regions, experienced ‘change’ long before the arrival of Christianity and Islam; missionaries retouched and reinterpreted ecclesiastical doctrine as a result of prolonged contact with indigenous populations, thereby ‘reinventing’ specific elements of Christian tradition (à la Hobshawm and Ranger?).

‘Christian’ is an elusive category because it encompasses Scottish Presbyterians, Anglicans, Catholics, the Italian missionaries of the Consolata, the Sisters of the Assumption, Nairobi; mosques are not merely spatial devotional places but sites of cultural socialisation. And so forth. All of this rethinking of categories I find quite salutary and philosophical. Although a few vaguely postmodernist sounding phrases are sprinkled throughout the book (*una postura multi-vocal*; *la polifonía de diferentes voces*) they are wisely placed so as to remind us that postmodern currents retain no monopoly over them. The dominant critical tone with regard to these terms, however, seems to lose some of its bite in the face of one of the volume’s goals: providing succinct ethnographic information. That is, how to be genuinely hypercritical of anthropological terminology and at the same time afford a Spanish-language readership general knowledge on anthropology and religion in Africa?

One final query hovers. Here and there the author’s language – *la Buena Noticia*, *la presencia de Dios se antualiza*, *el Reino de Dios sigue creciendo* – rings somewhat holy itself. Can we deduce a degree of personal involvement in ecclesiastical spheres on the part of the author during some portion of his African fieldwork and sojourns? The autobiographical notes (Ch. 6) with which the volume closes are in this vein elucidative. But I am reading between the lines . . . In general, readers of Cervantes’ language will find this text a lively introduction to the anthropology of religion in Africa.

BRIAN JUAN O’NEILL
Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa, Lisboa


Anthropologists have long been extrapolators of native wisdom, the nebulous set of beliefs that inform the actions of their ‘subjects’. But, as Gupta and Ferguson point out, the epistemologies behind notions of the field and fieldwork (the ‘native wisdom of anthropologists), have remained curiously unexamined. Such ostrich-like behaviour is untenable and irresponsible in the present day. Thus, they advocate a type of thoroughgoing enquiry at which many lesser scholars would perhaps have balked, an understandable reaction considering just exactly what is at stake. Fieldwork has long been the fortress of anthropology. Perhaps it is something of a surprise then, that to all accounts and purposes, the contributors to this volume appear to have executed something of a ‘quiet revolution’.

What should be made clear from the start is that this collection is far more than a critique of anthropological research tools. Rather, it represents a questioning of taken-for-granted notions of ‘what counts’ as anthropological knowledge, as decreed by dominant notions of ‘the field’ and ‘fieldwork’. And one cannot fail to be impressed by the bold way in which the contributors have sought to face, head on, the ‘simultaneously ineffable and pervasive’ (p. 11) effects of an archetypal ‘field’ which has for so long informed anthropological practice and product.

In their excellent introductory chapter, the editors quite sensibly start from the beginning,
with an examination of the historico-political origins of this ‘ideal-type’ field/work. The connections traced here between anthropology, other ‘field sciences’ such as ecology, and world politics are both convincing and revealing, as are the postulations about what such a history might have meant for the way in which ‘cultures’ were subsequently conceptualised.

Central to the rationales of the following papers is the assertion that anthropology has claimed legitimacy through the overdetermination of difference, an ethos which has both conditioned and constrained the way that research is carried out. In (some) anthropological imaginations, the world has appeared as a mosaic of discrete cultural groups, resident in compact – and almost without exception – distinct geographical locations. Hence the exoticity of most fieldwork sites and the proscription against both ‘anthropology at home’ and research which does not focus on a localisable, stable group. And here is the rub. The territorial metaphors which underpin dominant notions of the field mean that many worthwhile, but ‘non-traditional’, anthropological projects resolutely fail to get off the ground. Such projects, the editors suggest, would benefit from a reconceptualisation of fieldwork as a ‘stylised dislocation’.

