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KATHRYN A. KOZAITIS
Georgia State University

From Notes to Narrative is the biggest little academic treatise I have read in a long time. Kristen Ghodsee focuses on how to master lucid and influential ethnographic writing while retaining rigor in scholarship. Following the introduction, in which she makes the case for writing clearly, she presents a 12-step guide to writing an ethnography that is at once rich in empirical data, theoretically compelling, and accessible to experts and laypersons alike. Equally valuable is her conclusion, a step-by-step process for writing a book from conceptualization to submission for review and publication. A substantive suggested reading and bibliography section includes books about writing, guides for writing and publishing in the social sciences, manuals of ethnographic methods, and a list of 89 exemplary ethnographies, including 27 that have won the Victor Turner Prize in Ethnographic Writing from the Society for Humanistic Anthropology.

Good prose matters, Ghodsee argues, because it enlightens, it serves, and it sells. Clear and engaging writing attracts a large readership, an opportunity ethnographers may embrace to share their insights about the human experience with a broader audience. Ghodsee advises against “neologisms and tedious theoretical digressions” (2), deliberate “circuitous erudition” (7), extraneous and abstract rumination, and overreliance on disciplinary jargon to impress peer reviewers. She acknowledges “credentialing” (10) and the stylistic rules of academic journals that some senior scholars have established—for example, profuse citations of their own work—and that some junior scholars believe they must obey. However, she recommends minimizing “scientism” (82) and “academese” (84) in favor of lucidity and succinctness. While establishing a reputation as a serious scholar is understood to be a given, Ghodsee argues that original ideas, sound research, and accessible writing will reach audiences beyond reviewers for tenure and promotion.

Writing clearly and vividly, Ghodsee demonstrates, is a marker of intellectual courage and confidence. She also notes that today’s fiscally constrained academic presses demand good scholarship but are more likely to publish books written for classroom adoption to offset the costs of production. Original and critical ideas conveyed in simple prose are more likely to reach students and to inform and influence public thought and behavior, a goal that, Ghodsee asserts, ought to be intrinsic to social science scholarship. She posits that because anthropologists study and write about the daily, intimate experiences of ordinary people, they ought to make their insights accessible to multiple audiences, especially their research participants, whenever this is feasible.

Ghodsee reminds us that good ethnographic writing begins with a topic that the author is passionate about and excited to investigate. Whether we study in our own society or travel abroad to an unfamiliar location, a well-researched and well-written book relies on—and therefore should reveal—our personal investment in and enthusiasm for the research question. Ghodsee recognizes that an original contribution to the study of a particular community or society must be situated in the existing scholarly literature. However, she insists that a readable and lively ethnography should integrate ethnographic detail with theoretical principles throughout the narrative flow of the text or include theoretical discussion at the end of each chapter “without overwhelming the reader with extraneous verbiage” (54). Sparkling originality distinguishes academic work, but its impact on scholarship and public understanding is more likely when expressed in accessible prose.

First-person accounts, argues Ghodsee, bring “life and vigor” (25) to ethnographic writing: so do vivid sensory accounts of intimate details about a people's daily practices, politics, and rituals that represent their worldviews. Show rather than tell about a people's rhythm of daily life, she advises, and use precise descriptions of geographies, characters, material objects, places, and events as metaphors for the argument in the ethnographic manuscript. Informants’ voices must be heard, either via contextualized direct quotations, paraphrases that convey cultural meaning, or a combination of direct quotes and paraphrases. Quotations written as dialogue, particularly with depictions of the speaker’s body language and vocal inflection, add movement and variation to the narrative of a manuscript.
To further enhance the vitality of an ethnographic text, Ghodsee recommends including maps and other images that complement or illustrate ethnographic data and support the analytic argument.

Ghodsee’s strategies for writing compelling ethnographies are as useful as her conceptual guidelines are valuable. She tells us that authors should opt for endnotes instead of placing author-date citations in the text, that prose must be invigorating but lean, that simple words may communicate complex emotions and ideas, and that subjects and verbs must be kept together. Through illuminating examples and her own terse prose, she instructs us to master good grammar and syntax, privilege the active voice, avoid filler phrases, choose strong verbs, and limit adverbs and adjectives. Ghodsee’s practical tips on stages of revision and line editing remind us that writing is a craft to be relished. In her discussion of writing rituals, she reiterates that ethnographic writing is and ought to be a personal enterprise. Her simple but ingenious 10-step process for writing a book—from beginning with an imaginary table of contents to collating draft chapters into a manuscript to submitting it for review—is likely to inspire even the most ambivalent or insecure of us to overcome writer’s block.

The value of From Notes to Narrative is as aesthetic as it is instrumental. Each chapter stirs in the reader the aspiration to write and to write well. Ghodsee’s artful integration of excerpts from and examples of model ethnographies reinforces the power and beauty of her own message. Her plea for social scientists to write clearly and accessibly is prudent and timely. Graduate and undergraduate students, novice ethnographers, and even senior scholars in the social and behavioral sciences ought to read this book before they begin writing their next essay or their next book. Priceless!
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CASEY GOLOMSKI
University of New Hampshire

The chimera, the ancient Grecian amalgam of snake, goat, and lion that spits fire, is the metaphor the editors use to describe evil in their introduction to this volume. Over the expansive course of three sections—evil and the state/war, evil and religion, evil and modernity—the volume’s contributors movingly depict African peoples’ experiences of “great wrongdoing, malevolence, imputed and intended malice, wanton excess, and a desire for destruction and harm” (8). In the introduction, William Olsen and Walter van Beek couch the topic of evil in psychological terms—it is immoral, experiential, and cognitive, an “inevitable” (17), “intriguing” (19) idea that may enrapture anyone with its self-referential discourse about a sufferable sense of injustice. Groups and communities may act upon this sense to extinguish perceived forces of extreme negation. Evil here is not only the perceptible reality of negation, but also the violent social actions of retribution, defense, and expulsion in response to this negation. Boldly, the editors state that “all in all, African notions of evil are human in character…. Evil is ‘us’” (12–13), a claim that confounds their initial chimera characterization and perhaps indirectly speaks to the difficulties of ethnographically translating such phenomena.

The volume’s richly detailed case studies build bridges between the anthropology of religion and current anthropological theories of morality, ethics, and social suffering. Inspired by David Parkin’s 1985 The Anthropology of Evil, Evil in Africa was envisioned as a continuation of another volume, Religion in Africa: Experience and Expression, coedited by van Beek in 1994. On the whole, Evil in Africa, for which Parkin wrote the foreword, nicely sustains ongoing discussions about witchcraft, the occult, the moral imagination, and the nefarious use of political power in Africa. The postcolonial specificities of enduring wars and violence, the pragmatic character of African religious systems and their capricious deities, and the universal problems of illness and suffering are all factors that shape local cultural sensibilities of evil as well as social practices for evil’s mitigation. Olsen and van Beek argue that suffering is foundational to evil, although not necessarily its cause, and that evil most often accompanies a sense of injustice. The concept of justice as a sociopolitical idea is a main focus of their theory-based introduction and reappears somewhat opaquely in most of the 19 chapters. Overall, the chapters more clearly demonstrate how injustice operates as locally institutionalized social practices through which evil is rooted out or maintained by those in power. The provocative metaphor of evil as a more humanlike chimera of justice could interestingly also extend existing literatures on violence and social suffering.

Several cases helpfully push beyond the conventional topics of witchcraft and the occult to show how violence itself is a kind of uneasily human evil. In northern Uganda, community forgiveness forums were set up to effect reconciliation for civil war–related killings, yet Susan Reynolds Whyte, Lotte Meinert, and Julaina Obika show that local participants instead used them to repair intimate social relations fractured by infidelity, neglect, failed payment of school fees, and domestic violence. Jok Madut Jok recounts a harrowing experience of being beaten by South Sudanese national army soldiers. These soldiers, formerly of the
Sudan People’s Liberation Army, feel proudly entitled because they liberated the citizens of Africa’s newest nation-state, yet the citizens identify them as the most terrorizing source of violence in everyday postindependence life. The history of northern Sudanese divide-and-conquer strategies among southern ethnic groups also drives soldiers’ indiscriminate attacks on their fellow multicultural citizens, and the justice system there fails to punish these soldiers’ crimes. Chapters by Ulrika Trovalla, Kjersti Larsen, and Linda van de Kamp also show how uncertainties and dense histories of interconnectedness in postcolonial cities are likewise a source of evil to be battled by different religious groups.

The contributors also pose the question of how to depict evil ethnographically. Walter van Beek’s dark account of a corpse abandoned midfuneral in a Kapsiki village along the Cameroon-Nigeria border is explained as the outcome of a series of magical revenge tactics. Shifting between personal and objective perspectives in his analysis, he ultimately disavows these tactics in his conclusion as empirically unfathomable and morally indefensible, even if they are culturally contextual—he is not an extreme cultural relativist. His concluding methodological caveat is similar to Ilana van Wyk’s 2014 proposition, in her book *A Church of Strangers: The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God in South Africa*, for an ethics of dislike for her own unsavory religious interlocutors, who undertook spiritual warfare in a Brazilian Pentecostal church in Durban, South Africa. This is the same church discussed by Linda van de Kamp in urban Mozambique in this volume, but unlike van Wyk’s more localized interlocutors, van de Kamp’s Maputo parishioners engage in a wider warfare given the trans-Atlantic colonial scope of fetishism as ideated evil in Afro-Brazilian or Lusophone cultures. The negotiation of terms, beliefs, and histories of those who experience evil is masterfully represented in an innovative chapter of dialogic storytelling about witches in Togo between ethnopsychoanalyst Léocadie Ekoué and anthropologist Judy Rosenthal. Here Rosenthal presses Ekoué to recount her own and her neighbor’s perceptions of an old woman’s silent ascent to witch power and the horrific unseen mitigation of that power—the woman’s legs later transformed into cylinders. To Rosenthal’s attempts to make sense of the story using comparative ethnographies, Ekoué replies, “You and I validate each other with these examples, this close knowledge; it’s like magic” (138).

In her chapter, Nancy Schepers-Hughes revives the debate about objective and moral modes in anthropology to call out extreme cultural relativism itself as potentially evil in her mixed-methods interrogation of illicit global organ trading. She cites Paul Riesman, “Once we identify an evil, I think we give up trying to understand the situation as a human reality. Instead we see it as in some sense inhuman, and all we then try to understand is how best to combat it. At this point, we [leave anthropology behind] and we enter the political process” (269). Given the destruction of life and property we witness, document, and work against in our research, I imagine that fewer and fewer anthropologists today would find this position to be disciplinarily transgressive. Indeed, would anthropologists be evil, in our interlocutors’ terms, if we did not practically address or intervene into others’ sufferable injustices?


DOI: 10.1111/amet.12486

DOUGLAS V. PORFORA
Drexel University

Diane Nelson tells us that “this book engages Guatemalans’ experiences via number but also strives to unsettle readers’ relations to counting itself” (4). For me, the book succeeds on both counts. Nelson confesses early on that she is actually math-challenged and still on occasion counts on her fingers. Not to worry. So do I, even though I was a math major in college. Numerical relations are more than arithmetic, with which many mathematicians are not adept. Math-challenged or not, the way Nelson interweaves the role of numbers in postgenocide Guatemala produces a magical realist atmosphere, enhanced by the titles of her chapters and the numerical way they are coded, beginning with a preface numbered –1. The atmosphere is enhanced as well by Nelson’s well-chosen chapter epigraphs and references to Jorge Luis Borges and Gabriel García Márquez. She also mentions more than once the truth-detecting alethiometer of Philip Pullman’s *The Golden Compass*, and she gives us tidbits about the Mayan calendar and Mayan counting. The overall artistry captures something fundamental about contemporary Guatemala and something disconcerting about the role of numbers in our lives.

The title itself is an apt play on words. Who Counts? links questions about who is doing the counting as well as who is worth counting. Nelson is interested in the epistemological role of numbers in our lives, a role that is often deeply political. If she continues to allude to Pullman’s alethiometer, it is because she wants to challenge the alethiometric air that numbers, abstracted from their production, come to possess. Numbers, Nelson tells us, can seem more objective, more value-free than whatever it is they express qualitatively. Numbers seem transparent and unbiased and, by virtue of those qualities, rhetorically coercive. Thus, very salutary is Nelson’s effort to show us how “all numbers have histories” (79).

But as Nelson notes as well, the effect of numbers is not just epistemic. As with Foucauldian biopower, numbers...
can dehumanize. “One death is a tragedy, while the death of one million is a statistic” is a statement attributed to Stalin. Evidence of that kind of paradox surfaced while the mass killings in El Salvador and Guatemala were transpiring. While the Reagan administration was busy supporting the perpetrators, and you could read about the murders they committed in the newspapers, Americans were transfixed by concern for one Baby Jessica McClure of Texas, who had fallen down a well. There is something akin to magical realist fiction in that juxtaposition.

Conversely, Nelson shows that numbers can also humanize. Counting figures into how we make deaths count, as when we mark time from a ground zero like September 11, the Holocaust, or the Mayan genocide. And merely counting the dead, trying not to leave out anyone, humanizes too. “Numbers and bones,” Nelson says, “are condensed stand-ins for things and beings that are not fully present” (73). Even those who have been disappeared are made to matter by their inclusion in a count.

Who Counts? is based on Nelson’s ethnographic work in Guatemala since 1985 and revolves around five stories. The first follows the efforts of the Guatemalan Forensic Anthropology Foundation (FAFG) to unearth and count the bodies of those killed by the Guatemalan government’s genocidal campaign against, mostly, Mayan peasants. The second, which blends into the first, recounts the efforts of the National Reparations Program and Guatemalan courts to assign (count) beneficiaries, payments, penalties, and perpetrators. In the third story, Nelson finds that between the years of two visits, some of her informants, once activists, had become avid distributors for Omnilife, a diet supplement company that operates according to the pyramid structure of Amway, Tupperware, and Mary Kay. The fourth story relates how vast numbers of poor peasants lost everything to El Millionario, Guatemala’s equivalent to Bernie Madoff. With the final story, we are at a multinational level with dueling quantitative assessment practices in a conflict involving the risks to public health of a mining operation run by a Canadian firm. With these latter three stories, we get a picture of how Guatemalan life has devolved after decades of protracted political and military struggle.

That picture would have been clearer had the book (which I understand is the third in a series) included more detail about the historical context. We are told that during the guerrilla war, the government engaged in counteroffensives that amounted to genocide, and there are sporadic references to Catholic Action. But we hear little about the role of the Catholic Church and liberation theology. After a guerrilla war fought for social justice by a highly consciencitized peasantry, the devolution of that peasantry into Omnilife and El Millionario cults takes on even more pathos.

Nevertheless, Nelson conveys how, although the guerrilla war ended with a peace accord in 1996, it and the associated genocide overshadow Guatemalan life to this day. United Nations peacekeepers left only in 2005, and it was only in 2013 that former president and army general José Efraín Ríos Montt was convicted by a Guatemalan court for genocide and crimes against humanity. After that conviction was overturned later that year by the Constitutional Court of Guatemala, a new trial, since suspended, began in 2015.

How many deaths make a genocide? This question hangs over Nelson’s first two stories, especially as the round number 250,000 assigned by the United Nations has come under assault. If that number is correct, where are all the bodies? But the question ignores the way they have been hidden. We thus have a mystery that is at once both political and consequential: the number is what helped convict Ríos Montt and other perpetrators and what simultaneously gives meaning to the dead. In taking us through how the number was determined, Nelson makes us ponder whether it is a mere construction or something more.

In the last story, involving the mining controversy, the facticity and relevance of numbers again loom large. How is the level of each contaminant determined, and is the effect different when all are there together? Here, too, Nelson takes us through the politics involved in counting. In the end, it is a meditation on both Guatemala and numbers that Nelson offers, and, as I said, for me her book succeeds on both counts.
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HANS BUECHLER

Syracuse University

Numerous books have been published in recent years on the social movements of the first decade of this century. Rhythms of the Pachakuti stands out because its author, Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar—who contends that social movements should play a key role in shaping the very nature of the Bolivian government—was an active participant in these movements. Since Gutiérrez Aguilá’s familiarity with Bolivian social movements is intimately linked with her life as an activist, it is important to understand her life course, which Sinclair Thomson provides in a foreword that traces her trajectory as an activist, radical intellectual, and academic.

Born in Mexico, Gutiérrez Aguilá was involved in El Salvador’s FMLN movement in Mexico, where she met the future vice president of Bolivia, Álvaro García Linera. This led her to move to Bolivia in 1984, where she became involved with the Red Offensive of Miners’ Cells, which
eventually became the Túpac Katari Revolutionary Army (EGTK), and with military operations whose aim was to create a communitarian socialism. This activity landed her in prison in 1992, where she remained for five years. There she came to question both the state-centered orientation of the FMLN and the EGTK’s focus on overthrowing the state. After gaining provisional freedom, she joined with García Linera (to whom she was married for some years) and others to found the intellectual group Comuna, whose members produced a number of books that “combined critical theory with conjunctural political analysis” (xii). During that period, it appears that she got to know Oscar Olivera, the head of the Coalition for the Defense of Water and Life, one of the most successful social movements in Bolivia, and actively participated in its meetings. Her clandestine move to Mexico in 2001 ended any face-to-face contact with Bolivia’s social movements, which may explain why the section of her book on the Water Wars includes much more detailed descriptions of the dynamics of social movements than does her treatment of subsequent movements, for which she probably relied on more indirect sources (though the methodology is left vague in the book).

Gutiérrez Aguilar describes her objectives as, first, defining these movements as being based on “dignity recovered in the decisive acts of rejecting what is unjust and unacceptable; autonomy exercised in the planning and execution of what was decided…; and the ability to cooperate with others in conditions that were essentially equal although never free of tension” (xx; emphasis in original). Second, she seeks to investigate what she calls the “horizon of desire” implicit in the waves of uprisings between 2000 and 2005, as well as the “practical scope” (xx) of these actions, in order to understand both their potential and their limitations. Her aim, she avows, is less “a precise or meticulous recording of the events” than a philosophical reflection on what “social emancipation” (xxii) could mean. To this end, she focuses both on the sequence of events and on their slogans and documents, noting implicit desires as well as contradictions in order to “not only understand what it is and what is happening but also to have insight into what could happen, what outcome is possible as the product of collective efforts” (191).

