Joniak-Lüthi, Agnieszka: The Han. China's Diverse Majority. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015. 187 pp. ISBN 978-0-295-99467-3. Price: £ 33.00

There are good reasons to write a book about the Han. To be sure, the "Han" – which, according to the government of the People's Republic of China, accounts for more than ninety-one percent (or more than 1.2 billion) of the Chinese population – is an imagined category. Yet, as Joniak-Lüthi points out, even though the Han as a category/identity has since the mid-nineteenth century been closely tied to the rise of nationalism in China, and though it has since the 1950s been institutionalized as the first among dozens of so-called nationalities (*minzu*) who comprise the Chinese nation, how those who are identified as "Han" make sense of their Han-ness has actually not been adequately examined in the scholarly literature.

To understand what being "Han" means to those who are so identified in contemporary China, the author conducted interviews with "predominantly urban, mobile, educated, and relatively young Putonghua speakers" (16) who were at the time residing in either Beijing or Shanghai, two of China's largest and most cosmopolitan cities. Findings of the book are also informed by additional fieldwork and interviews conducted by the author in a multiethnic village in southwest China as well as in the district of Aqsu in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

What the author discovered through her fieldwork and interviews, to this reviewer at least, is illuminating though not surprising. As a category/identity, "the Han," we are told, is only one among many others people choose to employ (or deploy) in their daily life. Among the "powerful competitors on the contemporary 'identity market'" (9) are those associated with one's home place(s) as well as those that are constructed along regional, urban/rural, or native/outsider divides. Of course, not all categories/identities are equally powerful in all circumstances. In metropolises such as Beijing and Shanghai where *minzu* divisions are less visible than those found in China's border regions, many who are officially identified as "Han" would "turn to home-place and other non-*minzu* identities to find a feeling of belonging as well as social solidarity and crucial support networks beyond immediate kin" (142). But even though identities based on regional, urban/rural, native/outsider, or occupational divide can be seen as "ethnic" – meaning, according to the author, that they are also often based on "discourses of descent, shared inborn predispositions, and shared destiny" (133) – such identities are ultimately less ethnic and more transient when compared with institutionalized *minzu* identities.

As an historian who is often envious of his colleagues who are able to speak to their "informants" (a label I thought that has, for good reasons, gone out of fashion), I find the arguments in the present work reasonable and instructive. However, I do have several reservations concerning the methodology employed. Let me focus on two. The first has to do with the presentation of research data. I understand that the analysis presented here is primarily based on "almost one hundred semi-structured interviews" (15) and is necessarily of qualitative – rather than quantitative – nature. And while I am just as skeptical about numbers without contexts, I found the author's frequent use of "some of my informants," "the majority of my informants," "a small minority of my informants," or similar formulations (though once "every fourth informant" [47]), to be less than satisfactory. I appreciate that open-ended or semi-structured interviews do not as a matter of course yield data that is easily quantifiable, but if the author's arguments do to some extent (and I think they do) hinge on quantitative claims (as in, in a particular context, "more people claim to be A than to be B"), then a more transparent and precise presentation of the data would seem to be in order.

The second reservation I have has to do with what the author refers to as the "narration" of identities. Joniak-Lüthi is certainly correct in acknowledging that, "depending on their circumstances and interlocutors, Han individuals activate different identities" (4). And she is certainly right that one must be cautious in gauging how the responses given by the participants might be "influenced by what these Han thought their audience expected to hear, particularly when their audience was a foreign researcher" (79). Given her sensitivity to the issue, it is surprising that not more has been done by the author to address this methodological challenge. Of course, studies based on interviews and observations need not (and probably should not) be primarily about the authors and their methodologies, but the arguments of the present work would certainly be more persuasive if the reader were given more information about the contexts of the participants' responses.

One example of how this approach might be undertaken has actually been provided by the author. In a particularly illuminating section of the book (pp. 116–121), Joniak-Lüthi sets out to address the broader issue of Hanness and its fragmentation by laying out – and discussing the answers to – the three questions she invariably posed to her "informants" at the conclusion of each interview: Do Hanzu all over the country share the same culture (*wenhua*)? Are all Hanzu inherently alike (*tongzhi*)? Do all people classified as Hanzu have "enough" in common to form one *minzu*? Of course, it would be unwise (not to mention impossible) to reproduce in the book all relevant interview transcripts, but as a reader there is certainly something useful (and, dare I say, fascinating) in understanding how conversations about identities did unfold in particular contexts and how identities were activated "depending on circumstances and interlocutors."

Leo K. Shin

Josephides, Lisette, and **Alexandra Hall** (eds.): We the Cosmopolitans. Moral and Existential Conditions of Being Human. New York: Berghahn Books, 2014. 186 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-276-8. Price: $ 80.00

Cosmopolitanism is a worldview which sees all humans as belonging to one community. More specifically, it is about the relation of individuals and localized cultures to humanity as a whole. The leading question is whether human beings can be conceived as world citi-

zens (or even citizens of the larger universe, as the ancient Greeks understood the term). If cosmopolitans as persons are addressed, this may include transnational *non-lieux*-elites consuming diversity, but in most cases what is understood as cosmopolitans are individuals explicitly open to cultural difference and/or people challenging national boundaries and nationalism. Cosmopolitan thinking on global citizenship is related to assumptions on what is fundamentally human about any person. Thus, cosmopolitan reflections are related to universalist notions and also often come with a quite normative baggage.