The questions this book raises will have deep resonances for most anthropologists. This is evidenced in the broad range of substantive issues explored here: among others, the ethnography of transitory social phenomena (Malkki), anthropology and the cultural study of science (Martin) and the relationship between anthropology and other forms of travel (Clifford). However, one gets the sense that some of the contributors have failed to refine their analytical points sufficiently to produce something that is truly intellectually worthwhile. In Kuklick’s case, the historical analysis of fieldwork that she presents seems rather tangential and unfocused. Similarly, Deborah Amory’s analysis of African Studies in the US is hindered on the one hand by the lack of a cogent narrative, and on the other, by an over-reliance on rather poorly extrapolated points about the need for self-reflexivity and multiple positionalities.

Nevertheless, the key points of the well thought-out editorial resonate powerfully with most of the individual contributions. Particularly noteworthy are the chapters by Passaro and Weston, who together present the most compelling case for a rethink of what counts as anthropological knowledge, and the legitimate means for obtaining such knowledge. Drawing on her experience of research amongst the homeless of New York, Passaro presents an intellectually astute critique of the ontologies that underpin seemingly throwaway remarks such as ‘you can’t take the subway to the field’. Her attention to detail thus helps separate her work from some of the blander postmodern pontifications of recent years. Weston’s analysis of the concept of ‘native ethnographer’ is similarly nuanced: when she states in her conclusion that the field is a site for the production of difference, her meaning is crystal clear. Here is self-reflexivity used to its greatest advantage.

Prior to the publication of this collection, some inroads had been made by the likes of Clifford, Olwig and Appadurai into developing a critique of the practice of ‘fieldwork’ and conceptualisations of ‘the field’ within anthropology. Yet what this book does is to interweave these prior insights with some refreshingly new ideas, whilst at the same time resisting the urge to provide ‘all the answers’. Perhaps in retrospect we can develop a set of research tools that we do not feel obliged to place inside inverted commas.

NERYS ROBERTS
University of Hull


This anthology addresses the crisis in the discipline of anthropology ‘in a positive spirit’. In the introduction, the editors emphasise that the crisis of anthropology (as based on the concept of culture and the idea of a world of separate cultures) is also ‘a time of enormous possibilities’. As the essays show very well, the crisis has opened up for new, theoretically challenging opportunities for ethnographic work.

In the introduction, Gupta and Ferguson forward two broad sets of issues they find important for contemporary theoretical and methodological developments. The first concerns questions of place and the way that culture is spatialised; the second relationships between culture and power. The rest of the introduction is dedicated to present and place the individual contributions in relation to three crosscutting themes – place making, identity and resistance –
while simultaneously locating the essays within major theoretical debates. This is indeed a well written, but necessarily dense, short-cut to an extremely complex literature.

The volume explores a vast range of empirical contexts – identities and ideas of home among refugees in Palestine and Tanzania (Bisharat, Malkki), identities and ideas of Heimat in the post-war Germans (Borneman), disciplinary techniques in the modernisation of Chinese factories (Rofel), rural/urban identities and relations during the economic crisis in Zambia (Ferguson), the post-colonial Nonaligned Movement (Gupta), and so on. Apart from the introduction, the volume comprises thirteen individual contributions, seven of which are more or less revised reprints. Six of these appeared in a special 1992 issue of Cultural Anthropology (Gupta and Ferguson, Malkki, Borneman, Ferguson, Rofel, Gupta), and one was published by the Center for Migration Studies in 1994 (Bisharat). While academic pressure to publish sometimes has resulted in superfluous ‘reprints’, the bringing together of the present essays makes sense. Together they give a vivid and broad-ranging picture of the state of art in critical anthropology, in particular – when seen from Europe – as it has developed at North American universities. Diversity notwithstanding, they share a number of common ideas and approaches which come out in the reprinted, as well as in the ‘new’ contributions. Given the publicity that the ‘recycled’ essays have already gained, we confine our review to the new ones.

One of the common ideas concerns the construction of the global–local nexus and, as Peters puts it in his essay, ‘the waning of place as a container of experience’. The authority of the local and the immediate, embodied experience is undercut by ‘image totalities’, i.e. the coherent representations of social totalities which reach us through mass media, including modern administrative practices. The local and the global are not ‘linked’ or ‘articulated’; rather, the local ‘near-sight’ is profoundly informed or even constituted by the ‘far-sight’. This condition of bifocality may be seen as a characteristic of modernity.