The book includes chapters detailing the Water Wars against the privatization of water in Cochabamba and El Alto; Aymara roadblocks in La Paz due to the coca growers’ struggles from 2000 to 2003; the Gas War over whether or not to export natural gas through Chile and, later, over taxation of gas as well as other rebellions of 2003, which led to the collapse of the Sánchez de Lozada government; “the confusing year of 2004”; and the “growing tension between emancipation, autonomy, self-governance, and state reconstitution” (152) in 2005. Each chapter is supported by appendixes consisting of tables giving dates, participants, and the most visible demands as the mobilizations unfold. These mobilizations follow two distinct strategies. The coca growers employed a national-popular approach to carve “a path to win public offices and to use elections to displace traditional elites from positions of state control” (176). In contrast, the other movements took a community-popular approach and “desired and experimented with a structure of links and political attunement that would be different, self-regulating, new, not devoid of difficulties, and, most of all, lacking comprehensive and clear forms of expression beyond highly radical negative slogans” (177).

Gutiérrez Aguilar is critical of both strategies. She concludes that in spite of the fact that the social movements led to a reformist presidency, even the most successful ones had little staying power after their immediate goals had been achieved, particularly because they were driven by “spontaneous enthusiasm” rather than by “what the old Left traditionally called ‘revolutionary consciousness’” (184). Even the most influential activist, Olivera, lacked either the interest or the vision to become a national leader of what might have come to be a state based on a consensus (communal) model of the various forces constituting the social movements. Similarly, Evo Morales was engaged in a “self-interested acquiescence to the state” (139), and, when his MAS party (or movement) came into power (which Gutiérrez Aguilar deals with only in passing), he immediately began limiting the influence of social movements, increasingly moving toward a centralist government.

The foreword is marred by the fact that Thomson appears to have based his discussion of the book on an earlier version of the text—an open-source edition in the original Spanish, Los ritmos del Pachakutí: Movilización y levantamiento popular-indígena en Bolivia (2000–2005), published in Buenos Aires in 2008 by Tinta Limón, is available online from the publisher—with the result that none of the page references he gives remotely corresponds to the published version. I have been able to reconstruct the actual pages he refers to. On page xiii, pages 125–26 should read page 56 and pages 336–40 should read pages 139–44. On page xv, page 418 should read page 178, page 126 is page 56, pages 417–18 should read page 178, and page 260 is page 107. Finally, on page xvi, page xxxix should read page xxxvi.

In addition, it is likely that an anthropological readership would want more of the kinds of descriptions of direct encounters with activists that characterize Gutiérrez Aguilar’s analysis of the Cochabamba Water War. More generally, we do not get much of a sense of what Bolivian governance might look like if a community-popular approach had become the dominant structuring force. Nevertheless, because she was an intellectual who was both an insider and an outsider—and hence could be both a participant in and a critic of the momentous transformations
that took place during the first half of the first decade of the millennium—Gutiérrez Aguilar provides a unique and valuable perspective on Bolivian politics.
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**KATHLEEN BOLLING LOWREY**
University of Alberta

*Thunder Shaman* is based upon Ana Mariella Bacigalupo’s fieldwork among Chilean Mapuche from 1991 to the present, especially upon a close and multilayered collaboration with a controversial Mapuche machi, or shaman, Francisca Kolipi, who died in 1996. History and biography are interwoven in complex ways via the special relationship at the heart of this book. Bacigalupo has known Mapuche people since childhood summers spent at her maternal grandparents’ farm in Argentine Patagonia; Kolipi knew of Bacigalupo’s family for many years because Chilean Mapuche people travel to do seasonal agricultural work on that farm. By the time of Kolipi’s death, Bacigalupo had become her friend, shamanic assistant, and patient. After her death, for several years and at the request of Kolipi’s family, Bacigalupo was the designated keeper of her shamanic headdress and ring. During her life, Kolipi asked Bacigalupo to write and publish her “shamanic bible” (according to Bacigalupo, she specified that this be done under Bacigalupo’s name rather than her own). At the request of Kolipi’s family, however, Bacigalupo refrained from doing so immediately after Kolipi died.

After the lapse of some years, however, the community memories attached to Kolipi evolved in such a way that family and community members themselves asked Bacigalupo to go ahead with publication. Around the same time, Bacigalupo returned the headdress and ring to the community for burial in a ceremony that transformed the commemoration of Kolipi so as to collectively recognize a powerful connection to a past female thunder shaman, Rosa Kurin. Kolipi had during her life begun to claim this connection for herself. This claim, contested during her lifetime, has now become canonical, and the “facts” of her biography have been similarly transformed. Now someone who was during her life considered by many Mapuche to be a scandalous, irritating, and dangerous sorcerer is enshrined (literally, with the addition of the headdress and ring to her burial site) as a powerfully protective thunder shaman, the lineal descendant of the legendary Rosa Kurin—whose surname, which Kolipi had already claimed during her life, is now an accepted part of the latter’s name.

The birth and death dates on Kolipi’s gravestone have worn away such that she can now be said to have lived (as Kurin is said to have done before her) to the auspicious age of 110. The posthumous publication of Kolipi’s shamanic bible for a global, Anglophone audience under Bacigalupo’s name is another instantiation of this multitemporal (a key word in the text) arrival and return: the rebirth of machi spirits is part of how Mapuche people have always made and continue to make their own history.

Despite all that esoteric to-ing and fro-ing, it must be said that the first chapters of *Thunder Shaman* are familiar going for the contemporary anthropologist of the Global North (a descriptor much favored by Bacigalupo). Mapuche people and Mapuche shamans at first present a remarkably uniform set of characteristics, at least when considered in light of non-Western world peoples as cataloged in present-day ethnographies. They do a lot of strategic deploying; contingency is their polestar; hybridity is often found nuzzled in among them, but essentialism is only mistakenly attributed in their general direction; among them, all is contested, flexible, processual, and relational. This has its conveniences for the ethnographer. Descriptive precision about history and social relations, a tiresome duty in bad old-fashioned ethnographies, can now be waved aside as not just unnecessary but morally (ontologically even!) suspect (Lévi-Strauss on hot versus cold societies comes in for the usual enthusiastic kicking). Still, there are places in the text where a bit of linear tale-telling would have been illuminating.

Other sources of community contention around Kolipi include the facts that she was the child of a Mapuche mother and a settler father (this characteristic, interestingly, she shared with her thunder shaman predecessor), her immediate family did rather well out of reversals of Allende-era land reform in Mapuche territory, and she was a fervid Pinochet supporter. Bacigalupo explains this support (shared by quite a few Mapuche) as having been motivated by long-standing Mapuche cultural notions of personal power, direct patronage, and traditional authority. This leaves unexplained the fact that other Mapuche felt differently, and some of them were among Kolipi’s detractors. Finally, that Kolipi’s postmillennial rehabilitation by her family and community might have as much to do with the contemporary politics of indigeneity and its routinized charisma—so that in recent years a female thunder shaman descendant of a female thunder shaman lineally linking the 21st-century Mapuche present to the 19th-century Mapuche past is a convenient thing always already to have had—is an awkward subject handled cautiously by Bacigalupo. The authorial decision to go for high moral dudgeon on the theme does not foreclose the option of humor to the reader.

That being said, *Thunder Shaman* cumulatively works a considerable charm. The force of Kolipi’s character comes
through ever more clearly down the chapters, so that one closes the book truly grateful to Bacigalupo for making this posthumous encounter possible. Kolipi swears, prays, cures, rides a spirit horse, and foretells very closely the hour of her own death. Her prediction that “through this bible her shamanic spirit would return” (151) is triumphantly realized.

A testamentary anecdote: I read some of the final chapters on a plane (a common enough occurrence for a scholar from the Global North, I know) and had just come to a part recounting a conversation between Bacigalupo and Kolipi about the resonances between jet travel and spiritual travel. Kolipi says, “I also see the houses, the fields, very small when I fly. I’m not afraid of death. I see everything. But Ntúnechen doesn’t like people who are not machi flying in the clouds. He throws down the planes with lightning” (206). At that very moment, my plane hit a patch of turbulence. Bacigalupo’s book—or Kolipi’s spirit returned with it—had by that juncture cast the sort of total spell on me that left me (momentarily, but time is a funny old thing after all) cowed by my own prior irreverence. It’s not every ethnography that is so convincingly captivating—a book containing a shamanic spirit that makes the reader fall in love. The kind of anthropological connection Bacigalupo forged with Francisca Kolipi Kurin is rare and precious. We are fortunate to have a book that enables us to briefly lay our hand along that charged cord and thrill to it, too.
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**SINDRE BANGSTAD**

KIFO, the Institute for Church, Religion, and Worldview Research, Oslo

This book has been decades in the making. It is based on Richard Werbner’s and his research assistants’ meticulous recordings of what are known as wisdom divining séances among the Tswapong in the small village of Moremi in the central district of Botswana. Central to the account is Werbner’s close and attentive tracking of wisdom diviners with quite different performative styles, namely, the charismatic diviner Morebodi Kesupetswe and the classic diviner Moathodi Dikgang. Werbner’s finely textured and amply documented study breaks new ground precisely in the richness and the time span covered by his ethnographic data: he has “followed a diviner’s interpretive account from séance to séance with different clients” (16) since the early 1970s.

Werbner’s wisdom diviners are not marginal characters in the community in which they live and practice but, rather, respected elders and heads of large families who epitomize an archetype in their own divination: that of the patriarch. It is therefore unsurprising that the wisdom and knowledge imparted in and through their divination are also thoroughly patriarchal, seeing moral peril as arising above all from the unraveling of social and communal bonds inherent in the disrespect and lack of care for elders. The Tswapong wisdom diviners Werbner has studied draw upon a vast oral archive of praise poetry transmitted by word of mouth across the wide multiethnic expanse of southern Africa, an archive all but marginalized in the postcolonial literary canons of the region.

Werbner has long been an outstanding and prolific ethnographer of modern Botswana. The merits of what one could refer to as the ethnography of the longue durée are amply evident from this monograph. Werbner positions his latest contribution within “a critical tradition of interpretive ethnography” (9), applying a sociolinguistic approach and the methodology of the extended case study developed by his teacher and founder of the Manchester School, Max Gluckman. Werbner is sharply critical of the centrality accorded to witchcraft among Africanist anthropologists in the 1990s and onward—what he refers to as a veritable “witchcraft myopia among Africanists” (18). His ire here is clearly aimed at Peter Geschiere’s and John and Jean Comaroff’s highlighting of what they have referred to as the modernity of witchcraft, which emphasizes societal rupture rather than continuity in the wider field of divination of which witchcraft is a part and makes witchcraft central to the analysis of African worlds gone awry under conditions of the globalization of neoliberalism.

Werbner certainly has valid points here, and modern Botswana provides ample material for any anthropologist wanting to make the case for the ordinariness of postcolonial African societies, for continuity amid change, and for the need for anthropology to speak to a shared humanity. But it seems to me—as an outsider to the debates among a number of eminent Africanist anthropologists since the 1990s—that he may overstate the case by arguing that the anthropological targets of his criticisms spring from a “deeply fixed Conradian image of Africa from colonial times onward” (47).

More interesting and productive is Werbner’s engagement with the seminal work of Edward Evans-Pritchard in *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic among the Azande*, which “captivated” (28) him in his first year of postgraduate training at Manchester. He is surely correct in noting that this classical masterpiece in anthropology remains widely cited but rarely read in any depth. More than anyone else, Werbner faults Mary Douglas, arguably the most central of Evans-Pritchard’s intellectual heirs, for remaking Evans-Pritchard in her own image and thereby turning him into a hedgehog, not a fox, in the Oxford philosopher Isaiah Berlin’s famous terms. In Werbner’s own apt characterization, his aim with this monograph is to
“reopen more of the deep dialogue in *Witchcraft,*” by which he means “the dialogue that is supported by rich ethnographic evidence about fundamental issues and sustained between the ethnographer and major interlocutors, especially across disciplines,” and that in his view “runs unmistakably through Evans-Pritchard’s masterpiece” (28–29).

Werbner’s chapter on this is a veritable theoretical tour de force, with many useful reflections about what to this eminent scholar is wrong with the current state of anthropology. He notes that Evans-Pritchard’s own deep dialogue in *Witchcraft,* in spite of the paucity of references and citations to it in this monograph, was with the contemporary French philosopher Lucien Lévy-Bruhl. “The trained social anthropologist is one who learns to learn from specialists in other disciplines; Evans-Pritchard preached and practiced this approach” (31), states Werbner, and points to Evans-Pritchard’s own admission that he could not have written *Witchcraft* without first having read Lévy-Bruhl, with whom he eventually came to disagree on quite a few fundamentals. Here, of course, is an implicit word of caution to any anthropologist tempted to analogize anthropology and ethnography, to fetishize the latter, and to avoid the broad cross-disciplinary readings that provide the enabling context for much of what is groundbreaking in anthropological works past or present. Yet Werbner also signals a particular aversion to ethnographers who try to “scholar up” by overloading their studies with references to “philosophers of one kind or another and to many popular pundits distant from the people studied” (33), which inevitably leads ethnography to suffer.

Werbner’s *Divination’s Grasp* documents a long and distinguished career in the service of anthropology. It will be a touchstone for anthropological studies of divination for years to come.
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Some books are better timed than others. As I write this review, Aleppo—the closest major city to two of the three Palestinian refugee camps in Nell Gabiam’s study—continues to be bombed into pieces by the Russian and Syrian air forces. Gabiam conducted the main part of her fieldwork for this book much earlier, in 2004 and 2005, but in spite of the ongoing Syrian war and the scattering of her informants that the war has caused, she managed to update her findings with more recent research trips. Her book is thus a welcome contribution to our knowledge of both contemporary Syria and the Palestinian predicament. Moreover, studies of Palestinians in Syria are rare in comparison to those of Palestinians in other countries.

*The Politics of Suffering* examines the complex web of interaction among development aid, humanitarian relief, and refugeeness and its effect on understanding politics, place, and national identity in Palestinian refugee camps. To investigate this, Gabiam carried out ethnographic fieldwork in Yarmouk Camp in Damascus for one year and, later on, in a house-renovation project, the Neirab Rehabilitation Project, which provided new homes for members of camps in the north of the country. The Neirab Rehabilitation Project was sponsored by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), the UN organization assisting some 5 million Palestinians in the Middle East. For an outsider, the issue at hand might seem rather simple: because some of the refugees lived in deplorable housing conditions, the UN agency wanted to build better houses and, partly, move families from Neirab to the more spacious Ein el Tal. Importantly, increased awareness within the UN system also ensured that the project would use participatory tools, aiming to include the views and preferences of those intervened upon. Apart from UNRWA employees and international volunteers, volunteers from the local refugee communities were hence involved. Things started to go wrong despite the effort to include local participation when the rehabilitation project met with fierce resistance from local camp inhabitants.

Gabiam elegantly explains why such projects might be especially difficult to implement in Palestinian camps. She argues that opposition to ameliorating physical surroundings and housing in camps is intimately connected to the clash of two political drives among Palestinian refugees: the politics of suffering that aims to keep alive and one day implement the Palestinian right of return to former homes in present Israel and the politics of citizenship that seeks to close the gap between camp dwellers and city residents by integrating refugees into their host societies. As she also notes, this tension is recognizable from studies, such as that by Julie Peteet, of other Palestinian refugee camps in the Middle East.

The most thought-provoking part of the book is Gabiam’s detailed description, inspired in large part by Michel Agier’s work, of Yarmouk Camp. Yarmouk was already an integrated part of Damascus prior to the war and not very camp-like in any stereotypical way. Its residents were neither particularly poor nor uneducated, and its physical structures blended into the surrounding neighborhoods. Yet Yarmouk remained a distinctly Palestinian enclave, set apart by its identity, despite its ordinariness. Gabiam argues that a camp is produced and reproduced
by sociocultural practices—including political activism around the Palestinian issue and a certain stigmatization of the camp—both by Palestinian refugees and by Syrian citizens. Yarmouk also housed the headquarters of Palestinian political factions, which gave it a symbolic importance for Palestinians. Interestingly, as a camp Yarmouk could also be a “feeling inside” (111), an affective space connoting historical suffering and difference. This experienced difference should be understood as being related to statelessness, which has had very real consequences during the war. Once again, Palestinian refugees have been treated as noncitizens not only in Syria but also when they seek protection in the neighboring Arab countries.

Gabiam updates the reader on how the camps in her book have been affected (and to a large extent destroyed) by the hostilities and on how former camp residents live in exile. Yarmouk went from being “an exceptional place” to “a space of exception” (126), caught in clashes between rebel forces and the regime. She describes the Neirab Rehabilitation Project, moreover, as a quasi failure due to experiences of loneliness in the new place, lack of funding, and UNRWA’s incapacity to truly become partners with the refugees and its wish to depoliticize its own work.

One weakness of the book is a tedious repetitiveness in some chapters. This might be a legacy from Gabiam’s PhD dissertation, but it could easily have been avoided with some editing. In addition, I would have preferred more ethnographic examples and quotes from interviewees, not least from local refugees in need of new housing, rather than from people working as volunteers in the Neirab Rehabilitation Project. The analysis would perhaps also have been strengthened by interviews with former refugees who had moved out of camps on their own without any UN intervention. How did they handle the tension between the politics of suffering and the politics of citizenship?

Nevertheless, Gabiam’s book is a memorable example of research that puts anthropology in conversation with development agencies. One of her persuasive arguments is that UNRWA’s intended shift from humanitarian relief to development work is not happening in a vacuum but is, rather, symptomatic of an ongoing trend in aid to refugees; UNRWA and other UN organizations increasingly claim that since so many refugee situations become prolonged, humanitarian relief and development by necessity need to intertwine. Gabiam shows that it is not without complications to disconnect political causes and solutions from the handling of refugees. The Politics of Suffering should earn a place on syllabi of courses in applied anthropology and the anthropology of the Middle East as well as the anthropology of migration. It makes critical contributions to those fields and opens up new conversations about the relations among refugeeeness, place, and politics.
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Accounts of governance in postcolonial Africa often cite the corruption, authoritarianism, and nepotism of the elite to explain the continent’s political and economic troubles. Mattia Fumanti’s *Politics of Distinction* presents a compelling alternative to such accounts through a historical and ethnographic foray into the rise of three successive generations of political elites and their role in the construction of public life in Namibia. While the book offers a challenge to generally pessimistic narratives of governance in postcolonial Africa, Fumanti also seeks to avoid crafting an overly romantic counternarrative. What sets Namibia apart, he argues, is not that the country is free of corruption, authoritarian interventions, or political scandals. Rather, what sets Namibia apart is that such events have been subjected to rigorous public commentary among the media, civil society organizations, and elite Namibians in ways that have effected concrete change.