This volume takes up these challenges and addresses cosmopolitism as a political and moral project. Within this research field the authors are focused on cosmopolitanism from the perspective of a philosophically informed cultural anthropology. Works on cosmopolitanism are manifold and may be broadly divided in works on the concept world citizenship, on the one hand, and works on the political reality respective organization of common human interests. This volume is focused on the first issue, but also has to say a lot about the second, both with an anthropological micro-focus. The book is edited by an anthropologist and a political scientist and most of the contributors are cultural anthropologists with an interest in existentialist philosophy but also in politics.

The contributors are interested in universal characteristics of the human condition and their potential to transcend cultural boundaries in the interest of the one humanity on our planet. They exemplify important issues of cosmopolitanism by way of discussing (mostly contemporary) cases of localized cosmopolitanisms. A specific aspect running through the articles is the notion of the "other," conceived as a human actor with universal needs of self-realization (cf. L. Woods, Review of Josephides and Hall. *International Social Science Review* 90.2015). Thus the title of the volume, portraying "we" and us as cosmopolitans, may seem provocative to any ultra-relativistic perspective, but seems most appropriately chosen.

The introduction and the conclusion by the editors, taken together provide a sound introduction into cosmopolitanism as a primarily moral project within local settings. This is to be seen against the mainstream of works on cosmopolitanism which is on macro-issues related to global political management and cosmopolitics. In his contribution, Ronald Stade describes the historical emergence of different kinds of cosmopolitanism. He differentiates early Greek thoughts on the relation of individuals to the whole world (*cosmos*) and later versions more oriented towards the relation between the person or the self and her or his polity or larger political entities. He critically discusses Kant's concept of the right to worldwide mobility and political restrictions running counter to that right.

Nigel Rapport is focused on his concept of "Anyone," the universal human subject related to an understanding of "the human" as a general subject and as a transcultural condition. He exemplifies this by describing formal and informal behavioral contracts at the British Constance Hospital. A focus of these contracts is a notion of "goodness," non-egotistic orientation, gratifica-

tion, and mutual recognition. Alexandra Hall, one of the editors, in her contribution describes and discusses a sort of negative cosmopolitanism preventing social or cultural inclusion as well as compassion. Taking detainees in Locksdon Immigration Removal Center as a case study, Hall describes how they are systematically stripped of any recourse of distinction. The institutional complement to this is an inbuilt lack of moral responsibility. Anne Sigfrid Grønseth is concerned with what she calls embodied cosmopolitanism. Taking Tamil refugees in Norway as an example, she describes their pain as an embodied experience. Though being an interesting example, for this reviewer what is described and interpreted here seems more a sort of transnational subjectivity and suffering than cosmopolitanism. Marc Schiltz provides a historical case study on the human capacity for sociality and empathy. He discusses the successes and failures of welcoming strangers by missionaries at the Society of African Missions in the 19th century in West Africa. These missions were focused on preaching love social goodness more than on colonial evangelization. Thomas Hylland Eriksen adds a recent case study by discussing the controversies about cartoons showing Muhammad in Denmark and Norway through 2005 and 2006. Eriksen juxtaposes intentional provocations with a cosmopolitan orientation oriented on common interests and higher orders. Throughout, the author calls for a more inclusive cosmopolitanism than that offered by mere promises of a shared discourse.

Taken together, the contributions advance especially discussions about *rooted* cosmopolitanism respectively *vernacular* cosmopolitanism. The critical potential of ethnography is exemplified quite well. Beyond cosmopolitanism proper the book has a lot to say about shared moralities. Throughout this volume all contributions explicitly or implicitly address the question of universal attributes of human cultures, a traditional but usually neglected topic in current cultural anthropology. This could be fostered by a clearer differentiation between biological needs and faculties shared by all human beings as individuals (species traits, sometimes discussed as "anthropological constants"), on the one hand, and commonalities on the level of human collectives, on the other (pan-cultural universals; cf. C. Antweiler, Our Common Denominator. Human Universals Revisited. New York 2016).

The book is well-crafted and well-edited and comes with a systematic and wonderfully detailed index. Comparing that to the standards in German edited volumes, German-language anthropology publishers might take that as a paragon. The authors try out several theoretical and sometimes iconoclastic ideas and also different styles of writing. With the exception of the introduction and conclusion and Eriksen's contribution the authors tend to write in a demanding, quite reflective and sometimes meandering style. This book is most useful for readers who have already some knowledge of cosmopolitanism. For university courses on cosmopolitanism aimed at students of cultural anthropology this volume could be combined with simpler texts. A suitable candidate would be another recent volume on situated cosmopolitanism by the same

publisher, a book that comes with more, shorter and simpler contributions (N. Glick Schiller and A. Irving [eds.], Whose Cosmopolitanism? Critical Perspectives, Relationalities and Discontents. New York 2015).

