

(5 mai 2001); “Double vue : qu’est-ce qu’une bonne voyance ?”, ensemble d’articles dans un dossier “Voyance” du magazine *Cosmopolitan* (décembre 2000); six lames du jeu de tarot de Domenico Balbi; le tableau des centres d’énergie dits Chakras.

Pour terminer, excellente bibliographie de quelques 180 titres, et la table des matières.

J’estime en conclusion qu’à mes yeux, il s’agit d’un ouvrage de référence fondamental, exemplaire pour l’anthropologue, qui touche en profondeur aux problèmes de la croyance, et qui éclaire en particulier le phénomène actuel du “retour du religieux”.

Philippe Laburthe-Tolra

**Borofsky, Robert, et al.:** *Yanomami. The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn from It.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005. 372 pp. ISBN 978-0-520-24404-7. (California Series in Public Anthropology, 12) Price: \$ 19.95

It is not easy to find good, practical sense introductions to ethics for anthropology as one might suppose, and this problem is even more evident for didactic publications or textbooks for students. Robert Borofsky’s “Yanomami” is a valuable contribution to fill out this gap.

Sometimes the so-called great controversies in anthropology are very helpful to reflect upon ethical dilemmas and unethical behavior in our profession. One of these opportunities was Patrick Tierney’s “Darkness in El Dorado. How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon” (New York 2000) with its strong accusations against the geneticist James Neel, deceased in 2000 some months before the publication, and the (now retired) anthropologist Napoleon Chagnon. Tierney argued that Neel and Chagnon have violated basic ethical standards in their research projects among the Yanomami in southern Venezuela and even have contributed, through a combination of scientific ambitions and medical negligence, to have stimulated the expansion of a measles epidemic that had broken out just at the time when the two scientists started their research in the 1960s. While the main accusations against Neel could promptly be refuted, there continued to be the case against Chagnon. It regarded specially his research strategies, presentation of the Yanomami as “fierce people” in various publications and his specific forms or style to defend (or not) the Yanomami against the disastrous harms caused by invasions on their lands, above all in Brazil.

In spite of its sensational style (or just because of it?) Tierney’s book provoked a media storm in the anthropological milieu and outside academic circles. As a result, the American Anthropological Association saw itself obliged to appoint an El Dorado Task Force for analyzing the accusations and for elaborating an assessment published as a report on the association’s website.

The whole story around “Darkness in El Dorado” is very well documented in Borofsky’s book, including some comprehensive critiques of conveniences in American anthropology establishment to react upon Tierney’s accusations, but his approach is independent and quite

creative. In 2000, Borofsky invited six experts on the topic (Bruce Albert, Lêda Martins, Ray Hames, Kim Hill, John Peters, and Terence Turner) for a roundtable as a kind of jury trial whose contributions were first published on-line in the journal *Public Anthropology* and which now forms the second part of the book. Borofsky’s point is that the controversy is much more than a scenario composed by an accuser, two defendants, and some thousand Amazonian Indians. Rather, it offers an opportunity to scrutinize anthropology by itself and that it renders possible insights of how the discipline reproduces itself. The aim is not mere reflection on ethical dilemmas without consequences, but to enlarge the spheres of discussion and to shed a light on research realities behind stage lights seeking to empower readers to develop standpoints of their own for the discipline.

The starting point is not only the controversy by itself, but a remarkable paradox or, more specifically, a conundrum: How was it possible that one of the books with the highest number of copies and readers in anthropology, especially among students in introductory classes (“Yanomami. The Fierce People”), had such an overwhelming success among students and teachers that it provoked, for a long time, little discomfort and doubts regarding ethical standards of research and writing. I have to admit that my experience was the same when I studied anthropology at Cologne University in the 1980s. So it does not surprise that Chagnon’s work is the main point at issue.

The book is divided in two parts, the first presenting introductory explanations around the Yanomami and their role in anthropological literature, the contours and history of the controversy (the main characters, the accusations, and American anthropology’s reactions), the broader issues at stake, and Yanomami perspectives on the same issues and the controversy. This represents a very commendable approach for showing that anthropological and indigenous concerns can vary considerably in different matters. In the second part readers find the jury trial in three rounds plus three complementary assessments. As could be expected, the roundtable participants did not get to a common appraisal of the accusations discussed, for they did not have a mandate to pronounce verdicts. On the contrary, they disagreed on several issues, for example, Chagnon’s reluctance to pronounce himself in the Brazilian media against misuses of his work or proposals to reduce or split up Yanomami territory. The main purpose of the jury trial approach, however, was not to sentence, but to shed a light at the different issues at stake in the controversy so that readers can form their opinions by themselves. This possibility is facilitated by the didactic features of the book, which can be called an editorial masterpiece, for the principal points and considerations of each participant are summarized at the end of their individual set of arguments and in an appendix, which provides a summary of views on key topics covered in the three rounds. Moreover, readers are stimulated to find their own positions in two “You Decide” passages at the end of the two parts of the book.

Besides editorial excellence and outstanding didactic strategies (and an instructive photographic interlude

between the two parts, which should be mentioned), the book deserves to be commended for its concrete proposal of returns for the Yanomami, because the royalties from purchasing a new edition go to assisting the Yanomami. This is an important detail which draws our attention to a crucial point: anthropology, and some anthropologists, have profited a lot from studying this indigenous people, but did the Yanomami have due advantages from being so prominent for science? What could be fair returns for the direct and indirect contributions to the advancement of science for decades? Various proposals are discussed in this book.