Over the course of eight chapters and an epilogue, Fumanti charts some of this commentary by focusing on what he calls the subjective dimension of elite formation: how it is that broader social values and moral reasoning come to bear on the achievement of elite distinction and, in turn, how elite values subsequently infuse and shape public space. In tracking this intergenerational process, Fumanti follows the production and contestation of elite status within the public sphere through attention to debates among Namibians over good governance, the value of education, and the proper conduct of those who achieve elite distinction.

*The Politics of Distinction* is based on a decade of work in the town of Rundu, a middle-size administrative center in northeastern Namibia. Each of the book’s two parts takes as its primary concern one of two elite generations in Rundu—the liberation elite and the youth elite. While the subjective formation of these two generations captures most of the book’s focus, Fumanti interweaves their stories with those of two other elite groups. One is the colonial elite—the generation that rose to political power within the colonial administration whose members are elder kin to many of the liberation and youth elites. The other is the contemporary Afrikaner and Portuguese business elite, which holds most of the economic power in the region.

In part 1, Fumanti traces the rise of the liberation elite, the generation that led the struggle against apartheid and that now holds many of the upper-civil servant positions
In Rundu. In the first chapter, he focuses on how Rundu’s location between the center of the state and the rural hinterlands has made it a node within regional trade, administrative, and professional networks since the late 19th century. This interconnection, he argues, has left an indelible mark on processes of social stratification and the formation of civil society in the region. In charting this history, Fumanti sets the stage for his discussion of the rise of the liberation elite and its role in shaping associational life in Rundu over the course of the next three chapters. Through nuanced accounts of three different public celebrations, he shows how members of the liberation elite draw upon morally inflected narratives of hard work, professionalism, sacrifice, and affective leadership to construct themselves within the public space and recount the history of their distinction. Fumanti shows that it is by appealing to ideals of leadership within this space that members of the liberation elite attempt to legitimize their authority based on their moral reasoning and achievements—an appeal, he notes, that is nonetheless contested in different ways by both the youth elite and the white business elite of Rundu.

Part 2 explores the subjective formation of Rundu’s youth elite a decade after independence, at a time when many of that generation were growing wary of what they felt was a stark shortfall between the liberation elite’s promises about nation building and the subsequent accomplishments of its administration. Over the course of four chapters variously focused on youth elite narratives of distinction, the founding of a youth elite club, and the affective linkages that the youth elite maintains with rural kin, Fumanti charts the emergence of a youth elite generational consciousness. This consciousness, he argues, is one forged in dialogue with the liberation elite and, to a lesser extent, the colonial elite. He shows that as members of the youth elite seek to assert their own presence within Rundu’s public space, they not only reaffirm their ties to the colonial elite but also engage in a civil, often playful critique of the liberation elite. Fumanti charts the emergence of a youth elite generationally distinct. This consciousness, he argues, is one forged in dialogue with the liberation elite and, to a lesser extent, the colonial elite. He shows that as members of the youth elite seek to assert their own presence within Rundu’s public space, they not only reaffirm their ties to the colonial elite but also engage in a civil, often playful critique of the liberation elite’s authority. In the process, the youth elite offers its own vision of governance—one where elite authority is no longer based on party membership or participation in past struggle but is instead justified based on what its leaders achieve. It is in the detailing of this dialogue that Fumanti makes one of his most important and persistent points: elite succession in postcolonial Africa cannot be understood solely as a reproduction of earlier precolonial and colonial forms of authority. Rather, as new generations of elites emerge, so do new visions of governance and authority.

In The Politics of Distinction, Fumanti has created a complex and humanized account of elites in Rundu. But in reading about how Rundu elites shape debates over good governance, other questions arose for me that were not completely answered. Particularly, most accounts of elite moral reasoning and ideals of governance come from elites themselves. While Fumanti rejects the notion that the public moral discourses of Rundu’s elite were “a mere disguise to make their desire for power palatable to others, their subalterns” (12), nonelite perspectives are largely absent. Even slightly more attention to subaltern perspectives could have helped him build a stronger case for this view in addition to enriching the discussion of some of the book’s other major themes—such as the politics of achieving elite distinction or the emergent intergenerational differences evident in the formation of the youth elite. Regardless, this book has a great deal to offer scholars of Sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere who have an interest in postcolonial governance and elite formation.
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One might argue that the most important social change of the last four decades is the victory of Friedrich Hayek’s and Milton Friedman’s war on government regulation, particularly with regard to government’s role in protecting citizens and consumers from the consequences of entrepreneurial profit seeking. As with all wars, there are winners and losers, as Simanti Dasgupta illustrates in her case study of the unfolding neoliberal revolution in Bangalore, India. Here the global information technology corporation Infosys has given rise to a new national narrative that is changing the relationship between government and citizens. *BITS of Belonging* considers not only the economic dimensions of the industry and neoliberalism (i.e., government as the guarantor of free markets for the private sector rather than public services for the poor) but also those new neoliberal values that represent a strong ethical component of national pride—especially accountability and transparency. These values must, in the view of reformers, be brought to bear by all responsible Indian citizens against the postcolonial and socialist Indian state.

By illuminating the asymmetry of the privilege bestowed upon middle-class participants in IT, Dasgupta shows “how the market shifts the meaning of citizenship and belonging to the nation-state” (13), wherein citizenship is gradually linked to consumerism. Because the poor of urban slums cannot consume private services and products and thereby perform proper Indian citizenship, they were targeted for a water project whose transformation of sacred water to commodity was to be underwritten by the poor
themselves. Further, the NGO driving the project aimed to inculcate a value for citizen participation in which the poor would hold the corrupt state accountable. Participation in what? Dasgupta asks rhetorically. Citizen participation, she tells us, is “a key organizing idiom in developing countries.” Applied to the poor, she writes, “Structurally, participation continues to frame the relationship between the state and the civil society, but it seeks a shift in the balance of power to the civil society only to further privilege the already privileged” (186). The poor of urban slums, unable to participate as citizen-consumers, instead express concern about the new cost of privatized water after having always received it as a free public good. Dasgupta asks, Do such NGO-driven projects represent “a new form of class politics that is otherwise disguised in the name of the collective good?” (14).

As the neoliberal revolution proceeds apace, Dasgupta shows how the discourses of accountability and transparency (and of citizen participation as a counter to untrustworthy government) spread institutionally through the projects and programs of reform. Reformers view the market as an apolitical tool that can arrest government corruption, elevate India’s global status, and reward citizen-consumers with newly available goods and services. Tracing the metaphor of bits, Dasgupta points to how the digital coding of the world in zeros and ones is a coding of the “true” modern market paradigm, which provides the only road to prosperity and in which participation is mandatory for Indian citizenship, compared to “false” backward and obsolete, socially redistributive arrangements. By extension, this coding marks contrasts that Dasgupta draws out in Bangalore—contrasts between the global network of market transactions to which IT contributes and the local conditions of a developing nation that the leaders of Infosys aspire to reform, between government roles limited to enabling private-sector initiatives and governance based on equity and socialist-redistributive principles, and between the middle class that Dasgupta argues benefits from IT and neoliberal reforms and the poor whose marginal status makes feasible such neoliberal experiments as water privatization. These contrasts manifest themselves in urban space. Technology parks have everything that the middle class enjoys: gated communities, car dealerships, shopping malls, and a putatively reliable water supply to feed artificial lakes and manicured landscapes. Meanwhile in the slums, water from a communal standpipe arrives twice weekly, and residents who are excluded from citizen-consumerism must walk up to five kilometers for it. Such contrasts mark the neoliberal era of extreme skewing of access to wealth, power, and opportunities.

Dasgupta pays careful attention to the semantics of neoliberal ideology in Bangalore, as she transparently situates herself as an upper-class and upper-caste member whose position is unevenly received by those she interviewed from different classes. Other unique contributions of the book include her tracing of institutional connections between two seemingly separate and disparate sectors; the inclusion of Indian voices from the past and present and, interestingly, the past projected into the present; and the ethnography’s quintessential Indianness with its polysyllabic names, dusty potholed roads, rickshaws, and traffic juxtaposed against the images of glass and chrome modernity that describe IT.

The weaknesses of BITS are few and grow out of its strengths. As Dasgupta notes in her conclusion, an ethnography of neoliberalism “evades a linear path” (189). The number of organizations, their many acronyms, and the multiple connections among them may tax the reader’s patience, much as it must have been taxing for Dasgupta to keep track of them during her extensive research. Further, data presentation and analysis are informed by references to scholarship on neoliberalism and India. While these are useful to scholars of neoliberalism, their inclusion sometimes makes it difficult to follow the thread of the central narrative. More important, these interruptions also make BITS a scholarly work unsuited for the nonacademic readers most in need of insight into what is being done to the world around them and how it is being accomplished.

Whatever these minor challenges present, however, Dasgupta’s ethnography is a worthy, intelligent contribution to our understanding of the discursive and institutional mechanisms at work in the world of neoliberal reforms, especially those such as the privatization of water that challenge societies to deal with the instability induced by the injustices of deep inequality. What passes for development in India and elsewhere in both developing and developed worlds is the transfer of wealth and privilege to the few at the expense of the many. Dasgupta’s main contribution is to show us just how the many are recruited to the neoliberal reform agenda, how it is discursively and institutionally deployed, and how it is reproduced by its beneficiaries and resisted by those who feel its sting.

Not surprisingly, because neoliberal reforms deepen existing inequalities, they have inspired resistance among the poor. As with the perceived injustices that have given rise to angry support for nativist, antigovernment leaders in Europe and the United States, neoliberal reforms in India, underpinned by narratives of government corruption to be remedied by privatization of services and amenities, have radically altered the relationship between government and citizens. If the middle class celebrates neoliberal reforms and retreats happily from the state into gated communities, the poor of Bangalore and elsewhere feel abandoned to their misery. BITS of Belonging may be at times a challenging read, but it is no less an important one.
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The contributions made by economic anthropologists to the study of consumption and exchange are vast and significant. This is why I have long held that anthropologists make better microeconomists than economists. Notably, behavioral economists are only now discovering what our disciplinary forebears theorized more than a century ago about the motivations behind economic exchange. When it comes to macroeconomics, however, our discipline has fallen short. In a rush to find cause, we often make the same mistake most quantitative researchers make: comparing apples and oranges in an effort to manufacture significance. Our most egregious error may be blaming neoliberalism for just about every social injustice in the world.

Neoliberalism defines a political economic system designed to protect capital markets through deregulation. Philosophically, neoliberalism is premised on the idea that unfettered markets free both entrepreneurs and consumers. Critics argue, however, that the belief in the power of capital to grow markets, equilibrate the price of goods based on supply and demand, and create moral order is nothing more than what Karl Marx termed commodity fetishism. When freed from worker protection laws, environmental regulations, and financial ethics, large corporations often contribute to human suffering through their labor practices and lack of concern for the long-term and wide-ranging impacts of their businesses on communities. In other words, neoliberalism is real, but far too often anthropologists use the term in ways that gloss what is actually taking place in day-to-day transactions that are far more steeped in local history, culture, and individual personality than we give them credit for. So I was surprised while reading Speculative Markets: Drug Circuits and Derivative Life in Nigeria. In a rare book that picks up where one could argue that Jane Guyer left off, Kristin Peterson has taken the time to meticulously trace how post-1986 neoliberal structural adjustments have influenced daily life in Nigeria. Hers is a book that makes me hopeful that anthropologists can contribute in meaningful ways to macroeconomic theory, too.

Speculative Markets details what happened to the medical drug markets in Nigeria following the World Bank’s 1981 Berg Report, which triggered a wave of structural adjustments in West Africa. The market for fake pharmaceuticals in West Africa started around 1968 but grew rapidly when drug markets were deregulated in the 1980s. As a term, deregulation is misleading, because drug markets were in fact being regulated in favor of powerful and highly capitalized companies. In this stunning first book, Peterson connects the links among drug marketing, offshore manufacturing, and speculative capital in order to demonstrate why medical drug markets in Nigeria are so vulnerable to dangerous fake drugs. To do this, she details the impact that legislation has had on the demand for drugs, the pricing for drugs, and the licit and illicit markets that pharmacists have to engage in to stay in business.

In her first chapter, “Idumota: Pharmacists, Traders, and the New Free Market,” we get a sense of the historical and contemporary richness of place. Migrants from around Nigeria have come together to one of the largest drug-distribution sites—Idumota market—because of war and economic circumstance. Businessmen and businesswomen of Idumota market become indebted to one another and how this indebtedness shapes market culture.

Chapter 2, “Risky Populations: Drug Industry Divestment and Militarized Austerity,” describes the economic decline that motivated Nigerian officials to take a chance on structural adjustments. For those unfamiliar with how structural adjustments decimated medium- and large-scale manufacturing in West Africa, this chapter explains how choices that in retrospect seem absurd were approved by corrupt administrators from General Ibrahim Babangida to General Sani Abacha. Peterson defines risky populations as “citizens and markets that were exposed to newly discernible risks via military governance and corporate practices” (56). And while the risks created by the combination of Western economic control and local oppression seem obvious, she empirically traces the structural processes that dismantled older and more humane drug markets.

In chapter 3, “Regulation as a Problem of Discernment: Open Markets in the Making,” Peterson pivots to even more granular analyses of markets, both official and unofficial. She details the links between formal and informal markets and demonstrates how they operate in concert rather than as separate entities. Building on the site-specific analysis of banks, customs, and associations, in chapter 4 she follows up with an extraordinary analysis of what it means to have to live and die by these speculative markets. This chapter, “Derivative Life: Nominalization and the Logic of the Hustle,” focuses on the relationship between micro- and macroeconomics. In this critical chapter, Peterson shows how legislation, pricing, credit, and speculation shape labor, consumption, and exchange practices. She also discusses why the market equilibrium imagined by the architects of structural adjustments never materialized in Nigeria (or anywhere else in West Africa, for that matter). If I could assign only one chapter, this would be the one, since it not only articulates in precise detail how bad structural adjustments have been for local entrepreneurs, it also engages historically important economic theorists—freshwater, saltwater, and European.
Chapter 5, “Chemical Arbitrage: A Social Life of Bioequivalence,” explains how fake drugs enter Idumota through arbitrage. Peterson argues that the Nigerian drug markets are seen as such capital-poor markets that arbitrage—or buying low and selling higher—does not work. Instead, she argues, the drugs are arbitrated, meaning that the downward pressure on pricing allows sellers to do only one thing: adulterate the product in order to make production less expensive. This chemical arbitrage is, in other words, the end result in economies made vulnerable by new forms of speculation introduced by structural adjustments. Chapter 6, “Marketing Indefinite Monopolies: Intellectual Property, Debt, and Drug Geopolitics,” describes the role that debt and patents play to ensure that countries like Nigeria will continue to enrich Western drug companies.

Throughout, Peterson highlights the fact that the architects of Nigeria’s structural adjustments imagined a future when indigenous pharmaceutical manufacturing might be a cornerstone of the country’s postcolonial economic independence. Importantly, these architects did not suffer from a lack of vision. What they suffered from was a belief in utilitarian theories that credit people with perfect knowledge, markets with equal access, and everyone with a shared sense of the common good.

Speculative Markets is an extraordinary first book. There are of course many wonderful ethnographies of contemporary West Africa, but none that draws a clear connection among legislation, markets, and behavior. Peterson cites too many scholars and texts in a kind of unnecessary veneration, and readers who don’t know these works may find her book too difficult. But for scholars interested in contemporary economic anthropology, development theory, and global health, this book is a must-read.
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In the Brazilian Amazon, the amount of land claimed far exceeds the actual area of the region. In the state of Pará alone, claims exist for four times the amount of land in the territory. To add to the confusion, the majority of claimants do not have legal title to their land. Land that families have lived on for decades may suddenly be threatened by counterclaims supported by fraudulent documents. In Conjuring Property, Jeremy Campbell delves below the surface of weathered land claims into the institutional miasma and shadow economy surrounding land in the Brazilian Amazon.

Campbell’s study site is on the western edge of the state of Pará in the frontier town of Castelo do Sonhos, Castle of Dreams. He introduces the regional history, political economy, and social dynamics of this intriguing setting through a rich cast of characters, including Rambo and the gunslingers who help him expand his territory, a silver-tongued rancher-turned-environmentalist named Agamemnon, and numerous smallholders with dreams about and designs on a piece of earth.

Eshewing the simplistic framing of a lawless frontier occupied by villainous land-grabbers, Campbell carefully describes the grande (large-scale owners) and pequeno (smallholders) colonists who have arrived in the region in recent decades. Grandes use threats and coercion, as well as sticky webs of debt and patronage, to compel pequenos to cooperate with them. While both colonist groups tend to focus the blame for the land problem on each other, their methods for shaping and defining land are increasingly similar, responding to and also reconfiguring external valuations of property. Despite differences in socioeconomic status and power, these groups have cohered to some extent around their shared struggle for recognition and their vision of the future; this is an oppositional position in which the rural producer is defined by disdain for neighboring indigenous groups and cynicism toward the urban technocrats and socioenvironmentalists working toward a solution to the land problem. Because of Campbell’s nuanced treatment of colonists in relation to regional history and context, his ethnography will be useful for scholars attempting to understand the complex rural-urban sociology of Amazonian communities, in which factors such as class, regional origin, and ideology shape daily practices, social relations, and political alliances in surprising ways.

In a frontier region where the state is considered absent, inconsistent, or biased in apportioning benefits and punishments, colonists actively prepare for the day when legal titles will be handed out. Campbell elucidates the necessary deception, conflict, and collusion involved in conjuring rights to property through careful attention to colonist narratives and histories, official documents, and public discourse. People adopt anticipatory stances in relation to the precarious legal and institutional conditions surrounding land, hoping for the day when their labors and elisions will be rewarded with legal title and the benefits that it brings, including access to credit and relief from the constant pressures from competing claims.

Campbell excels in explaining the various tactics that the colonists employ to conjure property. For example, document falsification, known as grilagem, is a practice named for placing false land documents in a small box filled with grilos (crickets). After a period of cramped
cohabitation, the fraudulent papers are transformed into brittle, yellowed, and authentic-looking documents that attest to decades of ownership of public lands or properties claimed by others. Campbell’s analysis of hidden and subversive practices and conceptual resources—such as the development archive, in which various activities, stances, histories, and social relations are consolidated—reveals that colonists have general game plans for adapting to whatever shape the land reform will take when it comes to the region. His description of the everyday practices and inventive schemes involved in staking a claim and creating a life in Amazonia provides an essential complement to the predominant economic and institutional analyses of landgrabs and environmental degradation.

