

above, it is perhaps a more accurate to think of it in terms of improvisatory practice. That is, it is tied to and grows out of existing work and the much more difficult task is to create a bridge between the old and the new and to argue clearly for the specific contribution the latter makes to extending or reconceptualizing the former.

Despite these limitations, “Experimental Film and Anthropology” is an important volume that will enrich the discipline and offer valuable models for innovative projects. It is a pity, however, that the book itself does not include a DVD of works cited by the different authors. The reader needs to see the work that is described, since its effect is precisely that which exceeds descriptive language. I found myself searching YouTube (Kevin T. Allen), websites (dickblau.com), and even faculty pages (John Haviland) in order to check writers’ claims against my own observations. If prohibitive in terms of cost, at the very least the contributors might have been encouraged to provide web links for work that is available. Of course, some of it is unavailable. And all too often this is the very simple reason why anthropologists fail to engage with experimental practice.

Anna Grimshaw

Schneider, Arnd, and Christopher Wright (eds.): *Anthropology and Art Practice*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. 168 pp. photos. ISBN 978-0-85785-180-2. Price: £ 19.99

This volume continues Arnd Schneider and Chris Wright’s exploration of the relationship between art and anthropology. In their previous collections they set out to stimulate new dialogues, and to reveal the shared discursive ground between these two fields. Here they focus on “ways of working.”

Their argument is that “the way we work” defines the kinds of creativity harnessed, the possible collaborations, and the outcomes that result. In looking into ways of working they want to engage artistic practices anthropologically, but also to approach creativity and meaning as emergent. Their overarching goal is “to push forward theory and practice in both fields and to clarify what can be gained from juxtaposing this kind of work.” How close do they come to achieving this?

They begin by identifying several contemporary moments that are pertinent to achieving a better understanding of the value of the art/anthropology relationship. For example, they point out how the framing by artists of social forms of collaboration as works in themselves, makes it possible to see how anthropological practices might also be framed in this way. They identify the desire in both fields to shift attitudes of the “viewing public,” and they write of the emergence of “transmateriality” – the idea that transitory phenomena leave material traces that link backwards and forwards to similar events – as significant affinities.

A number of chapters do a good job of grounding these themes. Craig Campbell, Jennifer Deger, Rupert Cox and Angus Carlyle, Brad Butler and Karen Mirza, Christina Lammer, Kate Hennessy, and Juan Orrantia, each reveal some of the generative possibilities of combining artistic

and academic modes of making, reflection, and dissemination. The research they “perform” on the page, as well as report on, is infused with the kind of productive friction that I am more familiar with from craft collaborations, where different ideas, techniques, and processes are brought together in ways that stimulate material ways of seeing and thinking. In Campbell’s chapter, for example, his writing and art practice seem to fuse into one discursive movement, rather than becoming a linear naming of parts, or a submersion of materials in theory. One implication of these chapters is that anthropology might learn to conceive of its preoccupations with people, phenomena, and ideas in terms of experiences brought to audiences, rather than through the abstraction of data into a kind of intellectual monoculture.

Less successful, from an anthropological point of view, are those chapters that rely on existing anthropological concepts and theories, or which refuse the challenge of speaking to anthropological theory. Ruth Jones, in her investigation of ritual enactment through art practice, relies on Turner’s notion of *communitas* without acknowledging its subsequent contestation by writers such as Michael Taussig. Anthony Luvera, admitting that as an artist he does not aim to contribute to anthropological theory, points to a potential stumbling block for anthropologists wanting to be convinced of the value of art to anthropology. In my experience, if anthropologists, sceptical of the intrusion of art into the field, require one thing, it is to be convinced that creative practice speaks to, and can be constitutive of, theory. From an art perspective, however, these chapters appear differently, showing what anthropology offers art in the way of framing ideas, or providing useful examples of “socially-engaged” methodologies.

