

hest.” Since the Kivung movement was not just Berger’s but Lima’s as well, Valentine’s public attack must have seemed a shaming rebuke to his hospitality. In his notes Valentine wrote that Lima convened a series of meetings in different localities at which he reaffirmed his allegiance to Berger and asserted that the priest could be bested by “no other master” – apparently a reference to Valentine. Around this time, Valentine’s fieldnotes begin to convey “an impression of failure.” His intervention led Nakanai people to renew and redouble their support for his nemesis. His calls to have the priest disciplined or expelled from New Britain were dismissed by the colonial authorities. Finally, Valentine received a sharp letter from his doctoral supervisor Goodenough, who had left the field some months earlier, reproaching him for overstepping the bounds of appropriate conduct for an anthropological fieldworker. Overwhelmed by misgiving and stymied by his burnt bridges, Valentine eventually adopted a new supervisor and a new dissertation topic.

In telling this story, Jebens generously accords Valentine the respect due to one’s predecessor. However flawed it may be, Valentine’s view of the Kivung is infinitely more valuable to the project of retrospect than the silence we would have if Valentine had not recorded his experiences. But the connections Jebens traces between his own fieldwork and Valentine’s pale against the dramatic – and surely ethnographically significant – links that are evident between Valentine and the priest. Discounting as facile the explanation that they were both simply paranoid, how could these men have wound up behaving in such eerily similar ways? The conclusion Jebens draws is cautionary: they were both responding reflexively to expectations of whites that derived from Nakanai culture. The “construction of Other and Self” in the cultures we study is not just a matter for theory. Every fieldwork is potential ground for figures like the anthropologist Valentine and the priest Berger, who came to act out ideas of themselves as Other that they did not fully grasp. Ira Bashkow

Jenkins, Timothy: *The Life of Property. House, Family, and Inheritance in Béarn, South-West France.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2010. 181pp. ISBN 978-1-8545-667-2. (Methodology and History in Anthropology, 21) Price: £ 35.00

A number of high-profile attempts have recently been made to think “beyond” the local-global distinction, involving assemblages, a focus on interconnectedness and translocality, fractals and chaos theory, and other terms-of-art, with varying degrees of success. Timothy Jenkins’ new book accepts the challenge with characteristic subtlety. “The Life of Property” is no conventional ethnography of rural France, despite a former life as the Evans-Pritchard lectures at Oxford, and Jenkins’ acknowledgement of Evans-Pritchard’s own guiding influence. His aim is both to adumbrate central features of social life in a well-known rural region of South-West France, the Béarn, which borders the central Pyrenees; and notably, to analyse the multiple ways in which cultural practices in that region have influenced the broader national and interna-

tional cultural frame. It is an intriguing approach that, while remaining conceptually aligned on the “local-global” axis, brings a fresh set of perspectives that are all the more relevant to anthropologists for touching on one of the key thinkers of contemporary social science, himself a *Béarnais* by birth: Pierre Bourdieu.

Considering, to begin with, the structure and content of the volume, we are confronted with a composite arrangement, both in date of composition, and theme. Ostensibly, the book focuses on the nature of property in the French Pyrenees, its forms of ownership and transmission, along with continuities in these forms and their mutations. The proposition is that these forms effectively comprise a core cultural resource – “a key in our world to human being and order, to personality and politics, to extent and duration” – whose impact can be traced in a range of contexts, both at a local level, and of wider-ranging scope. In this regard, the first four chapters – the original Evans-Pritchard lectures – address the locality, although reflexivity is present from the start. Chapter 1 begins with the “discovery” of the Pyrenean family in the 19th century, exploring its manifestation as the “stem family” unit in sociological and anthropological theory, and its subsequent emergence in contemporary political debates concerning local social reform with regard to political, economic, and cultural issues. Chapter 2 moves on to examine the elements of local social life which underwrote this “discovery,” and reflexively analyses the sources that enabled historical continuity in the cultural forms themselves – notarial and legal records – and which thus, to a degree, facilitated this sociological conceptualisation. In this regard, it is already clear how a nuanced tracking between local contexts, wider social realities, and academic discourses, is immediately foregrounded in the text.