In the same vein, Crain poses the question of what it means to be a member of a ‘local community’ in the late capitalist consumer world of simulations and commodified differences. Her answer is grounded in an analysis of the contemporary version of the Andalusian El Rocio pilgrimage tradition and the links between visual representations, mass media and the constitution of locality as these unfold during the annual celebrations.

Koptiuch argues that the ‘third world’ can no longer be geographically marked off as a separate space from the ‘first world’. The ‘third world’ is a symbolic representation (and not a place) of the effects of exploitative incorporation and hegemonic domination. These processes used to take place at a safe and reassuring distance from the imperial ‘home’. Growing disparities between the dominant white population and the ‘minority’ populations of ‘first world’ inner cities (linked to new divisions of labour and global regimes of capital accumulation, strategies of mass marketing, the use of violent disciplinary techniques and hegemonic practices of representation) have nevertheless moved the imperial frontier back ‘home’.

Another idea which runs through the essays regards the relation between power and resistance. The authors do not regard resistance as opposed or external to power but rather as coterminous with networks of power which transform identities and the meanings and forms of resistance. Maddox advocates a ‘comparative analysis of resistance’ which contextualises the particular forms of resistance as well as the subject position of the scholars who undertake such analysis. Polemically he argues that the (North American) anthropologists who made resistance a key concept in the 1980s were blind in regard to the role of academic institutions in the contemporary global history of cultural, political and economic liberalisation. Anthropologists have neglected ‘studying up’ and have given too little attention to the formation and practices of new elites of cosmopolitan officials, planners, experts and scientists who influence what there is to resist in the ‘New World Order’.

Leonard’s essay on Japanese and Punjabi landscapes in rural California is also concerned with power and resistance. She turns the argument on its head by ‘situating the language of the colonizer’ within the precarious discourse of Japanese and Punjabi immigrants in the early twentieth century. That is, she turns from structure to practices of resistance: despite American popular notions that stereotyped them as ‘other’ and despite immigration and citizenship laws that regarded them as natives of other places, these migrants managed – in their own accounts – to revision Asian landscapes in California, and to see themselves as part of these landscapes by taking physical possession of the land and making a livelihood from it. But although Leonard notices
that recent Asian immigrants face different socioeconomic conditions and different sets of social actors than these earlier migrants, her analysis of this point remains weak.

Yet another angle is presented by Coombe’s analysis of trademark rumours in postindustrial imaginary. With reference to demonic rumours (which link companies to Satanism or Ku Klux Klan, for example), Coombe traces the cultural tactics available to people on the margins. Skilful and historically sensitive, she links rumours circulating in African American communities with southern race relations and race relations in contemporary inner city ghettos. She concludes that in a world in which the presence of power increasingly lies in the realm of imaginary, rumours may be understood as ‘cultural guerilla tactics’, as a ‘popular refusal of a dominant cultural logic that replaces exchange value to the extent that even the memory of use value is lost’, in sum, a subaltern means of communication.

While some of the essays give us an empirically grounded analysis, others are explorations or reinterpretative exercises from the perspective of a critical anthropology, including a measure of postmodern word-invention. Several of the reprinted essays were pathbreaking articles when they first appeared, in particular with regard to the relation between power, place and culture. The volume shows the complex range of approaches emerging after the ‘peoples and cultures’ paradigm. The speed with which these new approaches have entered mainstream anthropology across the globe illustrates very well the process of globalisation and re-differentiation which conditioned their production.

FINN STEPPUTAT and NINNA NYBERG SØRENSEN
Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen


The time of the gypsies weaves the tale of one of Europe’s poorest and more marginalised minorities: under socialist rule, the Hungarian Rom that Stewart describes were ‘the lowest of the low’. They lived in a social and economic environment within which they occupied the most peripheral niche, constantly struggling to keep their heads above water. And yet these gypsies were able to tell themselves a story about themselves in which they occupied the centre of the world. Borrowing from Gellner, the author reminds us that indigenous concepts are as liable of masking reality as of revealing it and that, in fact, masking the truth may well be their function. In Stewart’s account, the Rom remain caught between the way things are, and the way they would like them to be. The tug-of-war in which they are involved is what gives their lives their striking character.