The principal audience aspired seems to be students, but I think that all anthropological professionals can profit a lot by reading this book. It is a quite sympathetic gesture to mention the names of all the students who influenced the shape of the final El Dorado Task Force Report by their comments when, at some critical moments in the controversy, there appeared clear evidences of appeasement policy by AAA establishment. It is this kind of "student power" (52) which, for Borofsky, could play a crucial role for transforming the discipline. Maybe he is a little bit too optimistic, from my point of view, because academic establishments use to apply a whole bunch of strategies for impeding and obstructing transparency and structural transformations in various domains where power relations shall be maintained.

To sum up: this is a highly recommendable book not only for undergraduate classes, but for all anthropologists interested in professional ethics, especially in a period when ever growing specialization in our discipline produces various kinds of private ethics which undermine efforts to guarantee more comprehensive ethical standards. "Yanomami" (Borofsky version, and not "The Fierce People") should become required reading in ethics courses in anthropology, among other things for showing how to give a fair treatment to all sides involved in a fierce controversy. Peter Schröder

**Buckler, Sarah:** *Fire in the Dark. Telling Gypsiness in North East England.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2007. 234 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-230-8. (Studies in Applied Anthropology, 3) Price: \$ 75.00

Sarah Bucklers stark reflexive Monographie reiht sich in die Serie der anthropologischen Veröffentlichungen ein, welche sich an eine vorausgehende persönliche Erfahrung der AutorInnen mit Organisationen oder Hilfsprojekten anschließen (27).

Den Analysen über "reflexive Anthropologie" von Myerhof und Ruby (*A Crack in the Mirror*. Philadelphia 1982), den Beiträgen zur "Writing Culture Debatte" von Clifford und Marcus (*Writing Culture*. Berkeley 1986), sowie Rosaldos Betrachtung über Sozialanalysen (*Culture and Truth*. Boston 1989) folgend, bindet S. Buckler ihre eigene Person als aktiven Teil des Feldes mit ein. Dabei stellt sie sich als Beteiligte nicht selten über ihre anthropologische Beobachterperspektive (23), was sich prägend auf die vorliegende Arbeit auswirkt.

Im Zentrum dieses Bandes stehen Gypsies, welche laut S. Buckler ihre eigene spezifische Identität und verwandtschaftlichen Verortungen im Aushandlungsprozess des Geschichtenerzählens ("telling stories") ausdrücken und festigen. Selbst die Beziehungen zum geographischen Lebensraum werden nach Buckler mithilfe der Strategie des Erzählens von Geschichten hergestellt (33).

Das dritte Kapitel (37–52) widmet sich dem geschichtlichen Hintergrund des Feldes Teesside. Der historische Überblick über diesen semiindustriellen Handlungsort ist detailreich und erhellend beschrieben. Doch drängt er die geschichtlichen Daten die Gypsies im Feld betreffend in den Hintergrund. Somit steht die untersuchte Gruppe leider kaum in Beziehung zum Raum-Zeit-Verhältnis der Lokalgeschichte.

Der Titel des zweiten Teils der Arbeit (Kapitel 4 bis 7) stellt Gypsies als Gruppe mit dem Assoziativ des Feuers ("The Fire") dar. Diese metaphorische Gegenüberstellung zur Dunkelheit ("The Dark"; 141) lässt beim Leser leicht das Gefühl einer romantisierenden Sichtweise aufkommen, welche im Zuge der diskursiven Untersuchung teilweise revidiert wird.

In diesem Kernteil der Arbeit kristallisiert Buckler verschiedene soziale Aspekte (Familie, An- und Zugehörigkeit zur Wir-Gruppe etc.) aus den Alltagsgeschichten ihrer Informanten heraus, um diese in ihren analytischen Kontext einzubinden. Die dabei von ihr gewählten Argumente – um z. B. "face-to-face communities" den "imagined communities" (77) gegenüberzustellen – sind epistemologisch produktiv und klar dargestellt.

"Stories", so Buckler, stellen geschaffene Realitäten dar, in denen sich die Mitglieder der Gruppe verwirklichen und ihre Beziehungen zu ihrer sozialen Umwelt herstellen und bestätigen. Die Sozialisation und das Lehren der Art und Weise, diese Stories zu erzählen, stehen als ein zentrales Argument zur Disposition. Der Abgrenzungsprozess zu Nicht-Gypsies und die gleichzeitige Einbindung in die eigenen Moralvorstellungen der Gruppe und Familie werden inhaltlich im Prozess des "telling of stories" miteinander verknüpft (74f.). Probleme in der Verständigung zwischen Personen mit unterschiedlichen Sozialisationshintergründen ("not been socialised into the same community of speakers"; 78) und die daraus resultierenden Missverständnisse sind nachvollziehbar vor Augen geführt und in kontextueller Abhängigkeit betrachtet.

Wünschenswert wäre hier eine Reflexion über die verwendete Sprache, die das Nachdenken über den Inhalt und die Form der Stories begleitet. Buckler beschränkt sich hier nur auf eine Aufstellung einzelner Wörter im zweiten Teil (60). So bleiben Fragen über die Sprache als verwendeten ethnischen Marker oder die über eine Sprachwahl bei verschiedenen Gesprächspartnern unbehandelt und somit unbeantwortet.

Die genealogischen Diagramme der Verwandtschaftsmitglieder der Informanten im Anhang (207–211) sollten den Lesern die Verständlichkeit eines komplexen sozialen Verwandtschaftsnetzwerkes erleichtern. Jedoch bleiben diese Darstellungen eher unklar, da sie ohne In-