Chapter 3 is based on fieldwork, examining contemporary rural life, and how categories of property shape and influence it. Both continuities and ruptures are addressed, notably the significant influence of new agricultural technologies and the consolidation of land holdings, and particular attention is given to how the new is assimilated into the *longue durée* of social continuity. Chapter 4 then takes a wider view, discussing matters of local politics with regard to themes of authority, legitimacy, and power, in the context of land use and land sales. These four chapters, Jenkins argues, taken together, provide readings of the same phenomenon – property – from a variety of perspectives. The “life of property” consists precisely in these plural manifestations, interactions with wider frames, and a measured continuity over time, and such perspectivism draws attention, finally, to property’s own elusive nature. Rather than property’s “essence,” we are presented with overlapping strands of a mutable cultural form and their interaction, which underpin key social practices at different levels. One thinks while reading such a discussion, perhaps, of those well-known French historians who examined long-term cycles of economy and society – and whether mention of their work (and influences) might also be pertinent. But within the limits set, the ethnographic portrait developed is complex and multi-layered.

Chapter 5 comprises an “ethnographic reading” of the Gascon novel, “Los tres gojats de Bòrdavielha” (1934), by Simin Palay. The novel is analysed with respect to the data it provides on 19th-century Béarnais society, focused on themes of marriage, property, and inheritance in a farming family. Its psychological content supplements conventional ethnography, and the novel also provides detail on local interactions with wider social contexts through legal or political events. Such themes dovetail with Jenkins’ thematic focus, and the novel is framed as offering an indigenous perspective on social change, supplementing his strictly anthropological sources. Chapter 6 contains, finally, Jenkins’ analysis of the place of Béarn in the work of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu, as is well-known, conducted his first fieldwork in the region, and returned to this material at various points in his career. In doing so, Jenkins argues, he advanced some of his most influential concepts, such as notions of symbolic capital and symbolic violence. In later life, Bourdieu also drew on his Béarnais background and autobiography to situate his research and theoretical innovations, and underwrite his notion of “reflexive sociology.” Jenkins assesses the contribution of the Béarn to Bourdieu’s thought; offers a critical perspective on Bourdieu’s use of the region from an anthropological perspective; and suggests how working on such material might have influenced the development of Bourdieu’s theoretical models. While the arguments advanced would merit development at greater length, insights into Bourdieu’s project are intriguing and original, comprising, in some respects, the makings of an “anthropological biography” of this influential figure.

Given that Jenkins is engaging with topical debates in anthropological theory, of course, it is important to consider his achievement in this context. And it is here that a critical perspective might emerge. One wonders where Jenkins’ argument would have led, for example, had he welcomed some of the more recent attempts to rethink the local-global relationship into his concluding discussion. The rich ethnography and detailed research on Bourdieu and others, however, that informs this monograph certainly supplies material for further reflection in this vein. In this respect, the work is a welcome addition to the literature on rural Europe, and France in particular, and demonstrates the ongoing potential of European ethnography for illuminating anthropology’s “unconscious” dispositions and Western intellectual mannerisms. It will be of interest to historians and sociologists, no doubt, as well as anthropologists. Indeed, such composite works, featuring ethnographic analysis alongside the discussion of the work of novelists and social scientists, presage further new directions for the anthropology of contemporary societies that mine the extensive para-ethnographic materials available to researchers. In this regard, its innovative approach is of relevance to anthropologists working in a wider range of regions and contexts.