In Hungary, the communist authorities attempted to ‘break’ the gypsies and thus exterminate their way of life, mainly through enforced wage labour and housing programmes. They were faced with gypsy creativity and ‘gaiety in the face of despair’, both of which, as Stewart graphically described, enabled the perpetuation of the gypsy ethos. His ethnographic data enables Stewart to take an extremely significant step beyond earlier ethnographies of gypsies (even those that discussed the effects of sedentarisation and urbanisation on gypsy populations): he shows that proletarianisation does not lead to the end of the gypsy way of life. This raises the question of what makes a person a gypsy – a question that Stewart answers with a wealth of ethnographic material and a clear and direct style. The Rom, he explains, ‘adhered to a strongly performative model of identity and personhood’ (p. 234). An analysis of these Rom performances and their background forms the core of the book.

Secondly, Stewart explains Rom processes of boundary making as more than just an effort at keeping themselves distinct: in his account these processes appear as essential to a general attempt to turn relations between gypsies and non-gypsies on their head. He analyses the mechanisms that enabled such cultural inversion (horse dealing, trading with the non-gypsies or gazos, and a complex gendered morality), describing them as ‘acts of cultural appropriation and self-assertion’ (p. 234). In Stewart’s portrait the Rom seize cultural themes from the Magyars around them enabling the author, for example, to talk of ‘shame’ rather than of ‘purity/pollution’. Within this framework gypsies appear as quintessentially European, and their apparent exoticism has to be explained in terms of their embeddedness within Hungarian history. It is this success in meaningfully placing the Rom within a non-gypsy cultural milieu from which they borrow key themes that makes Stewart’s analysis so compelling. His description of the Rom in fact provides a peculiar and rich perspective into Hungarian society – see, for example, his statement
that, ‘far from creating a world of little grey men, the communists inadvertently provided a particularly fertile ground for preserving and elaborating cultural difference’ (p. 8).

Lastly, as other ethnographers of gypsies have done, Stewart emphasises the moral dimension of Rom constructions of themselves and of the non-gypsies. This morality, he successfully demonstrates, is gendered, and the perspective on Rom life that we gain through Stewart’s eyes is a male one. The consequence is that women are obliquely present in Stewart’s book – and it is to his credit that we nonetheless learn much about the gendered context from which performances that are specifically male gain their meaning.

In my view, the main strength of this book lies in the apparent easiness with which the author manages data that were clearly difficult to obtain and also extremely complex. The time of the gypsies draws on rigorous documentation and sharp analysis, and also on the fruitful evocation of what obviously was a fascinating personal experience for the author.

P A L O M A G A Y - Y - B L A S C O
Queen’s University, Belfast


Ethnographically rich, theoretically provocative and methodologically innovative, Linking separate worlds synthesises more than a decade of fine-tuned research on an Andean village, Tapay, and its migrant colonies in the large cities of Arequipa and Lima. Challenging much of the received wisdom from both community and migration studies, Paerregaard shows us how migrant and village worlds are tightly bound together in a state of interdependence that is hidden from outsiders and which usually eludes analysis. He rightfully insists that, like the migrants themselves, we must deal with ideas, people and goods from both worlds. This examination of the ‘covert network of economic, social, and ritual ties which bridge Peru’s distinct worlds’ (p. 2) also dispels stereotypes: a seemingly isolated village is revealed as anything but encapsulated and self-producing; supposedly assimilated urban migrants are shown to maintain strong ties to their Andean homeland. For most Tapeños, whether in their home town or in the city, the ‘other’ side of their community is continually present in their conceptual worlds and sense of self.