The negotiation around these possible readings raises questions of readership and context. Is this book for artists and anthropologists, already converted to the cause, who simply want more examples? Or is it aimed rather at artists needing to understand the nuances of anthropological collaboration? Although it is clear that various audiences are being targeted by the editors, there is a slipperiness about which chapters are targeted at which audiences, or the double nature of the modes of address, and the lack of discussion about this seems symptomatic of the way other important questions are passed over.

First is whether anthropology is, or should be, a discipline committed to making and co-production. This is not a foregone conclusion, and at this stage of the art and anthropology debate, it is an argument that needs to be made in different ways by different authors. Yet the language used by the editors about creativity, collaboration (rather than fieldwork), and outcome (rather than analysis or ethnography), is weighted firmly to art rather than to anthropology. Second, what are the resistances to the art/anthropology alliance from the non-believers in both fields, and what are the counterarguments and the difficulties in making these counterarguments? Knowing more about this would clarify for the reader what is at stake here, and for whom. While there is much in the introduction and the individual chapters that hint at these contestations, I would have liked this territory to be laid out more

carefully. Third, if the turn towards experience as a mode of understanding and theorising is to be further realised through works rather than scholarly exegesis, as discussed by the editors in their introduction, how will audiences of the future access these experiences, something already problematic when trying to view many of the works described here? Partaking in them is likely to be limited to those who can physically visit the sites of the work, or to works that can be effectively shared digitally, notwithstanding the restrictions placed on artists' production, in particular film and video.

Having said this, it's important to emphasise that I regard this publication as a welcome and useful contribution to the continuing exchanges across art and anthropology. And the editors, to their credit, acknowledge the distance still to go in furthering and articulating the "special relationship" between the two fields. As they say in their introduction "there is still more of a genuinely theoretical conversation to be had, not necessarily with words but with works concerning, for instance, theories of materiality, personhood, relations, actor-network theory, and perspectivism, to name but a few." Adding to their previous surveys, this publication not only showcases new projects but demonstrates some of the rich "thinking through making" being initiated in this territory.

Amanda Ravetz

Schnepel, Burkhard, Felix Girke und Eva-Maria Knoll (Hrsg.): *Kultur all inclusive. Identität, Tradition und Kulturerbe im Zeitalter des Massentourismus*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2013. 346 pp. ISBN 978-3-8376-2089-4. Preis: € 29.90

Obwohl der Begriff "all inclusive" ebenso wie der Hinweis auf Massentourismus im Buchtitel eine Verbindung zum All-inclusive-Urlaub, worunter in der Regel Strandtourismus und Clubferien verstanden werden, suggeriert, widmen sich acht der zwölf Texte des Sammelbandes touristisch regionalen und thematischen Nischenfeldern, vier Aufsätze beschäftigen sich mit einführenden Überlegungen bzw. theoretischen Betrachtungen. Laut Klappentext geht es um das "Verhältnis zwischen modernem Massentourismus und den unterschiedlichen Spielarten von 'Kulturerbe'", doch im Vorwort relativieren die Mitherausgeber Felix Girke und Eva-Maria Knoll, dass es nicht um Massentourismus an sich gehe, sondern um "die Potentialitäten des 'Zeitalters des Massentourismus'" (10). Hasso Spode stellt in seinem Aufsatz "Homogenisierung und Differenzierung" im vorliegenden Buch fest, "dass der kulturorientierte Reisestil ein Minderheitenphänomen ist" (97) und attestiert der kulturwissenschaftlichen Tourismusforschung thematisch bildungsbürgerliche Befangenheit (97), was der Sammelband belegt, da sich keiner der Autoren mit populär-konsumistischen Tourismusformen (Badeurlaub, Themenparks u. ä.) und Kultur(erbe) befasst. Dafür finden sich z. B. Forschungsergebnisse über einen Schweizer Neujahrsbrauch und zwei Theaterprojekte, über ein touristisches Ereignis im Hochland von Papua Neuguinea, an dem jährlich ca. 20 (!) Touristen teilnehmen und eine Studie über "community-basierten"