Matt Hodges

Johler, Reinhard, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer (eds.): *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones. World War I and the Cultural Sciences in*

Europe. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2010. 392 pp. ISBN 978-3-8376-1422-0. Price: € 38.80

This collection of essays follows a trend that goes towards reexamining the very foundations of anthropology, especially when it relates to theoretical and historical foundations of the discipline. The fact that political and historical circumstances shaped anthropology was well known (for example, in the institutionalization of the French *ethnologie*), and there are a number of studies dealing with anthropologists’ role before, during, and after the Second World War. On the other hand, although 1914 has widely been used as a year to mark the turning point in the history of anthropology (as well as in contemporary history, as Eric Hobsbawm put it as the beginning of the “short 20th century”), and the aftermath of the First World War, with the publication of Radcliffe-Brown’s and Malinowski’s seminal monographs (in 1922) widely regarded as the starting point of contemporary anthropology (by T. H. Eriksen, for example – cf. also the “Introduction” to the present volume, pp. 9–10), the First World War and the role of anthropologists in it have not yet been systematically studied.

This volume aims to fill this gap and initiate further research. It consists of the “Introduction” by the editors, 14 articles (grouped in 3 sections: “Adapting to Wartime. The Anthropological Sciences in Europe,” “Constructing a War Zone. Austrian Ethnography in the Balkans,” and “Studying the Enemy. The Anthropological Research in the Prisoner-of-War Camps”), and an “Afterword.” There are 16 contributors, both younger scholars and senior ones, from Austria, Germany, USA, Switzerland, Italy, and Russia. The articles deal with a variety of situations – from shifts in theoretical paradigms that influenced British social anthropology (chapter written by Kuklick), attempts to use anthropology in order to strengthen the Russian military, by incorporating minorities (Mogilner), the “folklore of war” in Italy (De Simonis and Dei), development of anthropology in Germany and Austria (Evans, Johler, Marchetti, Berner), physical anthropology in Bulgaria and Serbia (Promitzer), “arts and crafts” in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Reynolds Cordileone), Montenegrin tribesmen (Reber), and prisoners of war (Olin, Scheer, Lange, Fuhrmann). In the “Afterword,” Andre Gingrich points to the “triangular setting” of anthropology in German language after 1918 (anthropology – ethnology – *Volkskunde*; also discussed by Johler in his contribution), setting the stage for further developments and more controversial involvement of some anthropologists in the decades that followed.

It is difficult to emphasize enough the importance of such a volume. Despite some very minor imprecisions (Malinowski was actually able to move freely – although within Australia and the adjacent territories – during the war, and his actual fieldwork lasted between 9 and 18 months; as Županič was born in 1876, he could not have become “a professor of ethnology at the age of sixty-one” in 1940), the authors put forward a strong case for understanding the “turning point” in the history of social sciences and humanities in Europe. There are some real gems, dealing with previously less studied areas (like

the development of physical anthropology in Serbia and Bulgaria before the First World War, or accounts of Austrian research in Bosnia and Herzegovina – its true “colonial Other” – after 1878), but I suspect that the book’s main influence in the field will be seen in the contributors’ explanation of the development of anthropology in German language. As put by Johler: “[the war] put an end to Europe’s common scientific culture, effectively killing off the evolutionism that had been popular until then, leaving the academic landscape fractured along national lines” (139). The contributions also present a variety of important (and some previously not very well-known, like the participation of Jews in the studies of prison camps) case studies that will influence the way in which our colleagues understand and develop a critical view of anthropology’s role and influence in the last century. This combination of carefully developed specific points of research and thorough reexamination of paradigmatic theoretical models should make this volume an indispensable reading and an important point of reference for years to come.

Aleksandar Bošković

Kazubowski-Houston, Magdalena: *Staging Strife. Lessons from Performing Ethnography with Polish Roma Women.* Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010. 264 pp. ISBN 978-0-7735-3749-1. Price: \$ 95.00.

Orta, Lucy (ed.): *Mapping the Invisible. EU-Roma Gypsies.* London: Black Dog Publishing, 2010. 191 pp. ISBN 978-1-906155-91-9. Price: \$ 29.95.