Campbell relates the logic of fraud and deception to the boom-and-bust nature of Amazonian fringe economies, the inconsistency of state intervention, and optimistic visions of regional development and personal improvement, coupled with the other side of the coin: entrenched social hierarchies, rural-urban cultural differences, and relentless cynicism toward the state. He situates these local considerations within broader ideological and policy shifts, from developmentalism to socioenvironmentalism and the current environmental governance paradigm. His detailed accounting of actor agency and resistance toward interventions and reform, as well as the embedded logic of illicit practices that are often seen by outsiders and officials as dysfunctional or predatory, represents an important contribution. As neoliberal techno-managerial approaches, including environmental monitoring and economic modeling, exert greater influence on agrarian and environmental policies across the world, Conjuring Property provides particularly salient lessons for anthropologists as well as multidisciplinary researchers and practitioners of conservation, development, and environmental governance.
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The politics of belonging and processes of identity formation take varying shapes and forms. Nadav Samin’s Of Sand or Soil: Genealogy and Tribal Belonging in Saudi Arabia brilliantly illuminates a specific Saudi way of coping with the Saudi kingdom’s rapid social transformation: a return to—and in many ways the reinvention of—tribal genealogy. As such Samin deals with a seemingly marginal but vital and lively aspect of Saudi society that most scholars portray through an overemphasis on security and policy issues and on the religious and economic discourses that predominate in the kingdom's official culture.

Samin reconstructs the rapid changes in Saudi society that have unleashed a quest for identity among its citizens. It is a quest in which the modern Saudi state and its policies play a complex and profoundly ambivalent role. Samin argues that in premodern Saudi Arabia kinship networks organized social and political life. Over the 20th century, as the state of Saudi Arabia took shape, it at first worked to sedentarize and detribalize its subjects: the political significance of tribal and kinship ties was pushed into the background and replaced by a discourse of Islam and nationality. However, in the course of its consolidation, the Saudi state began to revert to this very idiom of kinship—that is, the tribal idiom—for the efficient ordering and sorting of its new subject-citizenry. After the state deliberately dismantled historically grown tribal kinship networks, citizens’ classification in symbolic networks of tribal kinship and representation and their standardization according to historic genealogical criteria again became a vital aspect of national belonging. The losers in this process were those who found themselves unable to offer credible evidence of their tribal genealogical affiliations.

Samin concentrates on the life and work of the Saudi Arabian genealogist and historian ʻHamad al-Jāsir (d. 2000) and his often troubled relationship with the Wahhabi religious establishment. Al-Jāsir was by far the most prominent of the scholars who contributed to the development of the kingdom’s modern genealogical culture. In doing so, he faced both support and enormous difficulties. When he began the systematic compilation of Saudi tribal lineages, he was forced to confront the lack of a written record of central Arabia’s past and its oral traditions. Samin shows that al-Jāsir’s endeavors at times also came into conflict with those of the ruling establishment, since the Saudi state and its Wahhabi scholars based their authority on scripture and religious discourse; oral traditions and narratives were discarded and suppressed as a dubious Bedouin mode of thought. Al-Jāsir was among the first to wrest textual authority away from the Wahhabi clerics. Ultimately, this challenge to Saudi Arabia’s learned establishment would see him ostracized by the same patrons who had first adopted him.

The historic caste-like status differences among Saudi tribes posed a further difficulty for al-Jāsir’s attempts to rehabilitate and reinvigorate tribal genealogies and affiliations. Whereas in other parts of the Arabian Peninsula (e.g., Yemen), tribalism features a more or less egalitarian discourse among and between members of the prevalent tribes, enormous status hierarchies are documented among and between the tribes that existed in central Arabia before the modern period—status hierarchies that continue to resonate in modern Saudi society. Samin
describes al-Jāsir’s efforts to remedy tribal hierarchies and rehabilitate formerly low and ostracized lineages and tribes in order to include their members as equal citizens in the symbolic genealogical representations of the modern Saudi state. Following the lives of Saudi lineage seekers as they weave in and out of al-Jāsir’s correspondence highlights the enormous pressure on Saudi citizens to claim affiliation with one of the historically recognized Arabian tribes, as the Saudi state began to standardize citizens’ identities according to genealogical criteria.

In many Arab societies, tribal genealogical representations (however fictional they may be) are an important aspect of identity politics and identity formation, not only with respect to the past but also with respect to the present. Genealogists, however, often retreat into a scientific ivory tower, undertaking research for the sake of research. Here, in Samin’s monograph, a very tangible and practical significance of genealogy, the Saudis’ “blood sport” (123), becomes apparent as individuals with suspect tribal origins scramble for the genealogical belonging that is at the heart of the kingdom’s modern genealogical culture. “From the starting line of status determination in the new Najd, there seemed a mad dash underway, a sprint to reach the closest credible tribal affiliation and hang on for dear life, even if this meant inviting the most profound sort of contradiction, disagreement over descent among closely related kin” (95). The Buraymi dispute of the 1950s, too, credibly demonstrates the enormous practical importance that genealogy—here the grafting of genealogical constructs—can assume in political and economic contexts. Samin identifies genealogy as the linchpin of the Buraymi dispute when British and US experts exploited local genealogical representations to assert territorial claims and oil exploitation rights on behalf of their Persian Gulf partners.

Of Sand or Soil is a pertinent, rich, and beautifully written book about Saudi Arabian identity politics. Samin offers anthropologists, historians, political scientists, and others the tools to analyze a contemporary Saudi debate in the field of genealogy and belonging. His book is, by all standards, a groundbreaking piece of academic research.

**Bukharan Jews and the Dynamics of Global Judaism.**
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**NATASHA ZARETSKY**
New York University

Bukharan Jews have experienced significant changes in recent decades, prompted by the collapse of the Soviet Union and migrations to Israel and the United States. Building on years of ethnographic and historical engagement, Alanna Cooper traces the transformations in this community beginning in the 18th and 19th centuries through a cultural history and ethnography, marking its progressive isolation from the so-called centers of the Jewish world and, consequently, the grander narrative of Jewish history. While her book may be read as a case study of Bukharan Jews—a work that integrates an isolated people into the broader chronology of Jewish history—Cooper also uses this material to argue that Judaism is not and has never been essential or static but, instead, should be viewed as negotiated and contested. As such, she foregrounds a Jewish diaspora group that has been overlooked in contemporary Jewish studies and, further, argues for its importance to understanding Judaism more broadly over time.

Cooper invokes conversations as her analytical framework for understanding the diachronic nature of the encounters between Bukharan Jews and various interlocutors that also allow her to argue for redefining normative Judaism as a dynamic process. Conversations frame the organization of her book, which is divided into an introduction and three sections focusing on the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries. In part 1, she begins with her arrival story, highlighting how her encounters with Bukharan Jewish immigrants in Queens, New York, shaped her understanding of their Judaism and Jewishness as conversations and contestations over meaning—a framework that anchors the ensuing cultural history and ethnography. In part 2, she turns to the 18th century, examining alternative accounts about Sephardic emissary Yosef Maman’s visit from Ottoman Palestine to Central Asia, originally framed by Avraham Ya’ari as providing religious enlightenment for Bukharan Jews. Using alternative scholarly accounts, she presents a different version of this encounter that endows her subjects with more agency than was previously suggested by depicting a sense of debate and contestation, which also grants more legitimacy to the diaspora experience.

In part 3, Cooper explores the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a key era of change in Jewish life as the Tsarist Empire colonized Central Asia. Using archived letters, she focuses on encounters between Central Asian Jews and other communities, including controversies over practices like kosher butchering that effectively demonstrate the contestations at play in how certain practices became enacted in local Jewish life. Through a close reading of these debates, she also demonstrates the way categories like local and global and center and periphery are both actively contested and in flux. Consequently, she suggests a different model for understanding how to “conceive of and maintain Jewish unity”: the “Edah Paradigm” that “accepts and even celebrates cultural diversity” (120) in diaspora communities, rather than privileging an authoritative center.

Part 4 considers the years after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, offering the most clearly ethnographic...
chapters in the book. Most of Cooper’s research with Bukharan Jews from Uzbekistan and Tajikistan focuses on communities in New York, Tel Aviv, Samarkand, and Bukhara. In chapter 8, for instance, she begins to trace the development of local Jewish practices during a period of Soviet isolation from other Jewish communities, including the transmission of religion outside of institutions, due to strong local kin networks and the maintenance of religious dietary practices and life-cycle rituals. She then focuses on the role of international organizations in Central Asian Jewish life and various migration experiences that reveal new struggles in identity and belonging, concluding that despite the different meanings attributed to edah (or community) in new contexts, it remains important, even as the notion of Bukharan Jews is clearly negotiated and constructed. She concludes that Jewish history, Judaism, and Jewish people are maintained as a “single religion” and a “single people” (261) through the way these categories are enacted and contested through conversations.

In many ways, with its emphasis on contingency and the contestations at work in defining a group and offering an account of a historically marginalized group, Cooper’s book aligns with contemporary concerns in anthropology. Cooper also positions her book in the line of ethnographies such as Barbara Myerhoff’s 1978 Number Our Days and Joelle Bahloul’s 1996 The Architecture of Memory, certainly important contributions to anthropology and to Jewish ethnography in particular. However, she also suggests in her preface that she is concerned with salvaging what she sees as a vanishing culture, a notion that might resonate in problematic ways with other histories in our discipline; overall, though, she does challenge essentialist renderings of a culture through her ethnography.

Cooper also makes promising connections between history and anthropology that could have been pursued more fully. Though she approaches her historical chapters with an ethnographic understanding and sensibility, paying attention to contested terrains of meaning, the voices of her contemporary subjects seem absent from parts 2 and 3, appearing only in the final section. It would have added to her argument to further develop the connections and dialogic relationships between the two disciplines as well as the points of tension between them. Additionally, while Cooper’s analysis of the dialogic relationship between the global and the local for Bukharan Jews is insightful, it would have been enhanced if she had presented a more sustained engagement with the theoretical work on globalization, transnationalism, and diaspora.

Overall, Bukharan Jews and the Dynamics of Global Judaism contributes to the growing field of Jewish ethnography, especially in its concentration on an understudied Jewish group that reveals the significance of contestation to understanding diaspora communities. Methodologically, Cooper’s focus on contestations and conversations and her incorporation of historiographic material in addition to ethnographic work are also valuable. This ethnography will be of particular interest to students and scholars of the anthropology of Jews, Jewish studies more broadly, and diaspora and migration studies.
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Courtney Handman’s study of the Christian life of the Guhu-Samane, a relatively large group living in the Waria River valley, a remote corner of Morobe Province near its conjunction with Gulf, Central, and Northern (Oro) Provinces, should be counted among the very best contributions to the anthropology of Christianity. Handman focuses upon the cleavages to this Christian landscape produced by a “schismatic impulse to perfect the church” (12), which she treats as an essential element of Protestant Christianity and which she partially locates within the fluid Melanesian sociality discussed by Marilyn Strathern, Roy Wagner, and the like. As a result of a succession of internal religious ruptures, the Guhu-Samane world is now characterized by three mutually critical denominations: the original Lutheran Church, which converted the local population in the 1910s, as well as two evangelically oriented churches known as the New Life and Reformed Gospel Churches, which emerged in the 1970s and 1990s, respectively. Taking this denominational multiplicity as her focus, Handman seeks to unpack the historical circumstances that created it as well as elucidate the differences in religious and cosmological meanings and practices that it contains in the present.

Handman begins by examining in detail the attitudes and practices of the various mission groups that have worked in the area. The first of these was the German colonial Lutheran Church, whose missionaries adopted a strongly critical approach to local religious traditions. The really important player in the external infusion of Christian ideas into the area was Ernie Richert, a linguist within the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) based in Ukarumpa, Eastern Highlands Province. Handman’s account reveals the utterly pivotal role played by Richert in his efforts to translate the New Testament into the local language, what the SIL refers to as “heart language” because it constitutes a “route to a subjective core of the self, the self that will respond to God’s interventions” (81). To gain a sincere appreciation of the gospel, the SIL argument runs, people must be able to grasp it in a way that is immediate
and socially meaningful. Through a “judicious selection and blending” (113) of concepts, the Guhu-Samane New Testament was born. Of great significance, too, is the fact that Guhu-Samane did not exist as an ethnonym prior to Richert’s work; he was responsible for creating it as part of his translation project. The group name, then, became synonymous with and brought into being the Guhu-Samane as a collective of Christian subjects. To be Guhu-Samane was to be Christian.

Couching the Christian message in the heart language of the Guhu-Samane had profound and far-reaching effects upon the Christian landscape. The most important of these was a world-changing revival movement that took place in 1977, incidentally the same year that Diyos of Eliptaman catalyzed a similar movement in the Min area, as Joel Robbins describes in his study of Urupmin Christianity. According to Handman, the revival was a watershed moment in local Christian history. As she puts it, “The revival—brought about by SIL—unseats and overcomes both the state and the mission” (143) through the creation of a truly local, village-based Christianity. Through a process of Batesonian schismogenesis, a group within the New Life Church then established the Reformed Gospel Church in the 1990s, based on a growing dissatisfaction with the use of traditional performative practices such as drumming during church services. The resultant configuration of different churches is a tense one, even to the extent that a vicious armed attack on the Reformed Gospel Church was suspected by its members of having been in some way organized by the New Life group. A crucial part of Handman’s argument is her claim that “Guhu-Samane Christians see their denominational disputes as processes through which they are able to criticize the forms of worship that have emerged since their initial introduction to Christianity in the 1910s” (217) and not simply as Protestant purification.

Handman’s book is ethnographically very rich and also theoretically well informed. Through clear and lucid prose, she tactfully weaves together various strands of linguistic, anthropological, and historical analyses to form a variegated and complex account of Guhu-Samane Christianity that is both faithful to the lived reality of the people and a substantial contribution to the anthropological literature on Christianity in Melanesia. Of the book’s many strengths, one of the most important is its emphasis upon Christianity not as one thing but as many different things to different people. As the Guhu-Samane situation shows the reader, there is not one Christianity but many Christianities, and these expressions of faith, furthermore, are not stable and enduring but unstable and shifting—constantly being reimagined and reshaped through an intense and carefully considered process of social critique. Too often, anthropologists of Christianity fail to apprehend the importance of the variety of churches that make up the Christian landscape in the communities they study, and Handman’s excellent approach stands as a call for other anthropologists of Christianity to consider the issues she highlights. Also central to her work is her refreshing look at the importance of sociality and groups within Christianity, which has often been sidelined by a strong emphasis upon Pentecostal Christianity’s efforts to create modern, Western-type individuals concerned with their own salvation.

Critical Christianity is without question one of the best books to appear within the now well-established Anthropology of Christianity series edited by Joel Robbins. It is faithful to the frameworks in which the field was forged, incorporating an interest in Pentecostal and evangelical Christianity and in the ways that this faith expresses ideologies that both break with and continue with the past. However, Handman expands this conceptual palette through her creative and original contributions to denominational disputes, the social and group dynamics of Christianity, and the inherent tendencies of Protestant and Melanesian sociality toward cyclical fracturing and bonding.
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The Italian word arrangiarsi, which is generally translated as “making do,” “scraping by,” or more literally “to arrange oneself,” is felt by many Italians to be a cultural metaphor for Neapolitans, a word designating the stoical and wise approach that these people have to the vicissitudes that life throws at them. Naples, where as Jason Pine observes in his intriguing book, crime, music, and everyday life mingle seamlessly, is the perfect place to enact this sort of canny philosophical pragmatism. Where does this art of making do come from, and why is it still part of contemporary life in Naples, given the complexities of life in a technological world? Pine provides a truly insightful answer. Simply put, Neapolitans have always understood that there is no certainty in life, only indeterminacy and ambiguity. And this intrinsic attitude is imprinted in the lexicon of the dialect of Naples and the fabric of its traditional music, the canzone napoletana, which deals with love and romance just as ambiguously as any haunting love ballad of the past and present.

Pine writes in a brisk style that falls between a trade paperback approach and a solid academic treatise. He presents a fascinating ethnographic portrait of a society that is still unique in many ways, despite the forces of globalization. Ordinary folk in Naples are still trying to make do in an increasingly dangerous environment that is constantly
cutting its connections with the past. Even with a shadow economy controlled by networks of violent organized crime from the Camorra to fringe criminal cliques, Pine argues that ordinary Neapolitans continue to cope, as they have always done, with adversity through the art of *arrangiarsi*.

The pivot around which Pine's thesis turns is the so-called neomelodica music business, controlled by both the real and the shadow economies, making it an unexpected success. Only in a making-do context can such an implicit collaboration exist, let alone thrive. In chapter 1, “Where There’s Money, There’s the Camorra,” Pine meticulously unravels the history of the emergence of neomelodica music and its overt references to the ancient *canzone napoletana* style. What both the criminals and the fans of this music understand is that the true language of Neapolitans is a musical one. The sponsor might be the Camorra rather than the church or the nobility, but the result is the same—Neapolitans are laying claim to their own musical language in contemporary ways. Pine makes the valid point that the Camorra's origins are obscure and rooted in an abiding mythology that has made it possible for this criminal group to exist as a parallel political-social structure.

In chapters 2 to 6, Pine provides the details of his ethnographic analysis, which exposes the persistence of secrecy as a code of honor and the role of *arrangiarsi* as a strategy for survival and adaptation to the reality of everyday life. The underlying subtext in these chapters is that the neomelodica phenomenon is the key to understanding the mind-set of a making-do culture. In its theatricality and its subtle references both to the traditions of Naples in the *canzone napoletana* and to the shifting identities that are emerging to threaten the Neapolitan character, the neomelodica style is truly a metaphor for modern-day Naples. Like traditional Neapolitan theater, the music mixes irony with tragedy. This admixture defines the stoicism of Neapolitan culture and its unique brand of humor, which is part satire, part sensibility to the ineluctability of fate. Blending resignation with a sense of humor is the sum and substance of *arrangiarsi*.

In a city where unemployment has become chronic, the neomelodica music industry has become the main staple of the Neapolitan economy, according to Pine. Singing and music are in the blood of Neapolitans, as Pine demonstrates throughout, and this knack for aesthetics provides a coping mechanism—a mechanism that is often the trigger for true art. In this sense, one can make parallels to the birth of blues and jazz in the United States. Repressed, suppressed, and deprived of basic human rights, the African slaves developed what is perhaps America’s only true musical art form: jazz, via its blues predecessor. Art is likely the ideal response for ensuring survival in miserable conditions. This does not mean that the neomelodica phenomenon reaches the same level of art as the original forms of jazz. It means that great music often crystallizes in socially deprived and emotionally repressive contexts such as early America and modern-day Naples.