Chapter 1 summarises the latest work on the politics of representation in Andean studies, as well as recent debates about the deterritorialisation of culture and community. Paerregaard puts himself in the picture, discussing his development as an anthropologist over time. An ‘Andeanist’ impulse to find an undisturbed reservoir of pure Andean culture initially led him to the distant, roadless village of Tapay for his dissertation research. (To get to the village requires descending, by foot, what is reputedly the deepest canyon in the world, and then climbing up the other side!) His expectations of purity, isolation and boundedness soon evaporated, however, as he became aware of the impact migrants were having on village life. But it was only years later, after considerable research with urban migrants and back in Tapay, that he developed a methodology and conceptual framework able to deal with the fact that three quarters of all adults born in distant Tapay are or have been migrants.

Chapters 2 and 3 look at the history and contemporary social organisation of the community and its colonies, analysing changes in ethnic identity, community, demographics and migration from the colonial period to the present. Chapters 4 and 5 look at the rural and urban livelihoods, household strategies and social networks through which Tapiño exploit both urban and rural resources. In chapter 6, Paerregaard studies the rise and fall of a mestizo family to discuss changes in ethnic composition over time as well as the way that ethnic identities are negotiated within and outside the village today. Chapters 7 and 8 move through contested religious terrain. We see the Protestantism of many return migrants clashing with the native Andean and Catholic religious practices of most non-migrant villagers, as well as the important role that fiestas and fiesta sponsorship plays in the reproduction of cultural identity and status hierarchies. We are also given a window into how rituals and other communal forms from Tapay impact on migrant social organisations, as well as the folklorisation of local identity, in the big city. Within Tapiño culture and community there are a variety of lifestyles which are not territorially bounded, as well as many different views of what ‘Tapay’ and ‘Tapeño’ mean.

The particular blend of quantitative and qualitative methods that Paerregaard mobilises ultimately accounts for the success of the book.
Paul Gelles
University of California, Riverside


The term ‘hibakusha’, meaning literally ‘explosion-affected person’, refers in Japanese to those affected by the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9 August 1945. The category of hibakusha cinema on which this edited collection is based embodies a wide realm of filmic treatment of the bombings. Thus the coverage takes in the earliest documentaries filmed in the cities only days afterwards (essays by Hirano and Nornes), the Godzilla films popular in the 1950s and 1960s (Sontag, Noriega), animated cartoons (Freiberg, Crawford), and contemporary fictional works such as Black Rain (Dorsey and Matsuoka, Todeschini). Other contributions are built around an attitude towards the bomb (Richie, on the elegiac notion of ‘mono no aware’), or an individual auteur (Ehrlich and Goodwin, both of whom consider Kurosawa).

Almost inevitably, the book as a collection, put together fifty years after the bombings, is difficult to categorise. The backgrounds and disciplines of the contributors vary widely. The methodologies vary as well, ranging, as editor Mick Broderick puts it in his introduction, ‘from close textual analysis, archival and historical argument, anthropological assessment, literary and film comparative analyses to psychological and ideological hermeneutics.’ The result of such range is that there is something for everyone; conversely, that the reader cannot settle into a relationship with the volume, but must continually shift his or her approach.

At the basic level, the book illuminates the changing relevance of hibakusha cinema in each stage of the nuclear era. The volume’s eleven essays include five contributions previously published and six apparently commissioned for this volume. In the earliest, first published in 1961, Donald Richie argues that most anti-bomb films, associated as they are with the Communist Party and thus part of a political rather than moral agenda, are de-legitimised as useful contributions to the genre. While Richie’s presuppositions can no longer be considered accurate, and his Cold War rhetoric is no longer compelling, the essay remains significant as a reading of the hibakusha genre within its earliest historical context, and serves as the baseline for the book’s sense of progression in both politics and criticism.

The next essay in historical time, Susan Sontag’s 1965 essay ‘The imagination of disaster’, demands a very different reading. In an excellent textual analysis of the genre of the science-fiction film Sontag foregrounds the film Godzilla and its depiction of the nuclear reality that was post-1945 Japan. What this approach lacks is a consideration of how such texts were read and continue to be read by audiences – a crucial issue if the attempt is to understand the lasting social and cultural significance of the bomb.