Christoph Antweiler

Keller, Eva: Beyond the Lens of Conservation. Malagasy and Swiss Imaginations of One Another. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015. 244 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-552-3. (Studies in Environmental Anthropology and Ethnobiology, 20) Price: $ 95.00

Global warming, biodiversity loss, species extinction. Sustainable development, natural resource conservation, carbon trading. Concern for environmental problems has increased in the past decades, matched by a myriad array of proposals for their solutions. Social scientists have played different roles in conservation efforts. At one end of the spectrum is applied work in partnership with conservation practitioners and ecologists, aimed at improving projects' feasibility and advocating for local peoples' needs and perspectives. On the other end of the spectrum is more critical scholarship, illuminating projects' negative (though sometimes unintended) social impacts, or questioning many of their underlying assumptions. While at their core both types of social scientists are driven by the conviction that people matter, the former sees possibility in rectifying disparate worldviews and positionalities, while the latter sees these as inherent and intractable. Madagascar, a country of great concern for environmentalists as a "biodiversity hotspot," has been the site of both types of studies, detailed in numerous articles, conference papers, edited collections, and monographs.

In this ongoing scholarly conversation about people and the protection of nature, Eva Keller's ethnography "Beyond the Lens of Conservation. Malagasy and Swiss Imaginations of One Another" provides a fresh and unique voice. It is a thought-provoking reflection of how ordinary people at two ends of a conservation partnership see – or more often, see past – each other. The partnership involves the Zurich zoo in Switzerland, which has provided ideological and financial support for the Masoala National Park, one of Madagascar's largest protected areas in the northeast of the country. Keller's focus is not the bureaucrats or power-brokers of this partnership but rather the ordinary people implicated in it. At one end are Swiss citizens: visitors to the "Little Masoala" zoo exhibit featuring over a hectare of living rainforest recreated abroad, and school children learning about Madagascar through zoo fieldtrips, children's books, supermarket marketing, and films. At the other end are Malagasy citizens: residents of villages within or bordering the park who find their ability to continue the labor necessary to feed their families and honor their ancestors severely restricted. Keller's main aim in this book is to juxtapose how these two groups of ordinary people make sense of the conservation partnership, and whether or not the project actually creates connections between them as it is intended to.

The book is divided into two parts, beginning first with the Swiss perspective and ending with the outlook from Madagascar. Chapter 1 provides a virtual tour of the "Little Masoala" zoo exhibit, including the recreated rainforest environment, informational displays, and visitors shop. Chapter 2 explores the tension between intent and perception, highlighting the disconnect between the information that the zoo tries to convey and what is actually understood or absorbed by visitors. Keller uses this chapter to provide the theoretical underpinnings of her ethnography, drawing from cognitive anthropology and schema theory; Anna Tsing's notion of global friction is also a recurrent theoretical lens deployed throughout the book. Chapter 3 shows how zoo visitors use the Little Masoala exhibit as an opportunity to reflect about generalized morality of protecting nature rather than the specifics of Madagascar's environmental issues. Chapter 4 similarly argues that schoolchildren and zoo visitors alike imagine Malagasy citizens as a generalized kind of people, which is further expanded upon in chapter 5 as the "coconut schema" characterized by deficiency, poverty, and backwardness. Chapter 6 shifts towards Madagascar, introducing us to the park and the two villages where Keller conducted her research, and detailing the various injustices faced by residents of those villages including land loss, inadequate compensation, punishments, and surveillance. Chapter 7 discusses the Malagasy "ethos of growth" related to kinship and land, which is presented as at odds with the park's ethos of conservation. Chapter 8 focuses on a case study of a small island that had been the site of ancestral tombs before being subsumed in the park territory, highlighting the tension between the park and ancestral custom. Chapter 9 and 10 detail how Malagasy people view outsiders involved with the park's creation, management, and tourism as hostile "others," due to a long history of expropriation and domination from colonial and imperial eras. The final chapter synthesizes these various viewpoints and stories, presenting two contrasting portrayals of Malagasy and Swiss values and engagements with conservation.

Keller's main argument is that the ethos of the ordinary people in her ethnography are so different that true connection and mutual understanding are impossible. They are not even in disagreement, because as Keller writes, they are "engaged in two entirely different stories" (221). Successful land management in the Swiss ethos is a pristine landscape free of people, but in the Malagasy ethos manifests in fertile rice fields or well-tended ancestral burial grounds. The Swiss zoo visitors and school children and the Malagasy farmers are indeed put into contact with one another by the Masoala conservation partnership, but ironically such contact has only widened the gap between these two groups of people. For the Swiss people, the gap is widened because they use Madagascar as catalyst to think in ahistorical generalities about the moral value of protecting nature and the difficulties of life for poor peasants, thus erasing any specificity to the Masoala project. For the Malagasy people, the park echoes specific and painful historical injustices, and restricts their obligations to past, present, and future generations.

Keller's ethnography is captivating and original, and her arguments well supported and vividly illustrated by