It is relevant to note that Pine's book was published in 2012. Since then the neomelodica craze has subsided considerably, as far as can be told. The original artists have become old and relatively rich, and the new generation of music fans has started to look elsewhere. Organized crime itself has morphed into something different in the world of web-based economies and aesthetics, where nanoculture (or a culture based on a quick turnover of fads) reigns supreme. For a musical trend to thrive, it must be assured of some modicum of stability. This is likely impossible in a world where memes and viral rule, conditioning all of us to expect constant newness and faddishness.

Pine's is an important book, documenting as it does how the art of making do has defined and likely continues to define the character of Neapolitans. Perhaps the art will dissipate in this brave new world of technology and globalization. But then again, Neapolitans have shown an ethnic consistency since at least the time of Italian reunification, making them stand out linguistically, musically, and culturally. The only thing I am left to wonder about is where did this art come from in the first place, and why has it not surfaced, at least in parallel ways, in other parts of Italy? Perhaps there is no answer to this conundrum. All we can do is document it, as has Pine.
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In *The Slow Boil*, Jonathan Shapiro Anjaria explores the lives, concerns, and desires of street hawkers in Mumbai, India, to illuminate how their insecure yet simultaneously rooted place in the street underlies their tense relationships with state functionaries. He contrasts hawkers' negotiated legality with the citizenship ideals of urban middle-class civic activists to argue that conflicts over the use of the street are contestations about the form and content of political subjectivity.

Borrowing a street hawker's description of the tension between hawkers and local state officials as a slow boil, Anjaria places the clash of divergent understandings and experiences of Mumbai's streets front and center. His vivid stories of street hawking include diverse actors—from scrap collectors to vegetable vendors—and weave sketches of sensory experiences into descriptions of the politics and economics that underlie them. Rather than analyzing these narratives through the lens of *either* affective experience...
or structural inequality, Anjaria suggests that both are essential to understanding the city. He presents a series of ethnographically rich narratives about street hawkers' negotiations over how they can occupy Mumbai’s urban landscape. Hawkers’ unions and local state actors enter into tense collaborations and encounters that are sometimes violent but also productive in their uncertainties and failures. Anjaria’s descriptions of police raids demonstrate the precariousness of lives and livelihoods in the street: handcarts are confiscated, goods are destroyed, and hawkers are sent fleeing. But there is productive potential in the ways that hawkers respond to these forms of oppression. Although raids remove street vending temporarily, hawkers trickle back to once again occupy the spaces they had been forced to vacate. Through these continued interactions and collaborations with local state officials, hawkers’ union leaders become powerful political actors who can successfully navigate local state bureaucracies and orchestrate resistance.

For the urban middle class, negotiations between street hawkers and local government officials are evidence of the corruption, inefficiency, and incompetency of the state. Street hawkers represent an illegal and unregulated encroachment into urban streets and neighborhoods, leaving sidewalks impassable and surrounding areas unkempt. Middle-class civic activists blame such an unruly cityscape on both the incompetent state and their apathetic peers for their lack of “civic consciousness” (142). These critiques are part of a larger feeling of political alienation and frustration with the changing cityscape. Through an examination of middle-class civic organizations’ legal discourses and understandings of civic responsibility, Anjaria argues that members of the urban middle class are “estranged citizens” (136) who feel excluded from both poor and elite forms of political power and knowledge.

Street hawkers are a key example of this estrangement. Middle-class pedestrians see hawkers as evidence of the state’s collusion with illegal occupiers of urban spaces in ways that privilege populist politics over the needs of the idealized pedestrian, whom civic activists conceive to be a more universal form of urban citizen. Using the courts to pass legal regulations aimed at containing and curtailing the presence of street hawkers, then, serves as a way for middle-class civic associations to assert their ideals of rational modernity and universal citizenship. As in his discussion of street hawkers’ relationships with state agents, Anjaria skillfully illustrates how differing understandings of who and what belong in the street are at the heart of state-citizen relationships that engender political subjectivities.

These complicated relationships challenge existing narratives in the literature on urban development in South Asia that establish the neoliberal period as one of complete transformation. Anjaria offers a constructive intervention into the literature on global neoliberalism and the making of urban spaces by resisting totalizing narratives. Rather than seeing urban development as a trajectory toward the total displacement of the urban poor, he demonstrates that state planning efforts are undermined on the ground. Street hawkers remain an instrumental part of the urban landscape despite ongoing efforts to restrict their activities. Yet this is not a new trend. Anjaria begins his analysis by historicizing state programs that regulate street vending and perceptions of street hawkers as a menace. Turning to the colonial archive, he demonstrates that hawkers have been considered a problem in the unruly city for almost two centuries. Colonial understandings of public and private spaces, property, and the ideals of free-market liberalism made streets into civic spaces deserving of state intervention and regulation. State responsibilities for public health, orderliness, and development became operationalized in the street and gave rise to projects that remain significant today—such as violent street clearances—aimed at managing urban streets and the bodies that occupy them.

Throughout, Anjaria focuses on the ambiguities of being in-between. Street hawkers are not the most abject and marginal of the urban poor, but in occupying spaces between legality and illegality, neither do they have a secure place in the city. Anjaria’s other primary group of interlocutors, middle-class civic activists, are also in-between: they are neither part of the negotiated relationships between hawkers and local authorities nor wealthy enough to be free from their effects. These in-between spaces and subjectivities mean that the city functions as a place of inequality but also of promise. Anjaria notes that the current theoretical trend in urban studies that focuses on the positive potential of flexibility and informality in the city, what he terms the “improvisational city perspective” (162), neglects the effects of structural inequality in favor of creative production. But rather than dismissing this perspective for its flaws, he suggests that we leave open its political potential for refocusing urban studies and reimagining models for the future.

The Slow Boil is a fruitful addition to conversations about the politics of urban spaces. Anjaria offers the city street as constructive of political subjectivities that generate and are generated by negotiations and thus are always in the making.
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Australian Aboriginal media practice has a long and rich history of entanglement with anthropology. As early as the 1880s, anthropological researchers introduced crayon and
paper as well as technologies of photography, film, and sound recording to the people with whom they worked. More recently, anthropologists were involved in stimulating the production of portable, marketable forms of art, and through the mid-1980s and early 1990s they introduced technological equipment and closely observed first experiments in video, radio, and community broadcasting. At the heart of much ethnographic writing emerging from these most recent experiments was a concern with the distinctive ways in which Aboriginal people deployed and responded to recorded and moving images and negotiated the world-changing transformations of broadcasting. At some basic level, to focus on radio, video, and televisual media was to attend to the increasingly blurred lines between localized forms of indigenous cultural production and the politics of indigenous representations in the larger national public sphere.

Daniel Fisher’s book continues in this tradition but also advances a distinct second generation of ethnographic engagement with indigenous broadcasting media. He elaborates a model of media production and radio broadcasting that coincides with the sustenance of kinship networks but gives special attention to the wider field of forces within and against which Aboriginal media is produced in the present. Elaborating the voice as the book’s knotty conjunction of these forces, Fisher reveals a “sound world” that “does more than simply echo an Indigenous agency; it also gathers to itself powerful, at times incommensurable agencies and interests” (250). The Voice and Its Doubles thus reveals the complex interweaving of Aboriginal imperatives with those of the state. Aboriginal radio is brought into being against a backdrop of competition for access to limited funding and conflicting expectations. Because radio programming is at once an object of institutional desire, a site of governmental attention, and the focal point of a wide range of policies, funding bodies, and state departments, it involves passionate contestations over definitions of media and Aboriginal identity. A decade after self-determination was declared a failed social experiment, ideas of Aboriginal autonomy share discursive space with a new neoliberal emphasis on privatization, responsibility, and corporatization.

To reveal the ontology of the voice is thus to sketch the contours of the varied and contested politics of indigeneity in contemporary Australia. Fisher highlights the larger geopolitical context in which an Australian Aboriginal politics emerged through the second half of the 20th century, drawing influence from the Black Power movement in North America as well as the anticolonial movements of West and South Africa. Traveling in tandem with these new forms of political tactics, modes of presentation, and contestation were distinctive forms of music that were coded as black. Aboriginal activists in Australia took to radio to counter cultural imperialism, keep their languages alive, play the music they loved, and create broadcasting arenas that catered to local interests. The distinctive nature of Aboriginal radio extends beyond the transmission of special interest content; it is fueled by two larger imperatives: to link up kin through mediated networks and, in so doing, with greater or lesser explicit purpose, to create public spheres in which Aboriginal people both recognize themselves and find their voice.

To grapple with this diverse and dynamic scene, Fisher undertakes fieldwork in two quite different locations: 4AAA radio in metropolitan Brisbane and the Top End Aboriginal Bush Broadcasting Association (TEABBA) in Darwin. Each radio station radiates across a spiderweb of listening and relational networks. In turn, the two geographically distant and different enterprises were “drawn close in the imaginations” (34) of the young Murri (Aboriginal) trainees wrestling with the nature of indigenous identity—hence Fisher’s rationale for this multisited inquiry. The issues at stake at each site vary, but Fisher finds both places contending with the neoliberalization of government programs. In Brisbane, trainees struggle to realize what might be glossed as professional broadcasting values. Here Fisher finds a group of young people taking to radio in response to forces at work in a larger bureaucratic environment that propels them into training programs. The 4AAA model instantiates a larger shift in the framing of indigenous cultural production from government-subsidized arts to emergent enterprise. The Aboriginal voice is “dispersed as technological skill, expressive technique, and the abstract ‘product’ of institutional labor and governmental investment” (10).

Meanwhile in Darwin, where TEABBA transmits across a wide arc of small remote communities, radio staff confront the contradictory imperatives of cultural brokerage. These broadcasters share strong affinities with the place-and kin-based priorities of their bush listeners but are curtailed by the requirements of the job, which see them “stuck behind computer screens, engaging in quarterly audits, surveys, and various kinds of accounting procedure” and contending with “a turbulent, bureaucratie environment under the intense strain of constant change” (188). While responding to members’ highly localized interests and needs, TEABBA broadcasters are increasingly pressured to direct their attention to the differently oriented criteria of business plans and marketing campaigns.

The book’s structure is shaped by Fisher’s identification of three key imperatives at work in Aboriginal people’s own investments in this mediated environment: “giving voice, sounding black, and linking people up” (4). We learn about the backgrounds and motivations of radio workers as well as about the way that the activity occurring in these spaces can lurch between the banal requirements of bureaucratic labor and forms of ritualized reverence. We learn that behind interinstitutional contestation there often lie disputed definitions of the role of media and models of culture and agency. The voice is the meeting place for the full variety of
pleasures, frustrations, constraints, resistances, and contradictions that attend Aboriginal subjectivity in the present.

More faintly heard here, through all the governmental noise, are the sounds of the airwaves and the songs that thrive at the heart of Aboriginal lives. Nevertheless, Fisher has made impressive work of characterizing the messy strands of this unstable and transforming social field. The Voice and Its Doubles makes for compelling reading, not only for students of media but for anyone interested in grappling with the contemporary contested politics of Aboriginality.
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Ethnographies of public housing projects have tended to treat them as encapsulated worlds, cut off from their surroundings both socially and spatially. Even the most sensitive portrayals have focused rather intensively on the importance of local networks and modes of reciprocity at the expense of situating these projects within their larger contexts. Now comes Catherine Fennell’s compelling new ethnography, which documents the end of the era of public housing in Chicago and examines its shifting relationship with both its dispersing tenants and its broader publics.

Fennell was able to capture in astonishing detail what would come to be regarded as the largest transformation of public housing ever undertaken to date. Beginning in the mid-1990s, several thousand public housing tenants were displaced when their buildings were razed. Some of these tenants ended up moving in with family elsewhere, but far more came to rely on a government program known as Section 8. Those with Section 8 vouchers moved into privately owned housing in peripheral neighborhoods that were off-limits concerns the ways in which philanthropies and their limits” (131).

What is original about Fennell’s approach is her deployment of the notion of sympathy both as a way to understand what these displaced tenants experienced and as a key element of the Chicago Housing Authority’s strategy of using the destruction of public housing as an opportunity to fashion a new civic ethos. In place of the racialized otherization that had sustained segregation, Chicago now embarked on a conscious effort to engender a new sense of commonality between the poor and the larger community.

Once in Westhaven, both the former tenants and the middle-class residents realized that they had been assigned important roles to play in this drama—the tenants as individuals supposedly in need of reform and the middle-class residents as their role models. Both groups were also forced to acknowledge the power imbalances between them. The New Urbanist design of Westhaven was intended to encourage neighborly sociability, yet rather than use the parks and backyards carefully designed for that purpose, the former Horner tenants preferred to gather on their front sidewalks, setting out barbecue grills, playing music, and visiting with one another. As Fennell describes it, “developers contracted to usher the site into its mixed-income phases increasingly worried that such scenes would unnerve and deter market-rate buyers and renters, whose buy-in was absolutely crucial for meeting financing targets” (150). Their solution was to design the next phase of Westhaven with almost no public space in front of the buildings and thus discourage the kinds of social interactions that the former tenants were accustomed to and valued.

Fennell spent a decade engaged in meticulous fieldwork, and the extent to which she immersed herself in a range of community activities is impressive. The work paid off: she shares insights that she could have acquired only through establishing deep and abiding connections with local people. One of the most striking chapters of the book describes the former Horner tenants’ enduring attachment to the blasting heat that had been a feature of their previous homes and that had previously been included in their rents. It is a hallmark of Fennell’s painstaking research that she then investigated the history of heating systems in public housing in order to discover where this luxuriant warmth came from. While most outsiders had found the heat oppressive, the tenants claimed to have become addicted to it, and their attempts to replicate those stifling temperatures in their new units—in which they were responsible for paying for utilities—resulted in astronomical bills and spiraling debt. Fennell uses their longing for a return to “project heat” to initiate a stimulating discussion of “how arguments about the embodiment of inequality in place might also launch a viable critique of market disciplines and their limits” (131).

Another significant discussion that Fennell also advances concerns the ways in which philanthropies and
not-for-profits have supplanted public forms of aid, whose resources—once somewhat predictable—could be managed and redistributed through local networks. Foundations, which are not subject to any democratic oversight and whose commitments tend to be rather capricious, now provide grants tied to particular goals that oblige tenants to participate in initiatives whose priorities they may not share and whose funding streams they cannot influence or control.

This is fascinating stuff, analyzed through the lens of theoretical perspectives that are rarely brought to bear in discussions of impoverishment and displacement. My one caveat is that some of these deliberations can end up seeming curiously abstract in a study that is definitely grounded in acknowledging the pleasures and injuries of materiality. Also missing are some references that one might have expected to find to other contemporary anthropological work on urban poverty and inequality.

But these are relatively minor quibbles about a book of impressive breadth, depth, and ambition. Fennell beautifully captures the complexities of the present postwelfare moment in all its contradictions. She concludes with an account of ongoing attempts to establish a Museum of Public Housing; the former public housing tenants had become antiquated relics of a bygone era. The story of the welfare state and its successes and failures will continue to be decried as oblivion and displacement. My one caveat is that some of these deliberations can end up seeming curiously abstract in a study that is definitely grounded in acknowledging the pleasures and injuries of materiality. Also missing are some references that one might have expected to find to other contemporary anthropological work on urban poverty and inequality.
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JEAN MUTEB A RAHIER
Florida International University

This short book is a thought feast. A self-described poststructuralist literary, cultural, and postcolonial studies scholar, Michelle Wright builds upon the ethnographic work of anthropologists and others conducted in various locations within transnational, national, and local circuits or networks of blackness.

The book’s departure point is Wright’s increasing frustration with the tendency of so many US-based scholarly discourses to portray blackness as homogeneous, sometimes in quite oppressive ways: “In [US-based] African Diaspora studies, theories of Blackness almost always predicate themselves on seeking total or near-total inclusivity, but as many, including myself, have complained, we lack a model that could accurately represent the majority of the Black Diaspora at any historical moment” (21).

Wright’s project is to begin proposing such a model, one that should allow for a more sophisticated understanding of blackness in its space-time complexities across the diaspora. That model should identify and correct the ordinary exclusions of those black individuals who do not conform to the definition of any prototypical blackness imagined from a US-centered, African American studies perspective. Anthropologists engaging with communities of the so-called new African diaspora in Europe, the United States, and beyond will sympathize with Wright when she writes: “The need for definitions of Blackness that do not exclude, isolate, or stigmatize is all the more pressing . . . with the increasing proliferation of diverse Black communities of individuals whose histories and current status as ‘hyphenated’ Black identities across the globe call for representation and inclusion” (5). Here Wright is drawing upon concepts discussed in, for example, Percy Hintzen and Jean Muteba Rahier’s Problematizing Blackness: Self-Ethnographies by Black Immigrants to the United States. This call for the edification of a model that defines blackness with respect both for its multiple and distinct historical formations and for its shared historical materiality of black oppression and abjection across the globe is certainly the book’s major contribution.

Wright notes that most discourses on blackness in the United States and the Caribbean (Central and South America could have been added here) are embedded in the history of the Middle Passage and in the historical experiences of slavery: they give shape to black cultural politics, performances, and social sensibilities. These constructed and phenomenological histories are perceived as “the defining moments of collective Blackness” (7–8). More than histories, they are “epistemologies: narratives of knowledge that are taught, learned, relayed, exchanged, and debated in discussions on the ‘facts’ of Blackness” (8).

The value of this book is Wright’s daring to suggest a deconstruction of what she dubs the Middle Passage epistemology—which she reveals as a dominant and commanding space-time narrative infusing the academic canon of African diasporic identities that reduces the complexity of the origins and performances of blackness in the West by stressing and reifying the process of being captured in one world to be forcefully brought into another. Wright’s deconstruction comes along with multiple and detailed critical references to Newtonian physics and philosophy that—for the most part—define the linear space-time and progress narrative that gives shape to the Middle Passage epistemology. As she suggests, the space-time of the Middle Passage epistemology could be (and indeed has been) represented by one or more lines or unidirectional arrows going from Africa to the Americas. By contrast, the space-time she understands as emerging from what she calls the postwar...
epistemology denotes an epiphenomenal approach to the here and now that should be represented as a circle with lines and arrows initiating and going potentially anywhere.

Indeed, although Wright doesn’t acknowledge that she is doing so, *Physics of Blackness* is very much about understanding the African diaspora in terms of multiple and multidirectional individual as well as social, translocal, and transnational networks or circuits of blackness. She calls for those of us engaged in African diaspora studies to expand our theoretical horizons by “deploying an Epiphenomenal concept of spacetime that takes into account all the multifarious dimensions of Blackness that exist in any one moment, or ‘now.’” That is, in that conceptual framework, we must recognize the circle she refers to as standing for “the ‘now’ of the present moment, [while] the arrows represent all the spacetimes that intersect with that ‘now.’ Reading Blackness from the ‘now’ does not mean erasing or marginalizing the past” (20).