Chon A. Noriega’s 1987 contribution offers...
what Sontag’s textual analysis does not, and so demands another reading shift. It examines the reception and marketing of monster films in both Japan and America throughout four decades, from their earliest appearance in the 1950s to the appropriately entitled Godzilla 1985. Based upon a methodology which combines psychological and sociohistorical approaches, the essay reflects upon the changing conceptions of nuclear history and of the Other in the two locations.

One might expect these older essays to appear rather dated when compared with others written more recently, since the latter are able to draw on a broader and historically deeper set of materials from the hibakusha genre. However, the wealth of material in fact seems to render the newer essays less coherent than the earlier contributions. The more contemporary authors, faced in the 1990s with the diversity and vitality of the genre, as well as the possibilities of different analytical approaches, seek perhaps to include too much within the essay format, such that their arguments are left somewhat less focused and developed.

That said, there is much of interest in the newer essays. The strongest of these contributions, for very different reasons, are those of Maya Morioka Todeschini and Abe Mark Nornes. Todeschini offers a gender studies-oriented analysis of Imamura Shohie’s Black rain, arguing that the representations of female victims of the bomb in that film (and others) are idealised ones, whitewashed for general consumption and not reflective of the experience of real hibakusha women. The argument is compelling, and it is unfortunate only that the essay format does not allow the author to bring in many results of her own fieldwork.

The longest and most carefully-researched essay is by Abe Mark Nornes on the documentary The effects of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Relying heavily on archival findings, Nornes provides an overview of this film’s history as related by the various personnel concerned with the project. Though famous (and widely criticised) for its lack of human images and, thus, supposed inattention to human suffering, Nornes argues instead that the film’s camera gives voice to the bomb itself, and is both terrifying and attractive precisely because of its utter objectivity. As opposed to fictional film makers who represent the bomb in the indirect terms discussed elsewhere in this volume – whether through monster images or through stories of affected young women – the documentary represents the ‘absolute indifference of the Epicenter’. Suppressed in Japan but available freely through the U.S. National Archives, the film’s images have been borrowed repeatedly by subsequent film makers and thus have, Nornes argues, lent a lasting influence on our consciousness of the very hibakusha the film is said to have ignored.

The essays offer a rich range of perspectives. The volume’s weakest element, however, lies in the repetition between them, as each essayist seeks to contextualise his or her work – something surely better done in a single and authoritative introduction. The repetitions, together with various inconsistencies (dates of individual films, bibliographical styles), suggest an inattention to editing surprising in such a highly-priced book. Given the dearth of materials on this significant topic, it is unfortunate that this otherwise valuable collection should be so marred.

SHELLEY STEPHENSON
University of Chicago


Representation, published in association with the Open University, is intended as an introductory text book for students of cultural analysis. The aim here is a structured work that leads students from theoretical issues through case studies towards a synthesis. The problem with this book derives from the formulaic treatment of its objects of study and its failure to integrate individuality of response into its theory of cultural representation.

Topics covered here present standard issues in the field, including masculinity in the media, exhibiting cultures and the revelation of the ‘Other’. The introduction provides a clear and simple guide to key cultural theorists such as Barthes, Foucault and Saussure and introduces readers to the constructionist approach that later
examples will be used to exemplify. It is argued (p. 25) that, since language is shared, our ‘private intended meanings, however personal to us, have to enter into the rules, codes and conventions of language to be shared and understood’. In this way an intentionalist approach to representation is ruled out at an early stage. Further sections on Foucault reinforce the idea that ‘discourse, not the subject… produces knowledge’ (p. 54). This leaves the way open for representations to be treated as constructed cultural paradigms which tell us about the ‘episteme’ or ‘regime of truth’ (p. 55) of a particular period or place, but which do not require us to know anything about the subjectivity of their producers or appreciators. Notably absent is consideration of the way in which, according to this rubric, both the arguments presented in this book and the readers response to them are also culturally constructed and lacking in intentionality.