Tourismus bei den San in Namibia. Das Ziel von Girke und Knoll, "die Öffnung eines weiten Vergleichsrahmens in thematischer und regionaler Hinsicht" (10), erscheint in Anbetracht der Bandbreite von Tourismus und seiner Bedeutung als einer der größten Wirtschaftszweige der Welt zu hoch gegriffen. Mit Ausnahme von Thomas Schmitt und Hasso Spode sind sämtliche der insgesamt 14 Autoren Kulturanthropologen bzw. Ethnologen, weshalb der Band das derzeitige Verhältnis von Ethnologie hinsichtlich Tourismus beleuchtet. Doch erst zum Inhalt:

Regina Bendix schildert die Dynamiken der In-Wertsetzung von Kultur(erbe) als ein Ineinandergreifen von ideellen, sozialen, politischen, religiösen und wirtschaftlichen Be- und Aufwertungen anhand der erwähnten Beispiele aus der Schweiz; weltwirtschaftliches Agieren lokaler Akteure deutet sie als Ausdruck kultureller Entfaltung und Dynamik. Den Tourismus auf La Réunion untersucht David Picard unter Analyse des Slogans "Die ganze Welt auf einer Insel". Er klassifiziert vier zeitlich lineare Imaginärwelten ausgehend von einer ahistorischen Natur bis zu einer Zukunftsvision, die im Ideal des Kreolischen gipfelt. Einerseits Ware, wirken diese Konstrukte andererseits sowohl sinnstiftend für Touristen als auch für die Bewohner der Insel. Hasso Spode bemängelt die zu starke Betonung von Differenzierung innerhalb der kulturtouristische Forschung – ein Vorwurf, der durch den Inhalt von "Kultur all inclusive" neue Nahrung erhält – und sieht die oft lediglich behauptete Angleichung von Räumen unter touristischem Einfluss als empirisch zu wenig erforscht an, um das Wesen des spätmodernen Tourismus erfassen zu können. Mit dem UNESCO-Weltkulturerbe und dessen Governanzmuster, beschäftigt sich Thomas Schmitt, wobei er den Schlüsselbegriff des *outstanding universal value*, die Grundlage für die Listung als Welt(erbe), ins Zentrum stellt. Seine Prozessanalysen der Aushandlungen in den UNESCO-Gremien entschleiern deren universalen Anspruch und erkennen Welterbe nicht nur als konstruiert, sondern überführen das Welterbe-Konzept des Eurozentrismus. Durch Anwendung einer Variante der Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie (ANT), die menschliche und nichtmenschliche Entitäten als gleichwertige Akteure innerhalb eines Netzwerks betrachtet, entlarvt Ingrid Thurner Sehenswürdigkeiten generell als konstruiert, mindesten re-interpretiert oder überhaupt erfunden. Entscheidend für den Erhalt fragiler kulturtouristischer Netzwerke und asteriskisierter Sehenswürdigkeiten sei die innere Verpflichtung von Touristen, ihre vorgesehene Rollen als Betrachter zu spielen. Wie die Kalam im Hochland von Papua-Neuguinea eigeninitiativ ein traditionelles Initiationsritual im globalen touristischen Kontext vermarkten und bewusst kontrollieren, beschreibt Joachim Görlich unter dem Titel "Wa(h)re Kultur". Das touristische Erleben der San Kultur in einem *community*-basierten Tourismusprojekt in Namibia analysiert Anna Hüncke. Unterwegs in einer durchlässigen "*Tourist Bubble*" ist deren Durchbrechen inszeniert, wodurch es Teil der Vermarktung wird. "*Sharing and Protecting*" im sogenannten Indianer-Tourismus Nordamerikas, diskutiert Markus Lindner. "*Sharing*" bezieht sich z. B. auf die Kulturvermittlung in Besucherzentren und Museen; in Bezug