Wright points to the importance of the very specific history of African diaspora studies in the United States, where multiple universities—unlike anywhere else in the world—have their own departments or programs of African American, African diaspora, black, or Africana studies. That relative blossoming of African diaspora studies research and teaching in the United States since the 1960s came along with an exclusive attachment to the Middle Passage epistemology. For Wright, who has worked on European African diaspora cultural politics, if we are to make sense of the contemporary contexts, situations, interactions, and processes that have involved so many diverse black subjectivities, we must depart from the Middle Passage epistemology and its linear space-time and instead embrace novel anti-essentialist theorizing that will allow the incorporation of black diversity in its purview. She insists that such a change requires us to move away from a Newtonian conception of time, which is perhaps the hardest thing to do.

The book’s size, along with the acuity of many of its interventions and the relevance of the questions it raises, makes it particularly appropriate for graduate seminars in African diaspora studies. Because Wright unambiguously posits the field as transnational and multidisciplinary, *Physics of Blackness* has the kind of reach that will be especially exciting to anthropologists.
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CHRISTEN A. SMITH  
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What is the relationship among race, geography, and movement? How does our migration between places affect how we understand ourselves and others racially, and how does this process of meaning making, in turn, influence the places we are going and the places we have been? These are the fundamental questions at the heart of Tiffany Joseph’s *Race on the Move*. A reflection on the politics of race, migration, and racial formation among Brazilian migrants to the United States based on her long-term field research, it offers an important reflection on the ways that race is negotiated between nation-states, not just within them. Many analyses of racial formation focus on national contexts. *Race on the Move* stands out as one of a handful of texts to focus on the migratory politics of race and how movement and flow (rather than bounded, spatial culture) shape transnational identity politics dialogically.

Joseph offers an important portrait of undocumented migrants of color in the United States, enriching it by charting the transnational histories behind their migration stories. She conducted research in the city of Governador Valadares in the state of Minas Gerais, “Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city to the United States for the past 60 years” (2). The city has been connected to the United States since the 1940s, when US mining executives traveled there to extract mica and set up an antimalaria public health campaign during World War II. This financial connection produced a special link that has been lasting: in 2004, Governador Valadares received $2.4 billion in remittances from the United States. Yet money is not the only thing that circulates between these sites. Like remittances, ideas about race also travel, remapping the sociopolitical economy of identity at “home” and “away.”

From September 2007 through October 2008, Joseph interviewed 73 people in Governador Valadares, 49 of whom were migrants and 24 of whom were not. Her interviewees were diverse: classified as white, black, or *pardo* (brown) according to Brazilian racial classification standards and evenly divided between men and women. Most migrants had traveled from Governador Valadares to the northeastern region of the United States, settling particularly in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Most had entered the United States legally with visas but overstayed their visas to work “as housecleaners, dishwashers, and babysitters, or in construction”—jobs open to undocumented workers with “limited English proficiency” (11). Their stories, which Joseph recounts, are as diverse and as complex as the people who made the journeys, yet their varying experiences are inevitably affected by the unique intersubjectivity of racial practices in the United States.

*Race on the Move* is a book about how migration influences racial concepts in Brazil and the United States. Joseph engages Peggy Levitt and B. Nadya Jaworsky’s term *transnational racial optic* to describe the “lens through which migrants observe, negotiate, and interpret race by drawing simultaneously on transnationally formed racial conceptions from the host and home societies” (7). Brazil serves as the primary referent for how migrants identify themselves.
 racially before they come to the United States and initially when they first move. Brazil is also the standard by which they interpret racial politics in the world. Brazilians leave home with notions of racial identity shaped by the ideology of Brazilian racial democracy—the belief that Brazil is a mixed-race nation where race is fluid and of little social consequence. This leads many Brazilians to reject racial identifications, choosing instead to claim that they do not see race or that they are not of a specific race at all. However, when Brazilians migrate to the United States, they confront a new set of racial schemata. Those who may have been classified as white at home suddenly become Latino—a term that does not exist in Brazilian parlance. Those who may have been pardo or mulatto may suddenly become black when they cross the border. This experience prompts migrants to reflect deeply on the politics of race in new ways that can be unsettling.

Following Wendy Roth, Joseph incorporates a social psychological analysis of the relationship between migration and racial schemata. How do individuals “use perception, judgment, and memory to understand race and identity,” and how can migration “yield transformations of these concepts”? [8–9] Joseph considers the politics of hybridization that leads migrants to combine “elements from the host and home countries in their own minds” [9]. She focuses on the stages of migration, not just the end results. Migrants learn about race from other former migrants at home before their journeys, transmit knowledge back to nonmigrants while they are abroad, and produce knowledge at home based on their experiences when they return. This is how racial self-classification and understandings of the world mutate as people move from living in a city considerably influenced by the United States for more than half a century to deciding to migrate, migrating, living abroad, and then returning home. This is how the longue durée of transnational migration influences conceptualizations of racial formation in a transnational context.

Race on the Move is both thought-provoking and well researched. It contributes substantively to our ethnographic knowledge of transnational identity politics. Yet at times the text reifies the very bounded notions of race it seeks to challenge, giving the impression that the racial ideologies of Brazil and the United States are cultural forms that emerge sui generis from each national context. Race is and always has been a concept negotiated through transnational dialogue and movement. Cultural conceptions of race in Brazil and the United States today cannot and should not be separated from the dialectical, global negotiation of the concept of race since the period of conquest, slavery, and colonialism. It is not just that migrants pick up notions of race abroad and bring them back home but also that movement is a fundamental aspect of the process of racial formation itself. Race on the Move does an excellent job of chronicling this in the present, reminding us that movement—not just fixity—articulates race in our world today. Joseph’s book will undoubtedly shape the fields of migration studies, Brazilian studies, and studies in identity moving forward.
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YOLANDA T. MOSES
University of California, Riverside

In this wide-ranging look at race, Gerald Sider both builds upon his previous work in North Carolina, published in his 2003 Living Indian Histories: Lumbee and Tuscarora People in North Carolina, and draws upon his firsthand experiences, dating back to childhood, of changes in the racial landscape in the region. While he claims that his book is for a new generation of activists, as someone who has done research for years on race formation in the United States I would add that it is a book for scholars as well.

Sider looks at race production in two places over time as it affected Native Americans, African Americans, and Euro-Americans living in the same locale—Lumberton and Maxton, North Carolina—but experiencing different worlds with regard to access to goods and resources, such as decent jobs, schools, and housing, and to power. His focus is the 1960s, a time of change in the South when many African Americans were finally getting their civil rights, most notably the ability to vote. While the right to vote may have been granted earlier to formerly excluded peoples, taking advantage of that right in a still deeply toxic racist environment was highly problematic and downright dangerous. Sider examines how race was in the past and is today both socially constructed and lived. He takes the tack of looking at race by way of what he calls “the transition from yesterday to tomorrow” [9]. Race yesterday is a job not yet finished in the present, and race tomorrow must begin to be envisioned today. These processes therefore overlap, and this is where the chaos of racism lives today! Sider unapologetically looks at race from the position of the vulnerable.

Three very important organizing features give this book its compelling character. The first is Sider’s use of storytelling. He tells stories about race that are about his own experiences and the experiences of other people who live with racism. As an anthropologist, he knows that he is an observer as well as a participant in these events. Washing dishes in a café while going to college in Philadelphia, registering voters and confronting authorities in North Carolina in 1967 and 1968, visiting black churches, talking with the power elites—Sider uses storytelling to let us in on what is happening in the moment and to show us the
deeper symbolic significance of these events. He says that stories should be understood on at least two levels: “‘The stories that people live are often happening in a past that will not stay past, and simultaneously in a future that struggles to be born’” (3). Through these poignant stories, he lets us see through his eyes and those of others how race is lived by the vulnerable and disposable people in this society.

Sider’s second organizing feature involves looking at the labels given to the oppressed and noting that they are not just names—they go much deeper in terms of the scars produced on the bodies and psyches of these people. In other words, an insult is not just an insult; it takes on deeper meaning both for those who are dominated and for those who dominate them. Sider says, “The names take on their cultural, social, and political force because they also point toward what was done and will be done to a people so categorized” (7). He explains, for example, why he uses the term nigger instead of the N-word in a few instances where it is a direct quote or an attribution. Sider does not want to shy away from showing how such language itself in the past and today continues to shape how powerless people are discussed. When the euphemistic N-word is used to discuss what was, it conceals and minimizes the brutality and the violence of the processes that created inequality in the past and that sustain it in the present. The politeness of language can sometimes disguise still deeply held prejudices and discriminatory practices against people deemed disposable.

Sider’s third organizing theme is the often invisible role played by the state in the past and the present in shaping the everyday lived experiences of race both for the oppressed and for those in positions of power. The state and other power structures often restrict the tomorrows of defenseless populations rather than affording them new opportunities. Sider shows how inequality at the state and local levels—differential schooling, housing, health care (e.g., toxic waste locations and untreated rat infestations), transportation, and community services—is scarcely mentioned or publicly opposed in any sustained way. This made me immediately think about the lead-tainted water system in Flint, Michigan, and how nothing like that would ever happen in a more affluent community.

In the last chapter, Sider offers glimpses of a way forward for those of us who want to be the authors of our own tomorrows. If we want to loosen the bonds of structural inequality, he has words of advice for us to follow. Most important, those of us in our respective struggles should not isolate ourselves from other struggles. Individualism is not the way. We are all strong in our group struggles if we all struggle together. It is the “we” who will ultimately make headway. Through our collective struggles, we will reach a deeper understanding of class, race, gender, and religion (those denominations that truly care about the oppressed) that will allow us to find common ground to stand against the tyranny of yesterday and against those who would constrain our collective vision of a truly socially just tomorrow.
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Catherine Besteman’s beautifully written book chronicles the journey of Somali Bantu families from their village in the Jubba Valley to refugee camps in Kenya and, eventually, to Lewiston, Maine, an unconventional and unlikely resettlement city. Besteman conducted fieldwork in southern Somalia in 1987 and 1988, before war devastated the region. She studied how insecurity, poverty, drought, and social hierarchies, including racism, shaped the everyday lives of subsistence farmers, including their reliance on networks of mutual care and support. She left Somalia before the government collapsed in 1991 but maintained her connection to the region by writing books, academic articles, and editorials, which became useful to the United Nations for making the case to resettle Somalis in the United States.

In 2001, the United States began resettling 12,000 farmers from the Jubba Valley. These Somali Bantus—a new name that was “created in the refugee camp for the process of managing their resettlement process” (11)—had spent a decade in refugee camps. In 2006, in a surreal turn of events, Besteman agreed to provide background on and lead a panel discussion with Somalis in Lewiston and discovered that she had known some of them during her fieldwork. The discovery would take her across the United States in search of more survivors from the Jubba Valley, but her book centers on Somali Bantus in Lewiston, a postindustrial small city that was 96 percent white before Somalis began migrating there. Over the course of a decade, they would come to make up 15 percent of the city’s population, which changed the city for everyone.

The book is neatly organized into three parts, each with a short introduction followed by two to three chapters. Part 1 uses oral histories to recount how war came to the people of the Jubba Valley, whom and what they lost, and how they escaped to Kenya, highlighting “what humanitarianism feels like to those who are its objects” (29). Helpful are stunning photographs of life in Banta in the late 1980s, images that Besteman and her husband, photographer Jorge Acer, captured while in Somalia that complement reports of what happened to some of those people. Somalis in the camps challenged presumptions of them as helpless and dependent on aid and instead claimed “to be authors
of their fate and creative strategists of their life trajectory” (59). It was in the Dadaab camps in Kenya that the farmers from the Jubba Valley coconstructed—with humanitarian aid organizations like the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—their new ethnic identity as Somali Bantus, a persecuted minority group. This identity stemmed from the history of enslavement and minority status that led to their marginalization, poverty, illiteracy, and lack of education as well as assaults by encroaching pastoralists in prewar Somalia and violence against them in the camps. Though they appeared to fit the image of perfect apolitical, helpless, premodern victims, Besteman shows how colonial battles, the slave trade, and modern US and European involvement in Somalia during the Cold War helped define the Jubba Valley as an object of international development, disenfranchising the farmers living in it for decades to come.

In part 2, Besteman focuses on the Somali migration to Lewiston—an unlikely location to choose to live in because it was not an official resettlement site. Somali Bantus chose to move there as secondary migrants because Lewiston was a small, affordable city with “good public housing, safe schools . . . more financial support than in other cities, and the familiarity of a growing Somali community” (108). Because it was a mostly white, postindustrial city with a struggling economy and many Somali Bantus lacked formal education, English, and literacy, achieving economic self-sufficiency was difficult. In Lewiston, Somali Bantus found refuge and support but also racism, nativism, intolerance, and an unsettling response to diversity. Besteman chronicles the overwhelming job that people in public and private institutions—people like teachers, police officers, and social service workers—faced in supporting Somalis in a neoliberal economy. She also uses responses to an op-ed piece she cowrote for a local newspaper—“The Top Ten Myths about Somalis and Why They Are Wrong”—to illustrate the impact that engaged anthropology can have on a community such as Lewiston.

Part 3 explains how Somalis worked to make their own refuge, taking into account how they navigated “the twin expectations of self-sufficiency and integration in their new home” (212). Somalis created their own ethnic-based organization, and Besteman chronicles the ups, downs, internal hierarchies, and factionalization that the organization and the Somali community faced. She looks closely at parenting practices, youth culture and identity, and the particular challenges facing Somali Bantu girls and boys in Lewiston, including the role that race plays in shaping everyday youth experiences, and she uses this material on subjectivity making to add nuance to current theories of citizenship, the commons, and resistance.

Besteman also worked with doctors, social service workers, teachers, community police officers, and volunteers who spent invaluable amounts of time supporting the refugees in Lewiston, a particularly difficult task in the neoliberal borderlands. Their hard work should be acknowledged. However, although I know similarly dedicated people from my work with refugees in Fargo, North Dakota, I also found problematic practices among service providers, including paternalism and an emphasis on arcane rules of sociality. Besteman explains well the racism and xenophobia facing Somali Bantus in Lewiston, but (perhaps strategically) she romanticizes others who worked with Somalis. In any case, Making Refuge is a superbly written, well-organized book with beautiful stories and photographs and sound but subtle theories that will make it a great book for undergraduates and graduate students and a must-read for anyone interested in refugees, human rights, the aftermaths of war and migration, race and ethnicity, and engaged anthropology.
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RANDALL H. MCGUIRE
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The Colorado River was once the North American Nile: a large and powerful river that rose in high mountains and then carried water 1,450 miles through the desert to a massive fertile delta. The United States began damming the river in the 1930s. Today, more than a dozen dams block the stream, and virtually no water crosses the US-Mexico border to refresh the now-dried-out delta. The original inhabitants of the region, the Cucapá people, still struggle to survive in the desiccated waste that was once a plentiful marshy delta teeming with fish, birds, and mammals. These “river people” have traditionally survived by fishing, but since the early 1990s the Mexican government has tried to curtail their fishing or stop it altogether.

In Where the River Ends, Shaylih Muehlmann examines how the Cucapá people have responded to the drying up of the delta and to the Mexican state’s efforts to manage the environmental crises that resulted. Her rich and nuanced ethnography of a Cucapá village gives an intimate portrait of this community. The reader gets to know her interlocutors as real, reflexive, active, and flawed people struggling to survive in abject conditions. Beyond this specific case, Muehlmann engages the reader in broader anthropological and public policy issues related to environmentalism and indigenous peoples.

Muehlmann spent a year living among the Cucapá. She studied the international politics of Colorado River water management and interacted with NGOs that sought to
address the environmental crises or to establish economic alternatives to fishing. In the Cucapá case, the environmental crises of the dried-up delta have engendered conflicts over indigenous identity, class, gender, and language politics. To better understand the dynamic processes of identity formation within these conflicts, Muehlmann used Stuart Hall’s concept of articulation.

Articulation depends on what is never articulated. Muehlmann begins with the invisibility of the delta to introduce the international development and politics of the river and the Cucapá people. She tells the story of how the United States “tamed” the Colorado River and notes the ideological parallels between the concept of taming the river and the conquest of the American Indian. To the US politicians, engineers, and lawyers who tamed the Colorado, the delta in Mexico remained largely invisible. Muehlmann engaged in a project of community mapping with the Cucapá that further identified this invisibility. Because the Cucapá could not articulate their sense of place with Cartesian coordinates, the project failed to produce maps representing a communal sense of place. Muehlmann argues that the maps colonized the local landscape because the Cucapá sense of place did not translate onto them and thus remained invisible to dominant interests and discourses.

Muehlmann observed the struggle over the Cucapá’s right to fish for corvina in the Mexican Upper Gulf of California Biosphere Reserve. On a global scale, identifying as indigenous has become an important strategy to legitimate claims to natural resources. Mexico’s constitution also contains a clause that encourages indigenous cultural recovery and protects indigenous resource exploitation. In both of these contexts, however, an essentialized, outsiders’ notion of indigenousness determines authenticity. The government and the NGOs used numerous aspects of contemporary Cucapá experience to question their authenticity and to deny them fishing rights. These included the loss of Cucapá language, fishing with nets instead of spears, using launches instead of canoes, and selling fish on the market.

In many other contexts, Mexicans recognize Cucapá indigeneity. These contexts included NGOs that attempted to promote Cucapá crafts and ethnic tourism and narcotraficantes who wanted to employ them in the cross-border drug trade. Narcotraficantes see the Cucapá’s indigenous knowledge of the desert and their ability to navigate it as desirable characteristics that make them better smugglers. The Cucapá’s poverty makes work as smugglers in the drug trade attractive to them despite its dangers. The upshot is that the Mexican government defines the Cucapá as a problem and tries to restrict their movements.

Gender relations represent a realm of difference between Cucapá and Mexican culture. The Cucapá reject Mexican machismo and, in fact, oppose it by believing that women are worth more than men. Muehlmann discusses relations and conflicts in a Cucapá family to illustrate the dynamics of this clash of gender hierarchies and how people use it to negotiate Cucapá indigenous identity.

Only a small number of elderly people in the village still speak Cucapá, and it appears that soon the community will be monolingual in Spanish. However, despite the decline of the native language, young people still use it for swear words. Muehlmann demonstrates how Cucapá youths in interactions with outsiders—police, soldiers, NGO staff, bureaucrats, and anthropologists—use these swear words to subvert and critique the use of the native language as a measure of authenticity.