These two books share a common goal, namely, to help break down the barriers isolating European Roma from the surrounding society through artistic endeavours. Magdalena Kazubowski-Houston does this by pursuing a project in “performance ethnography” whereby victimized members of society, in her case a small group of Romani women, are encouraged to act out their problems on the stage of a Polish theatre. Lucy Orta and her team of collaborators, on the other hand, struck up partnerships with a variety of Romani participants in Romania, Greece, Turkey, Italy, and England that led to exhibits, art installations, conferences, and other events intended to illustrate the plight of impoverished and disempowered Roma.

Kazubowski-Houston, who had a background in experimental theatre before embarking in Canada on doctoral studies in anthropology, describes in her book the making of an ethnographic experiment. For her dissertation fieldwork she chose to return to her native Polish city of Elbląg where she gathered a group of Romani women willing to participate in the production of a play about their encounters with violence. Kazubowski-Houston practices “interpretive” or “reflexive” ethnography based on the premise that informants ought to be treated as “research participants” who collaborate with the anthropologist in the pursuit of “empowerment.” This lofty outcome was to be attained through the collective creation of a play about the challenges faced by Romani women in post-socialist Poland, whereby the long and intensive process of talking about and acting out shared problems was hoped

to result in increased self-awareness by the participants as well as greater understanding of their plight by ethnic Polish members of the audience. As the author reminisces: “I saw people in dire need and hoped that through my research I could one day help this community” (23).

Things didn’t unfold in the expected way, though. Kazubowski-Houston had a very difficult time recruiting “research participants,” and even after she had overcome numerous obstacles and had assembled a small group of women willing to collaborate with her, she couldn’t overcome their steadfast refusal to go on stage and act out their lives in front of an anonymous audience. In the end, then, young Polish amateur actors were substituted, and the play was cobbled together through an arduous process of collaborative rehearsals that reduced the Roma to the role of cultural advisors. This partial failure in fact provided the stage director-anthropologist with a wonderful opportunity to observe and describe the biases and stereotypes that influence the relations between Roma and ethnic Poles. As the young actors belittled the older women’s preference for melodrama and soap operatic kitschiness, and as the Roma reciprocated by putting impossible demands on the inexperienced actors, Kazubowski-Houston buckled under the weight of contradictory expectations and obligations. When she sided with the actors in their quest for a sophisticated portrayal of Romani culture, she suffered pangs of conscience, realizing that “Ironically, while my project sought to facilitate a ground for the Roma women to articulate their claims for justice, ... I actually denied their right to speak for themselves” (139).

The reader of this book gains few new insights about Polish Roma. It contains several interesting interviews with the author’s informants where they speak openly and engagingly about their lives and the impact of violence (refreshingly, Kazubowski-Houston doesn’t censor out accounts of violence within the family), but the bulk of the work addresses methodological issues. The experience of putting performance ethnography to the test has made the author doubtful about its emancipatory potential. She concludes that the mere act of empathic listening to the women’s stories may have been more empowering to them than the time-consuming and expensive theatre production that formed the centre-piece of her research.

The authors of “Mapping the Invisible. EU-Roma Gypsies” are far less critical of their marriage of art with scholarship. Like Kazubowski-Houston, they envisage the project as a catalyst for the empowerment of Roma, but unlike the playwright-anthropologist they tell us precious little about the process in which the project unfolded and its outcome. What the reader learns from explanatory notes is that “EU-Roma” constitutes a network of European “architects, artists, designers, urban planners, sociologists and activists” determined to effect greater awareness of the injustices faced by Roma through common artistic projects as well as personal interaction (9). Although there are some examples of this type of collaboration interspersed, seemingly haphazardly, throughout the book, its bulk consists of numerous case studies, some with the length of minor essays, others being mere vignettes, of Romani communities under threat. The au-