

MacClancy, Jeremy (ed.): *Anthropology and Public Service. The UK Experience*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2017. 191 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-402-3. Price: £ 67.00

This edited volume invites us into the secret life of anthropology within the British state. MacClancy has assembled a range of contributors who were educated in anthropology to undergraduate, master's, or doctoral level, but who now work for government in some applied capacity. Among the most remarkable is Bryan and Jarman's account of playing a key role in managing the Orange marches during a period of political turbulence in Northern Ireland (along with another former anthropologist, Mo Mowlam). Meanwhile Bennett tells a sincere and engaging story of how his anthropological background informed his work as governor of Britain's only therapeutic prison – and gives us the book's most beautiful line when he compares the testimonies of prisoners to “the devotional outpourings of sectarian saints.” The result is essentially a collection of autoethnographies exploring the social life of anthropology beyond academia.

One of the questions which is raised repeatedly is the understanding of anthropology itself. If anthropology is not something exclusively taught and practiced by the incumbents of university departments, then how should we think of it? A set of methods and techniques (Hills, Gooberman-Hill)? A privileging of subaltern positions (Gregory)? MacClancy attempts to neutralize the question by emphasizing “anthropologies” – a legitimate move, but one which would have benefitted from some accompanying typology of what this plurality consists of. I would offer that many of the chapters present the practice of anthropology as one of inhabiting an interstitial location between different groups. The civil servants interviewed by MacClancy affectionately refer to themselves as “odd-balls” and anomalies, engaging in “guerilla strategies” within the organizations they work for. In a sophisticated chapter Smith calls it a form of “displacement” – arguing that once you have fully absorbed the capacity to see culture from the outside you cannot subsequently “go home again” and return to being a member in any unproblematic sense. Instead, these individuals trained in the discipline have gone on to thrive as mediators and go-betweens moving among a range of different actors. One of the core lessons pedagogues can draw from this book is thus the extraordinary efficacy of an anthropological education in producing a capacity for cultural motility, which is both profound and long-lasting. It is striking how many of the contributors still consider themselves anthropologists.

Among the perils of occupying such an interstitial location is its moral ambiguity, and the ethical dilemmas of being an anthropologist working for the state are in evidence throughout. It seems odd then that MacClancy omits any discussion of ethics in his afterword, and the short shrift he gives to critiques of military anthropology is troubling. The most glib discussion in this respect, however, comes from Hills. Hills spent many years working for the MoD and rather bizarrely uses his chapter to launch a defence of the invasion of Iraq in 2003 – a position he says that some will find “unacceptably provocative.” Provocation is fine; provocation is stimulating. It is the logical inconsistencies of Hills' argument that diminish it. His apology for the Iraq war is combined with a solemn reference to the rise of ISIS as proof for the necessity of military anthropology – and yet he strangely fails to acknowledge the documented link between the two. He also describes himself as possessing a capacity for “laser-like quality assurance” and yet his reflections on anthropology are watery and highly generalized. Fortunately, Hills' chapter is an outlier, and the other contributors display far greater ethical sensitivity – although none of them place ethics at the centrepiece of their analysis.

A final theme which becomes clear when reading this collection is that applied anthropologists feel rather wounded by their academic counterparts. They talk of “academic arrogance” (Gregory) and a “dissdain” (Smith) towards their work. They describe the sense of being a “poor relation” (Bryan and Jarman) to those who work in universities. MacClancy's interesting presentation of the suppressed history of applied anthropology shows how deep this wound goes – a contemporary legacy of the historical pre-eminence of pure over applied forms of research. My main critique of the editor is that instead of utilizing the volume as an opportunity to begin the process of healing such a wound, he decides instead to rub salt into it. At times, MacClancy adopts an undiplomatic and even reckless tone towards his colleagues which the latter may find alienating.

Overall, MacClancy has done a fine job in bringing these autoethnographies together, and comes across as someone passionately committed to the value of anthropology beyond the academy. This is a worthy project and there is no reason why he should begin the conversation on the back foot. He has more friends among the “academically ensconced” than he thinks.

Vita Peacock

Mylius, Maren: *Die medizinische Versorgung von Menschen ohne Papiere in Deutschland. Studien zur Praxis in Gesundheitsämtern und Krankenhäusern*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2016. 337 pp. ISBN 978-3-8376-3472-3. (Menschenrechte in der Medizin – Human Rights in Healthcare, 2) Preis: € 39.99

Die Ärztin Maren Mylius beschäftigt sich in ihrer Publikation, die auf einer Dissertation und Magisterarbeit an der Medizinischen Hochschule Hannover basiert, mit einer besonders vulnerablen Bevölkerungsgruppe – mit Menschen, die ohne rechtlichen Aufenthaltstitel in Deutschland leben. Sie verfolgt dabei die Forschungsfrage: Welche Zugänge zur medizinischen Versorgung bestehen tatsächlich für undokumentierte Migrantinnen und Migranten?

Einleitendbettet die Autorin das Thema in aktuelle migrations- und gesundheitswissenschaftliche Diskurse ein. Bisher liegen im Bereich der Gesundheitsforschung zu Menschen ohne Papiere überwiegend qualitative Untersuchungen vor, die vor allem die Perspektive der Betroffenen rekonstruieren. Quantitative Studien finden sich zu Teilaспектen der gesundheitlichen Versorgung die-