Muehlmann does an excellent job of showing how environmental conflicts in the desiccated Colorado River delta involve more than just the environment. In their struggles to find a viable place for themselves, the Cucapá find that their indigenous identity becomes a two-edged sword. Indigeneity gives the Cucapá special rights, but only if they perform that identity to fit the essentialized notions of NGOs and the government. Outsiders constantly call on them to demonstrate their authenticity. Their performance entails manipulating the social categories—indigeneity, class, gender, and language—that articulate and produce local subjectivities. Scholars studying the US-Mexico borderlands, North American ethnography, environmental movements, resource conflicts, and most importantly indigenous peoples will find Where the River Ends an engaging, insightful, and enlightening read.
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Section 35 of Canada’s Constitution Act, 1982, recognizes and affirms the Aboriginal and treaty rights of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples—1.4 million out of an estimated total national population of nearly 36.3 million in 2016. Since the act’s passage, important strides have been made toward righting the many wrongs of the state’s troubled relations with indigenous peoples, not least in clarifying those rights and negotiating the first of a new generation of comprehensive land and self-governance treaties. Yet problems persist, arguably none as urgent as the poverty, deplorable living conditions, inadequate health care, and limited educational and employment opportunities that are the lot of far too many First Peoples, whether they live in the hinterlands or in the towns and cities where many go in search of something better. It is hardly surprising that they also endure disproportionately high rates of incarceration, family violence, substance abuse, and youth suicide. These
ills comprise the darkest and most shameful legacy of a slow-to-fade colonial system—a mix of apartheid and Jim Crow—that effectively stripped indigenous nations of their languages and autonomy and denied their members a meaningful place in Canadian society. Absent an all-out effort to stem the tide, this crisis will exact an endless toll from peoples struggling to reassert their indigeneity and chart their own futures.

In *Skin for Skin*, Gerald Sider focuses on this ruinous heritage in a remote corner of the country, Labrador, the ancient homeland of Innu and Inuit populations. Sider aims to lay bare the roots of the self-inflicted violence that has plagued them, with growing intensity, since the 1960s. The approach he takes is principally historical, beginning with an examination of common and divergent aspects of each people’s centuries-long engagement with the colonial institutions of fur trade and mission. From there, he takes up their experiences since 1949, the year Labrador, together with the island of Newfoundland, entered the Canadian confederation. This proved to be a fateful development—one that brought both groups under the direct control of two levels of government, federal and provincial, for the first time and eventually led one, the Inuit, to achieve a self-government arrangement in 2005 following years of tripartite negotiations. Innu claims await final resolution.

The picture Sider draws of indigenous-white relations in Labrador from the 1600s onward is dispiriting and stark. The dictates of merchant capitalism, combined with recurrent episodes of disease and starvation, reduced once-autonomous groups of Innu and Inuit to little more than pools of expendable labor. And the state, in league with domestic and foreign corporate interests, ultimately relegated them to an even more precarious position—that of society’s disposables, dependent peoples forced into so-called concentration villages and recolonized as de facto wards of the province. Although they survived the privations and brutality of the colonial past (Sider compares their wounds to post-traumatic stress disorders) without resorting to inwardly directed violence, it is the oppressive conditions of more recent times, with each group relegated to irrelevance, that have triggered the spiral of self-destruction for which their communities—perhaps none more so than the now-abandoned Innu village of Davis Inlet—have gained unhelpful notoriety at home and abroad. From the evidence Sider presents, however, it is unclear whether gasoline sniffing, alcohol abuse, and even violence against women and children comprise a strategy of resistance to that relegation, as he appears to suggest. The alternative (and arguably more defensible) explanation is that these behaviors are driven by the pain born of a marginalized existence and the means to escape that pain. Testimony of many residential school survivors to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada speaks to this point.

Sider has given us a thought-provoking book on a timely and complex issue. But in some ways, what he presents as substance and analysis amounts to a just-so story, constructed in large measure from selective reading of a few secondary sources on the colonial era and, for the postconfederation period, of public documents. A detour around the immense and rich body of primary historical material, including Hudson’s Bay Company and Moravian mission archives, yields a narrow outlook on the dimensions of the time period under scrutiny. Those with research interests in Labrador will find myriad errors throughout the chapters Sider uses to set contemporary problems in context. Describing settlers, known today as Métis, as “white trappers” (127) is a big error. So, too, is the assertion that upon settling in Davis Inlet, Innu hunters had “no viable market for furs or pelts” (179); in fact, the provincially run Northern Labrador Trading Operation provided local commercial outlets once the Bay withdrew from the region in 1942.

All that said, what stands as the work’s biggest flaw is Sider’s inexplicable failure to make room for the voices and knowledge of Innu and Inuit themselves, the very peoples whose present-day lives and deaths form the book’s core. “To ask a research question,” he says in his prefatory remarks, “is to assume that you know what is important to ask about” (xv). Perhaps. But isn’t it also a way to find out what other people—in this case, those who know the crisis at first hand and daily endure its consequences—have to say? If it has achieved anything, Sider’s refusal to ask—in a book praised as “socially engaged ethnography,” of all things, in a back-cover blurb—leaves readers with an incomplete view of the horrific scourge playing out on the ground in Labrador and a limited sense of any possible means to arrest its spread there and elsewhere. And that’s too bad.
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**BARBARA J. MICHAEL**
University of North Carolina Wilmington

There have been conflicts over land in the Negev since the establishment of the state of Israel. Historically, Bedouin Arabs used the land for agropastoralism, while Jewish nation building was based on a Zionist rhetoric (Emily McKee calls it discourse) of establishing and protecting land made exclusively Jewish via agriculture and agricultural labor. Because Bedouins were not (supposedly) farmers, this rhetoric negates their claims to the Negev, an assertion further bolstered by portraying them as part of the natural
landscape. Bedouin claims to the Negev are also rejected because they have “only” genealogical ties to the land and not legal documentation of ownership.

The land conflicts that McKee addresses are not unusual. Colonizers typically described land occupied by indigenous peoples as empty. McKee’s approach, however, is not simply to contrast usufruct concepts of land use with titled landownership, as a particular instance of a more generic practice, but to investigate the locally articulated ideologies that underlie land use in the Negev. McKee says there is a binary opposition of Arab:Jew. However, while in some domains of state policy this is accurate, the binary opposition needs to be more discriminating in analyzing the Negev. Not all Arabs are Bedouins, so the more accurate binary opposition for McKee’s analysis should be Bedouin:Jew. She addresses three central questions: “What kinds of attachments to land are people fighting over? How are particular lines of opposition entrenched as ‘natural,’ such that conflict is taken for granted? Do avenues of conflict resolution being explored move beyond these naturalized oppositions?” (4).

McKee’s research methodology involved seven months of participant-observation with an environmental justice NGO, Bustan, with members who are Jews and Bedouins—where she learned about land conflict and its links to the environment—followed by participant-observation in two government-planned communities in the Negev. She lived four months in a legal Bedouin township that she calls ‘Ayn al-‘Azm and four months in a Jewish immigrants’ settlement that she calls Moshav Dganim. She also did fieldwork with residents in unrecognized Bedouin villages (the Israeli government label) whose residents have no legal rights to the land they inhabit and use. She conducted interviews, collected narratives, and participated in the everyday lives of residents in both primary field sites. Her goal was to understand how each community defined and related to its environment via what she terms its environmental discourses as well as how oppositional discourses (Bedouin:Jew) resulted in conflict. More importantly, her aim was to discover how the binary oppositions might be softened. She notes that her comparative approach is unique in that she included two communities with different environmental discourses in one study, rather than studying each in isolation. This strengthens her research, because what she learned in one community could immediately inform what she asked and learned in the other.

While McKee resided in one community at a time, she moved back and forth between the two during her fieldwork period. She includes narratives from a few informants that reveal the respective ideologies, but the empirical data scattered throughout the book are too sparse to support her analysis. Exactly why she chose the two communities is not clearly stated, but one can surmise that physical proximity was a consideration. Though not discussed in detail, members of both communities had some modicum of interaction with each other. Interestingly, the sociocultural distance between the two communities was reinforced by a landscape barrier: a dry riverbed that made travel between the communities circuitous.

One reason McKee says she chose the two communities is because she believed investigating them would reveal social commonalities as well as divisions between Bedouin and Jewish residents. It is true that both communities are urban, planned communities. However, there are many dissimilarities, particularly in terms of support for or maintenance of services in each, with more government attention being given to the moshav. The Bedouin township, one of only seven recognized Bedouin townships in the Negev, has a population of 15,000. It is comprised of neighborhoods made up of kinship groups, though numerous lineages and tribes are represented in the total population, some of whom had conflictive relationships before settling. On the other hand, the moshav population of about 700 is made up of a community of Cochin Jews who immigrated (by choice and at their own expense) en masse from Kerala, India, where they had attended the same synagogue.

The Cochin Jews came from an urban environment and urban employment and, perhaps most significantly, were advocates of the Zionist rhetoric of state building. Not having any prior links to the Negev before arriving at the moshav, they were committed to becoming embedded in the landscape via the Zionist rhetoric of establishing place through labor on the land. The Bedouin township residents, on the other hand, were uprooted from their landscape, expected to engage in largely unfamiliar wage labor, experienced high unemployment, and had no approved spaces for engaging in farming or animal husbandry. Although many of the older residents of the Bedouin township had lived a nomadic life, most residents constructed their environmental discourses from memory. Because these structural differences in the landscapes would, logically, influence the discourses that McKee studied, would the environmental discourses have been different had she compared the residents of unrecognized Bedouin villages (still actively living their environmental discourses) with those of the moshav?

Interestingly, just as the Bedouins of the township are estranged from direct experience of the land as a lived environment, so too are Cochin Jews outsiders to Ashkenazi Zionist rhetoric. Identified as Mizrahi, they are characterized as being “dirty, disordered, and in need of training to become ‘modern’ members of Israeli society” (8). Like other Mizrahi immigrants, they were sent to establish settlements in the Negev. McKee does not discuss the fact that while the settlements were purportedly agriculturally focused, their primary state function was to block infiltrators from coming into the frontier, a purpose for which low-status Mizrahim were suited. And unlike Ashkenazi colonies established in northern Israel, in which lands were leased...
to residents for 40 years, after which the inhabitants were given private ownership—as Sami Shalom Chetrit discusses in Intra-Jewish Conflict in Israel: White Jews, Black Jews—residents in the immigrant moshavim have no such option. Ironically, though the moshavim were established on the principle of what McKee calls the “environmental discourse of redemption” (32) in agricultural labor, agriculture in the Negev has proved unsuccessful and most residents of moshavim depend on wage labor or tourism.

McKee concludes her study by looking at environmental activism undertaken by organizations like Bustan that include Jews and Bedouins in cooperative activities. She suggests that these activities soften boundaries between different perceptions of appropriate land use, that is, environmental discourses, and open the way to find common ground in environmental stewardship and thus a means of addressing the institutionalized inequalities that permeate Israeli state policies.
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JUDITH FREIDENBERG
University of Maryland

This fascinating book takes us on the private journeys of US mixed-status families—those with at least one undocumented person in the household. While this label designates people without legal proof of residence, only half enter without permission. The rest are visa overstayers. Latin Americans concentrate in the first category and are the focus of this major contribution to the scholarship on migration.

The book’s hallmark is Ruth Gomberg-Muñoz’s careful attention to how the legalization process affects everyone in the immigrant’s family, documented or not. She starts each chapter with a compelling, compassionate, and intimate vignette that—together with sources such as ethnographic interviews, mixed-families blogs, the media, and interviews with lawyers and immigration policy experts—opens a window onto the complex legalization process. A legalization flowchart entitled “Undocumented and hoping to change your status? See whether you qualify under US law” portrays the multiple pitfalls that an immigrant seeking legalization might stumble into. No small wonder that many decide not to apply for legalization.

For those who do decide to seek legalization—to move out of shadowed lives, in the words of Leo Chavez—the path is difficult and unpredictable. Gomberg-Muñoz takes us on the path to legalization (or not) that the would-be documented themselves have to take: from making the decision to apply to leaving the United States to process paperwork to adapting to whatever the outcome of the legalization process might be. The barriers to legalization are more than legal ones: only those individuals who are married to US citizens and whose families can get by with one wage earner’s income during separation can undergo the economic hardship of processing paperwork and thus entertain legalization as a possibility. Because many will continue to live in fear, unable to either leave or consider a change in legal status, immigration policy has had the unpredictable effect of trapping many within the United States.

Gomberg-Muñoz expertly conveys a vivid and empathetic sense of what it means to feel and live outside the law, a law many do not fully understand or are unable to make work for them. She clearly shows that not only the undocumented but their networks of relationships are truly implicated in traversing the geopolitical and legal spaces claimed by nation-states. Her depiction of the undocumented experience reminds us of other families transformed by separation, like incarceration, war, or military service.

This coherent and well-researched book brings forth the inherent contradictions between a nation-state that values family and a nation-state that forces families to live apart. Gomberg-Muñoz’s concise yet thorough historical review of immigration policies reminds us that legislation is framed by values that change over time regarding who should be considered for inclusion in the nation and who should be excluded. While much changed with the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act’s goal to diversify the incoming flow of immigrants during the civil rights era, one of its unanticipated consequences, according to Gomberg-Muñoz, was the growth of large numbers of undocumented. The lack of federal immigration reform legislation since the late 1980s prompted local initiatives that ranged from providing sanctuary to immigrants to criminalizing them.

An informant’s experience of the latter is used to plea for immigration reform legislation to change the system that creates the undocumented label. Gomberg-Muñoz does not go so far as to suggest alternative scenarios such as the borderless nations or permeable borders that Diego Acosta proposes in his 2016 essay, “Free Movement in South America.” Nor does she imagine a nation-state where resources are not spent on securing borders, incarcerating and deporting the undocumented, seizing their Medicaid and Social Security contributions, or using their circumstances to fuel political discourse that frames immigration as a problem, particularly during elections.

Nevertheless, her plea for immigration reform opens the question of how it might be translated into practical policy that addresses the policy makers, politicians, organizations, agencies, and institutions in contact with those considering a move or already in the United States and
Becoming Legal

Susan Greenhalgh

American Ethnologist

become visible and have merited a wide audience. They make us think of other instances of the undocumented human condition that split families: those awaiting processing for either asylum or deportation in detention centers, those trapped in the United States with expired visas, those children who were not granted US citizenship through their parents upon adoption, those who die tragically when entering the country through waterless deserts.

Through private stories, Gomberg-Muñoz brings to mind the public issues embedded in the many human consequences of immigration policy. She also reveals other walls less visible than those erected at the US-Mexico border: the facts that length of residence in the country, marriage to a US citizen, and parenting US-born children are all insufficient to guarantee legalization and may trip the unwary who rely on them as justifications for staying in the country legally. This often results in a paradoxical existence, one in which the immigrant lives a life of legal exclusion while experiencing a life of inclusion in family, neighborhood, workplace, and other areas of human communion. Becoming Legal should be read by everyone interested in current debates around immigration, scholarly or otherwise.
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Susan Greenhalgh argues that anti-obesity hype in the United States is pervasive in the popular media and in everyday conversation, and as a result a generation of young adults is weight obsessed. She shows this primarily through an analysis of various forms of fat talk that her former students at the University of California, Irvine, deploy as they discuss self-esteem, eating and exercise practices, and interpersonal relationships. One of Greenhalgh’s foundational tenets is that a particularly harmful result of our weight-obsessed society is the “doubly duty-bound biocitizen” (24), those who take responsibility not only for watching their own weight but also for ensuring that others maintain a healthy weight. Consequently, individuals feel both anxious about their own bodies and compelled to constantly nag and badger others about their body size, eating, and exercise habits.

Fat-Talk Nation is organized into four sections. First, Greenhalgh explains how the war on fat works through widely perpetuated biomyths about weight as a matter of personal responsibility and an indicator of moral worth and about body mass index (BMI) as a reliable measure of health risk. This section also describes the southern California cultural backdrop and research methods for her study, which include body image–focused essays written by male and female college students, individual interviews, and surveys. Part 2 features the essays of college men and women who detail their own body image suffering or that of loved ones through confessions of anxiety and low self-esteem, failed attempts at weight loss, and the misery of being teased by others about their weight. In part 3, again through essays, Greenhalgh explores the physical and emotional toll that our weight-obsessed culture levies on young people. College students describe extreme attempts at weight loss that affected their physical and mental health and strained their relationships with friends and family members. Part 4 offers a summary of findings as well as a few strategies for resisting dominant anti-fat narratives. Greenhalgh points out that one of the most egregious injustices of the campaign against excess weight is that it proposes no effective solutions for achieving and sustaining a “normal” BMI but, instead, emphasizes only the harmful effects of being fat. This unbalanced approach results in fat stigma, victim blaming, and hypervigilant fat monitoring of self and others.

One of the book’s strengths is the foregrounding of students’ voices through essays that reveal their deeply personal and emotional experiences with fat stigma. The result is a powerful firsthand glimpse into the tormented inner lives of young people that has the potential to engender understanding and empathy among readers. Greenhalgh also highlights the Asian American segment of her sample, a group that has been neglected in body image studies. This is the most in-depth and informative account of body image experiences among Asian Americans that I have seen. Further, Greenhalgh draws on her background in Asian studies to contextualize these students’ experiences within broader Asian American cultural values and family dynamics. Another strength is her inclusion of young men, who tend to be overlooked in much of the body image and obesity literature. In particular, Greenhalgh highlights the stigma of being a skinny guy, which can be more threatening to a young man’s masculine identity than carrying extra weight.

Greenhalgh’s exploration of how college students incorporate fat angst into their identities provides insight into students’ self-esteem, body image, and beliefs about fat. For example, some students with BMIs in the upper normal range were so fearful of excess fat that they took on what Greenhalgh refers to as a fat identity. Most with BMIs in the overweight or obese categories also took on the fat
identity, but others contested it by accepting their body size and refusing to buy into the dominant anti-fat narrative. The book illustrates how students negotiated their identities vis-à-vis prescribed BMI categories and dominant societal narratives about fat in a range of predictable and surprising ways.

Greenhalgh wrote her book for a broad audience, and she therefore aims to avoid overtheorizing. The only theoretical concept she draws upon is Michel Foucault’s biopolitics via the terms she derives from it—for example, biocitizen, biomyth, biocop, bioabuse, biopedagogy—to explore knowledge production and identity work around body size. Biopolitics is a useful lens for understanding the students’ experiences. But Greenhalgh could have theorized identity work in the same reader-friendly way to further trace the complex and fluid ways in which identity gets negotiated socially. For example, Greenhalgh and several of the student essays mention spoiled identities, but the concept is never explained and Erving Goffman, the concept’s author, is not cited.