Chapters are closely organised to make sure that students have understood how they should appreciate the images provided for them by way of the theories being explained. Sections are brief and have activities attached which ask that students consider such-and-such a picture in terms of the argument presented. The first chapter on ‘France and Frenchness in post-war humanist photography’ can serve as an example. This chapter argues that certain photographs made by French photographers up to 1955 can be treated as belonging to a collective paradigm of ‘Frenchness’ and the contemporary ‘humanism’. The selection includes well known pieces (Doisneau’s kissing lovers) alongside lesser known photographs by Cartier-Bresson and others. It is suggested that all these photographs can be broken down into ten themes such as ‘La rue… Children at play… The family’ and so on (p. 102), and can be considered by reference to their contribution to this ‘paradigm’. The student is asked to consider a series of images in that way:

**ACTIVITY 2**

Now look at these three photographs of *la rue* shown in Figures 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5. Whilst looking at these images consider how they fit within the French humanist paradigm and what they tell us about how the photographers represented the daily life of the *classe populaire*. (p. 115)

I look at Figure 2.3. This is a photograph by André Kertész from 1934 called *Dubo, Dubon, Dubonnet*. It is true that we have here a picture of a street with two figures in it (the *classe populaire*?). One is a woman seated on a bench who is looking downwards and away from the camera. The other is a man in a hat who is striding off fuzzily to the left with his back turned. But the title indicates that these people and the street are not the centre of interest. At the top of the photograph are a series of posters in which a cubistic cartoon figure pours *Dubonnet* into a glass. The overlapping white and black oblongs of the posters present a flat, two-dimensional sequence which severs the upper part of the picture from the three-dimensional lower part. As a result, we are able to see the retreating figure my eye towards this play between two- and three-dimensionality and hence toward the generic problem of a flat surface that projects depth within itself. Whether or not that was Kertész’ intention it does seem a plausible appreciation of this picture by this viewer. How would the authors of this book configure my failure to ‘consider’ the image in the terms they demand? – as false consciousness? or as the last gasp of subjectivism?

This is perhaps an elaborate way of saying that too much is excluded when we treat a diverse group of French photographs as fitting ‘within the French humanist paradigm’. In particular what is excised is the ambivalence of subjective response to a representation which makes this individual image significant to me. The very qualities of autobiography and prior aesthetic appreciation through which I understand myself to grasp an image are in this way constructed as irrelevant. This is not a plea for subjectivism in itself. My point is that there can hardly be an adequate cultural analysis of representations that does not touch on the subjectivity of the viewers of these representations since only subjectivity can endow images with more than thin, generalised, stereotypical meanings. Even if subjectivity is constructed, does that make it culturally insignificant? It is, of course, convenient for cultural analysis to ignore subjective determinants of a picture’s value, but it is also inadequate. If I were an Open University student, I would want to know what this explanation of these pictures really tells me and why I should follow the regime-of-looking imposed upon me here.

It is valuable to compare this kind of contemporary approach to representation with the work of two social scientists who also create images. Keyan Tomaselii and Toni de Bromhead are both anthropologists and film-makers. Unsurprisingly, intentionality does feature in their
understanding of representation. Tomaselli’s *Appropriating images* suggests much of the ambivalence about this issue that is unfortunately absent from Hall’s textbook. The author is a South African and has spent many years negotiating the complexities of who it is that makes film in the region, for whom, and why. This is a very broad-ranging study that draws on a large amount of anthropological and philosophical writing on this area as well as providing descriptions and analyses of major anthropological films. Tomaselli uses the work of the American Pragmatist, Peirce, to provide what he hopes will be a new theoretical grounding for visual anthropology. He distinguishes semiology (which he sees as deriving from Saussure and ultimately from Kant) from Peirce’s semiotics. Peirce’s approach allows us to understand the subjectivity of the viewer as part of the truth of the filmic image and hence to avoid appeals (as in semiology) to an ultimate reality. In particular, Peirce’s concept of the *phaneron* is deployed as a way of emphasising the reflexive nature of the process of representation: ‘the phaneron embraces the real experience of the subject, individual as well as collective, in the signifying situation as part of the overall context’ (p. 223).