Although the student essays are a powerful dataset, I was disappointed that the book did not incorporate material from the in-depth interviews that Greenhalgh mentions early on. The essays provide a foundational layer of understanding: they present a fairly linear, coherent account of how students have experienced body image. However, student essays lack the messy contradictions and complexities that characterize identity work. It is through ethnographic methods such as in-depth interviews, focus groups, and participant-observation that a deeper and more nuanced understanding of human experiences emerges. Survey data were presented intermittently with a comprehensive, question-by-question summary of findings in the appendix. Overall, inclusion of interview data and better integration of all three datasets (essays, interviews, and surveys) throughout the book would have strengthened Greenhalgh’s analysis.

Fat-Talk Nation clearly underscores the ways in which America’s war on obesity has really become a war on fat people. It is a book about a fat-obsessed nation and the hidden emotional and physical impact of that obsession on young people. Greenhalgh does not analyze discourse as much as highlight instances in their essays where students describe body image talk. As such, the main title does not quite capture the essence of her book. Also, the title is too similar to that of another book on body image and young people, Mimi Nichter’s 2000 Fat Talk: What Girls and Their Parents Say about Dieting. Greenhalgh’s use of a hyphen does not offer as clear a distinction from the original work on fat talk as she intended. Despite these issues, Greenhalgh provides a vivid account of the intense physical and emotional suffering experienced by young people raised in an aggressively fat-phobic society, making her book a noteworthy contribution to the literature.
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Occupational Hazards draws on Elanah Uretsky’s encounters with government officials, businessmen, and their friends and families in Ruili—“the ground zero of China’s HIV epidemic” (15)—to reveal a hidden story of HIV/AIDS. Thanks to the ritual practices of yingchou (business entertaining), sex with female entertainers and women other than one’s spouse becomes a necessary part of work for male officials and businessmen, bringing heightened risk of HIV/AIDS. This is a hidden story worth revealing, because existing public health and social science studies typically associate vulnerability to HIV infection with marginalized populations, such as “injection drug users, female commercial sex workers, and men who have sex with men” (6). By looking at powerful men who are not usually seen as being at risk, this book follows the trend in anthropology to “study up” and uses it to “turn AIDS on its head” (7).

Epidemiological surveys and public health interventions typically focus on stemming the biological risk of HIV infection by charting and modifying individually motivated behaviors (e.g., condom use). Challenging this approach, Uretsky explores the social rewards for male officials and businessmen of engaging in casual, extramarital sex as well as the social risks of not doing so. In particular, she looks beyond sex to yingchou as a whole, examining its gender dynamics, cultural shaping, and politico-economic functions. She shows that while the market economy assumes exchange to be universal and impersonal, the market-government ties and the distribution of state-controlled resources in post-Mao China require networks (guanxi) building and personal displays of loyalty, often in the form of offering and receiving lavish entertainment. She then shows that the hegemonic masculinity in urban China requires men to work hard outside of their homes in order to obtain high socioeconomic status. An important resource for this endeavor is men’s homosocial relations, including those built through yingchou. Moreover, men learn to separate their emotions, bodily needs, and marital obligations—a separation that allows or even encourages them to enjoy extramarital sex.

Undergirding these practices, Uretsky suggests, is the emerging sexual culture in contemporary China, where “people are seemingly free to explore their individual sexual desires but at the same time must restrict public perception of their sexuality” (88) in order to abide by the state’s political control. In this context, men constantly negotiate
the risks and power that derive from sex. For example, they often treat mistresses and minor wives—women for whom they provide outside of their legal marriages and who perform wifely duties, including childbearing, for them—as status symbols, business partners, and (politically and biologically) safe sex providers. Beyond these individual interests, yingchou also facilitates the informal economy across the Sino-Burma border, a function that contributes to China's economic interests and political security. These individual and collective functions of yingchou thus encourage men in power or aspiring to it to both engage in risky behaviors and cover things up—for example, they may not seek medical help when they might be infected.

Uretsky's multifaceted discussion challenges not only our common distinction between work and sex (or leisure in general) but also our tendency, when we focus on sex as work, to restrict our interest to female commercial sex workers and their precarity. Unfortunately, the broader applicability of these insights is obscured by her tendencies toward cultural essentialist formulas and assumptions of Chinese exceptionalism. Uretsky asserts that the surge of sexuality in contemporary China that allows businessmen and male officials access to extramarital relations is a revival of the traditional Chinese sexual culture, which "celebrates sexuality outside the reproductive realm" (91), rather than "a revolution toward a foreign sexual culture" (13). Yet historians such as Leon Rocha have shown that the ascription of a quintessential ars erotica to ancient China came from sinologists' orientalist mistranslation. Moreover, the market economy in many parts of the world is quietly maintained by personal trust and loyalty, which are in turn built through homosocial networks. A nonessentialist reading of the Chinese story could shed light on how crony capitalism elsewhere may likewise be associated with forms of masculine sociality that entail exploitative and hazardous access to sex. Similarly, while the author claims that the trajectory of HIV in China "is grounded more in culture" (139), as if HIV elsewhere were more about biology, her story might in fact teach us how to trace the biocultural pathways of HIV/AIDS in general.

While Uretsky's attempt to turn AIDS on its head is theoretically significant, the evidence that supports it is rather thin: the book mentions only two male officials who have contracted HIV through yingchou. Certainly, masculine sex work is an important part of yingchou, but the occupational hazards it produces are multiple, following a complicated gender pathway. The book cites a survey by William Parish and colleagues, published in 2003, to demonstrate the relationship between yingchou and men's elevated risk for sexually transmitted infection. However, the survey actually shows that while women whose partners have high incomes and often socialize or travel have an elevated risk for chlamydial infection, those men themselves do not have a higher risk for infection than other classes of men.

Beyond sex, as Uretsky mentions in passing, feasting and other activities associated with yingchou may also bring about health risks worth addressing. While I understand the difficulty of conducting research under "a shroud of secrecy" (142) and of entering a circle of powerful men as a female researcher, I wonder if it might add to the shroud of secrecy to focus solely on an extreme condition about which one can only speculate. In contrast, a more multidimensional perspective might allow the ethnographer easier access to and a more comprehensive grasp of the hazards of yingchou, as well as the local responses to them.

On the whole, this book helps us understand how gendered and classed bodies become the site of sex work and of a masculine homosociality that facilitates the post-Mao market economy. With a more substantiated, comprehensive, and nonessentialist analysis, Uretsky could provide a broader critique of crony capitalism, leading to biosocial interventions of its bodily practices.
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On his 2016 visit to Midway Atoll to quadruple the size of its national monument, President Barack Obama described its coral sand as hallowed ground. The atoll, at the farthest tip of the Hawaiian archipelago, sits amid the waters in which the US Navy fought one of World War II’s iconic battles. In doing so, he evoked a long American tradition of honoring blood-soaked ground. It was at Gettysburg, of course, that Abraham Lincoln spoke the words that every US schoolchild is still asked to ponder:

“We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

“But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—or the ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.”

Such a belief—that the spilling of soldiers' and sailors' blood sanctifies a plot of ground—is widely shared among citizens of nation-states all over the world. Yet, as Geoffrey White makes clear in his closely observed ethnography, this belief does not simply unfold on its own. It is, in fact, a
process that requires great effort. And the task seems never to cease. Efforts not only to make the site of Japan’s attack on the United States’ fleet at Pearl Harbor hallowed but to keep it that way have been relentless.

Part of the problem, it appears, is fear of contamination both by the Native Hawaiian people from whom the site was wrested by the US military and by the Japanese tourists whose dollars keep Hawai’i afloat. White explores many of the contradictions inherent in this process of sanctification, but surely these are two of the most striking.

In a manner that remarkably echoes Stephen Murray’s 2016 *The Battle over Peleliu*, his account of American veterans of the World War II battle on Peleliu in Palau—where visiting soldiers explain that the local people’s experiences of the war that virtually destroyed their island simply are not relevant—many American vets as well as others insist that the original American seizure of the Hawaiian Islands is of no relevance to the story of the attack on the American military that occupied them.

And although shopping is as central to the broad sweep of America’s civic religion as military sacrifice, the proposal to turn the Pearl Harbor memorial into a shopping center also provoked public outrage. This is how public commemoration is contested, and White has captured the essence of such conflicts.

My only criticism of this solid ethnography, and I’m not sure whether it is a large or a small matter, has to do with what feels to me to be a certain lack of immediacy. As White repeatedly emphasizes, it is personal testimony from survivors of the attack that most animates the site for visitors. Meanwhile, however, my own history at the site drives my interest in this story. Some of the museum’s exhibits are mounted in hangars where I once labored to repair my squadron’s aircraft. I flew in and out of the Ford Island airstrip many times, and our ship often tied up along the quay wall. There was never a moment on Ford Island when I wasn’t keenly aware of what might be called the long blue line connecting the Japanese attack there to the missions I’d been flying in Vietnam.

The memorial and museum at Pearl Harbor aren’t only about World War II and about today’s visitors, Native Hawaiian sovereignty, and political relations between the United States and Japan. They encompass the martial culture in which White’s generation (and mine) grew up. White understands this, certainly, but nowhere in his book did I find anything that really shook me. My concerns about America’s place in the world mirror the arguments he ably details, but I had expected to be agitated and moved by his account, and I wasn’t. Despite my enormous moral and emotional investment in all of his story, he never grabbed hold of me, never looked deep into my eyes and disturbed me.

Throughout America, there are places like Pearl Harbor, Gettysburg, Valley Forge, and the Alamo come immediately to mind. At all those places, people not directly connected to the dead find a connection to them—soldier to soldier, citizen to soldier—that at times is encouraged and at other times is muted in favor of a more diffuse and universal empathy. I wonder today, now that we have a president who won an election in part by promising to build a wall cutting Mexico off from the United States, what visitors to the Alamo are thinking and feeling. It is well worth remembering a song that my generation grew up with, one about the fight to wrest a huge part of its territory away from Mexico and, then, the call to sanctify it as American with the very blood the Mexicans shed defending their land: “Hey Santa Anna, we’re killing your soldiers below! / That men, wherever they go, will remember the Alamo.”

White’s book also makes me wonder if, after the last survivor of Pearl Harbor dies, past rancors will also die, or will they be revived with new “orientals” to turn into enemies? Yet one more reminder that the past, as William Faulkner had it, isn’t dead—it isn’t even past.
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More than half of the 3.5 million tourists who visit Israel-Palestine every year are Christians, drawn from every continent and every denomination. The tourism infrastructure that services them is made up of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim tour guides and drivers working for Israeli Jewish or Palestinian Christian companies. Jackie Feldman, an anthropologist whose earlier published work focused on Israeli Jewish teen pilgrimages to Nazi death camps in Poland, has here turned his attention to Christian pilgrimages to the Holy Land. He has a unique perspective. Years ago, after Feldman moved to Israel from the United States for his graduate studies, he completed the two-year tour guide licensing course sponsored by the Israeli Ministry of Tourism; he later found steady work with a Palestinian company with both Christian and Muslim employees based in East Jerusalem. Although located only two miles from his own residence in Jewish West Jerusalem, Feldman’s work with this Palestinian company was the first of many border crossings that he addresses, whether social and perceptual or official and exclusionary. With decades of experience as a professional guide, he has worked with British Protestant, German Catholic, Dutch Reformed, and American Evangelical pilgrims.
The subtitle of this volume conveys the reflexive ethnographic prism through which Feldman reveals his multiple subjects. He uses his encounters with Christian pilgrims to illuminate his own emerging Israeliness. His role as a Jew among Christian pilgrims, as an Israeli among foreign tourists, and as an Israeli working closely with Palestinians sharpened his awareness of religious and national boundaries and identities, even as he plays across those boundaries in interesting ways. While the subtitle effectively signals the reflexive nature of these encounters, it does a disservice to this ethnography by obscuring its other valuable elements. For example, because he guided tours for both Catholics and Protestants, Feldman reveals how sacred space is socially constructed when he describes the pilgrims’ different experiences of the multiple sites associated with the resurrection. In general, Catholics focus on shrines, while Protestants look for evidence of the biblical past in the contemporary landscape. Significantly, Feldman notes the role of the Israeli Jewish guide in creating and reinforcing the Protestant pilgrims’ expectations of encountering a biblical land immanent in contemporary Israel-Palestine.

Moving from the spiritual to the transactional, Feldman also considers how the relationships of Israeli Jewish guides, Palestinian drivers, and international Christian pilgrims and their clergy are mediated by money—salaries, commissions, and tips. He offers a fascinating insider’s perspective on the “color” of this money, where colors stand for degrees of explicit or tacit understandings and rules. Salaries—white money—paid to guides and drivers are uncomplicated transactions. Commissions—black money—involve the covert exchange between tourist shop owners and the guides and drivers who direct the pilgrims to particular stores. This exchange is particularly contentious, in part because the pilgrim, as tourist, views it with suspicion, even as a kind of theft. The commission, after all, is coming out of the tourist’s pocket. Tips—gray money—are less fraught with discomfort: the pilgrim might ask how much to tip, while the guide and the driver might wonder if the tip will be sufficient to augment their insufficient salaries. In Feldman’s treatment, this subject becomes more nuanced, as he discusses strategies to change the colors of pilgrim money, for example, by encouraging a group’s pastor to endorse merchandise as devotional or to reframe the tip as an offering.

In addition to critically drawing on his more than 30 years of tour guiding, Feldman and a coresearcher conducted interviews with approximately 25 veteran Israeli guides of Christian groups, along with foreign religious leaders, Israeli Ministry of Tourism officials, and travel agents. He also augmented his personal experience by employing two research assistants to accompany a range of Christian groups on their tours, interviewing both pilgrims and guides. Feldman acknowledges the limitations that his own position created. He is far more tuned in to the view “from the front of the bus” (35) than a pilgrimcentric view. Nevertheless, even from this perspective we learn how the Holy Land (and not the contemporary contested territory of Israel-Palestine) is coproduced by Jewish guides and Protestant pastors and, further, how Zionist, Protestant, and American perspectives are interwoven and enacted in pilgrimage performances. In so doing, Feldman reveals the coproduction of a religious experience in the interactions of Israeli Jewish guides and American Protestant pastors. He does this via close readings of four verbal performances: the orientation offered to Christian visitors upon arrival at their tour bus outside Ben Gurion Airport, the welcome to Jerusalem from a panoramic view overlooking the city on the Mount of Olives, the evocation of Jesus approaching the holy temple at the archaeological excavations at the southwestern corner of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, and the juxtaposition of sacred space with the bustling Arab souk along the Via Dolorosa in the Old City of Jerusalem. In these contexts, the guide performs to meet the Christian pilgrims’ preconceived expectations and further shape their perceptions. Islam, Muslims, and Palestinians largely recede into the background, as does the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Yet that conflict is inescapable. To reach such sites as Bethlehem or Nazareth, Christian tourists have to cross back and forth between Israel and the West Bank, and in so doing the pilgrims cannot help but encounter Israeli military checkpoints and the politically polarizing Separation Wall. Here Feldman shows us how different Christian theologies skew the pilgrims’ experience toward identifying with an Israeli view or a Palestinian view. Christian Zionist tours are consistent with a Fundamentalist Protestant worldview that portrays the Israeli occupation and even future annexation of the West Bank as a fulfillment of God’s plan, eventually leading to end-times and the Second Coming of Jesus. The wall is seen here as a manifestation of the ongoing violence that presages and embodies that conflict. Living Stones tours, more popular with politically liberal Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Lutherans by contrast, strongly identify with Palestinian Christians as coreligionists with legitimate claims to the land. Palestinians (Christian or Muslim) stand for the suffering Jesus and Christian martyrs, while the Israelis fill the role of the evil oppressors.

Feldman successfully shows how deeply the political and religious dimensions are intertwined and enacted when guides and pilgrims navigate a sacred landscape marked with politically potent barriers. This kind of material makes A Jewish Guide in the Holy Land a wonderful case study to use in teaching about pilgrimage and tourism in a space marked by multiple narratives of competing nationalisms.
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Unni Wikan’s collection of essays spans nearly the entirety of her career, from her 1970s fieldwork on gender and shame in Oman through the anthropology of experience associated with her later fieldwork in Bali and Cairo and her politically charged reflections on culture and honor killings in Europe during the new millennium. There is an extraordinary sweep to these essays, and it is worth noting that Wikan did not choose to organize the book chronologically, leaving her introduction to bear the weight of intellectual biography for interested readers. This was probably a wise decision, because it allows her to lead off with some of her most generative theoretical essays on themes that may not have been fully realized in her earliest projects but that have come to define her place as a master ethnographer and disciplinary leader.

Wikan’s title essay, “Beyond the Words: The Power of Resonance,” is written as a sort of metacommentary on her ethnographic legacy. She puzzles over the problem of translation in ethnographic practice—not the translation of symbols and concepts that has been the very definition of anthropological proficiency but the subtler and harder to attain translation of what lies behind the words and concepts, “the shifting aspects of being in the world and acting on it by which concepts uniquely spring alive” (69). If the idea of culture as a total and seamless enmeshment in shared webs of significance is a rhetorical conceit, the resonance toward which Wikan points is a more existential condition of motherhood in Bhutan, reflections on the life of honor killings among first- and second-generation immigrants to the Scandinavian welfare state. The latter project—which was also the subject of her monographs Generous Betrayal: Politics of Culture in the New Europe, published in 2001, and In Honor of Fadime: Murder and Shame, published in 2008—extended Wikan’s critique of culture in anthropology to the critique of European policies that sometimes seem to favor the supposed integrity of immigrant culture over the human rights of the most vulnerable members of those communities, especially girls. This wasn’t an easy position to take, because it troubles—in a refreshingly direct way—one of the most sensitive fault lines in the public engagement of contemporary anthropology: the collision between defense of cultures, conceived as sovereign and unassailable grounds of meaning, and the intrinsic universalism implied by human rights conceptions.

Wikan’s decision to side unapologetically with those who suffer makes sense given the trajectory of her work traced in this volume. But in the end it leaves its own indelible residue of doubt and ambiguity. Her confrontation with honor killings in Europe challenges not just the
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exculpatory paradigm of culture but also, inevitably, the very resonance with the other forms of human life that she consistently advocates. "Resonance has its limits," she writes, after describing the trial of nine accomplices to an honor killing in Denmark, "and I have met mine" (238). Fair enough. But I am not convinced that this episode really runs counter to the thrust of her argument as a whole. Isn’t this recognition of limits, this refusal to move on to analysis as usual in the face of honor killings, also in its own way an acknowledgment of the shared or at least overlapping moral universe that killers, victims, readers, and anthropologists all must surely inhabit?