The examination of Peirce here is of considerable interest. The more general comments on semiotics which take up the first 70 pages of the book are less so. Tomaselli accepts as given many of the questionable premises of semiology/semiotics, such as the idea that film is a ‘text’ based on a ‘code’ and that viewers are ‘readers’: ‘The term “reading” is preferred to viewing or watching a film because it implies an active negotiation on the part of the interpreter’ (p. 32). As with other semiotic accounts, the exact sense in which a book, a film, and a dance are all ‘texts’ is never spelt out. Much of this theorising takes place at a highly abstract level and at times seems only weakly articulated with the description and analysis of film which is the subject matter of the book. Sometimes the impression also emerges that the role of semiotic theory here is not primarily elucidatory but is simply aimed at placing another barrier between the film ‘expert’ and the generality. Certainly, on occasion, the snobbery of the professional film-maker comes to the surface:

> The invention of Super8 in the 1960s, and in the 1980s Video-8 and Hi8, placed cameras in the hands of millions of amateurs with absolutely no formal understanding of style, film theory, genre or any other kinds of encodings. Yet they clearly create images which communicate something to their audiences. (p. 160)

Ouch! However, peccadilloes apart, Tomaselli repeatedly provides striking insights into the politics and meaning of anthropological film. The last chapters might make very useful general reading for students of this topic (particularly Chapter 9, ‘Towards ethical film-making and crew-subject interactions’).

De Bromhead’s *Looking two ways* covers some of the same ground as Tomaselli’s work but does so in its own idiosyncratic and intriguing way. This is a refreshingly well-written book, which is not over-loaded with theory but nonetheless opens up an important area of discussion. De Bromhead suggests that many of the failings of anthropological film-makers come from their refusal to espouse cinematic values and their frequent retreat into simple journalism or fact-finding. Cinema, or ‘the cinematic’, de Bromhead proposes (she uses ‘cinematic’ as a term of aesthetic praise), is distinguished by its command of narrative. Narrative is the means by which viewers enter emotionally (and not simply rationally) into the world represented to them. Anthropological film-makers too often destroy this possibility of entry into an imaginative world either by trying to convey too many facts or by employing distancing techniques such as voice-over which preempt the viewer’s subjective engagement. De Bromhead argues that these film-makers’ mistakes derive from a misconception concerning realism:

> When it is accepted that all documentaries, whatever their narrative form and style and whatever their purpose, remain personal creations, illusions that depend on reality for their source material … then film-makers should be able to express themselves more freely, offering a personal vision in whichever way they choose whilst still honouring the people and worlds that they are also representing’. (p. 11)

The answer is to see documentary film-making, specifically anthropological film-making, as a question of creating narratives rather than simply collecting and rationalising facts. De Bromhead defines narrative as the ‘system that gives order and meaning to the material in hand’ (p. 118). To illustrate this, the book describes and analyses a number of narrative styles, ‘classic’, ‘detective’, ‘episodic’ and so on, and shows how each engages the watcher in a different way. In the process, she
successfully takes visual anthropology out of its cramped compartment, dusts it off and compares some of its better products with some of the best documentary and fictional films. These comparisons occasionally turn out to be cheekily individualistic, as when Don Pennebaker’s Don’t Look Back is matched up with David Turton’s The Land is Bad under the category ‘road movies’. But the results are uniformly readable: it seems that de Bromhead has taken her own Aristotelian message about narrative to heart.

Needless to say, such a voluntarist view of representation – one which places emphasis not only on the subjectivity of the film-maker but also of the viewer – would be anathema to the constructionist view-point of Hall et al. Nonetheless, what all these books suggest (both negatively and positively) is that there is a need to place subjective aesthetic appreciation back into the cultural analysis of representations. And de Bromhead is right, I think, to imply that the opposite, anti-subjectivist anti-aestheticist, position is motivated less by theoretical rigour than by an unquestioned puritan ideology:

My wish is to see more documentary films made that provide real filmic pleasure … there is enough evidence to demonstrate that this is possible in documentary, and surely it is time to shake off the puritan notion that the pleasurable but rarely gives benefit to the soul. (p. 143)

HUON WARDLE
Queen’s University, Belfast