

particular, Rihtman-Auguštin coined the term “ethno-anthropology” as a possible way out. On the one hand, she was always very conscious of the limitations of socialist-era education and attempts to completely ignore politics; but on the other (as demonstrated in some of the essays), the founding father of Croatian ethnology, Milovan Gavazzi, taught in late 1940s something that today would be regarded as “cultural anthropology.” The author was herself very prominent in the methodological and theoretical debates about directions and future of Croatian ethnology in the early 1990s. As a result, there is a whole new generation of brilliant scholars (almost all of them women) who have in the last decade produced some truly outstanding works.

The main body of the book consists of ten essays, written mostly in the last two decades, and already published in Croatia and Serbia in slightly different forms. Rihtman-Auguštin was taught by two men who determined the development of Croatian ethnology for over half of the century (Gavazzi and Bratanić), but gradually developed different and eclectic interests, ranging from Lévi-Strauss’s structuralism to Geertz’s interpretive theory. As a witness and participant in the fascinating field of Croatian ethnology, she was perfectly positioned to outline, with outstanding clarity and insight, both historical and theoretical developments of the discipline.

Although all the essays are brilliant exercises in historical sketches combined with Rihtman-Auguštin’s impressive knowledge, the one on the 19th-century Croatian ethnologist, Antun Radić, particularly stands out. Using Eugen Weber’s concept of “peasants into Frenchmen,” she demonstrates how similar methodology can be applied to her native country, with quite original results. Among the more theoretical ones, the final essay of the book (“The ICTY in The Hague and Anthropological Expertise”) questions our positions on reality, knowledge (both local and other), and expertise, putting it in a very specific and serious context of deliberations at the International War Crimes Tribunal. When questioning other (“nonnative”) interpretations of events, Rihtman-Auguštin was not going to fall into the “it takes one to know one” attitude – instead, she carefully outlined different perspectives and points of view. She was simply too good a scholar and too intelligent a person to demand her readers to simply agree with her – what Rihtman-Auguštin does is essentially to open the space for a dialogue on some very important issues.

The editor of this volume, Jasna Čapo Žmegač, also deserves the credit for this invitation for a debate. The book is nicely set out, but there are some unnecessary errors (for example, Gavazzi was born in 1895 – not 1885), and translation is sometimes awkward (the translators used the word “imposing” instead of “establishing,” for example). It would have been interesting to include some notes on the debates about “ethnology” and “anthropology” that characterized Croatia in the early 1990s – without them, some implications of Rihtman-Auguštin’s brilliance are not that obvious to

outside observers. Having said that, I believe that this is only a first step towards better understanding of one of the liveliest and most original anthropological traditions in contemporary Europe. Aleksandar Bošković

Rödlach, Alexander: *Witches, Westerners, and HIV. AIDS and Cultures of Blame in Africa.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2006. 247 pp. ISBN 978-1-59874-034-9. Price: \$ 29.95

Paul Farmer’s book: “AIDS and Accusation. Haiti and the Geography of Blame” from 1992 (Berkeley) brought the AIDS epidemic into the historical, economic, and political context in which it is unfolding. With Alexander Rödlach’s book we have finally got an African counterpart to this work. Politics of blame are no less relevant in relation to the African AIDS epidemic, and Rödlach sets out to explore these in Zimbabwe: From witchcraft accusations in everyday social interactions to conspiracy theories about national and international agents.

In the introduction Rödlach sets the theoretical frame of his discussion: The search for meaning in the face of misfortune, social representations theory (the dynamics of how meanings become attributed to the AIDS epidemic), and the applicability of studies on illness meaning and representation to AIDS interventions. He furthermore describes the setting and his fieldwork, which took place in a small town called Plumtree on the southwestern border of Zimbabwe and a township in Bulawayo, the second largest city of Zimbabwe. In chapter one he further elaborates the conditions of his fieldwork, the methods used, and in particular his double role as catholic priest and anthropologist. Chapter two is an overview of the historical and political context in which the Zimbabwean AIDS epidemic has unfolded: The history of the Ndebele kingdom, the arrival of European traders, missionaries, and administrators, the establishment of European rule, the national politics from 1960 onwards, the political struggle for majority rule, the political turmoil of recent years, and the economic decline it has caused. Finally the arrival of the AIDS epidemic, the declining health care system, and national responses to the epidemic are outlined. All of the above, it is argued, has shaped the experience of AIDS and contributed to the interpretation of the epidemic within a discourse of blame.

Part II consists of three chapters on different kinds of sorcery evoked in relation to AIDS. The author shows that they must all be understood within the context of illicit sex, and can be seen as a form of social control. Part III presents different kinds of conspiracy theories concerning the origin of AIDS, some of which involve international agents (especially the U.S.). Others are concerned with health care providers and Westerners more generally speaking. Much of this discussion is based, not only on interviews, but also on an analysis of debates in the media. In the final part of the book, one chapter compares sorcery accusations and conspiracy theories in order to further our understanding of theories

of blame. It is argued that sorcery and conspiracy are neither identical nor can they be neatly separated (175). Both of them imply that people assume there is more than meets the eye (165), and both of them have a strong moral undertone, seemingly used to reinforce the social values and norms, by describing the opposite, and thereby, from an etic point of view, they can be said to promote social cohesion (167). The last chapter deals with the applicability of a study like this for health education.

The book is well-written, clearly structured, and full of evocative descriptions. Many of the chapters contain well-chosen and intriguing illustrations, e.g., newspaper cartoons and photos of woodcarvings of relevant themes. Some of the directions in which I suggest that the argument could have been pushed even further have to do with, on the one hand, the fieldwork and the position of the anthropologist, and on the other hand, the “causal ambiguity and creativity” of human beings (170), more specifically the role of politics of blame in everyday social interactions.

The author suggests that there are several advantages of being a priest as well as an anthropologist. The kind of long-term involvement and knowledge of the language, which his experience as a priest in the area has given him, do indeed provide a solid and interesting ground for anthropological fieldwork. Reflecting on the role of the anthropologist should, however, imply more than simply identifying advantages and disadvantages. It is rather a question of describing the path of the anthropologist into the society s/he studies and how that particular path has shaped what one sees and what one does not see. It would have been interesting to hear more about the how Rödlach's path was carved thanks to his double role as anthropologist and priest: What social settings and interactions he became part of, who his informants were, and how he interacted with them. Were people simply more open? Or were there matters that he was able to obtain privileged information about, and what kind of information did he not get from the position in which he found himself? Did morality mean the same in this particular social interaction as it would have in others? Were there people he had more easily access to than others? Etc. In sum, how is his analysis of the politics of blame connected to the particular role and the path that characterized his fieldwork? This, of course, is always important in anthropological work, but it would have been particularly interesting (and important) considering Rödlach's long-term involvement and established role in the area.

The above comment leads to the more general one: That we hear very little about the fieldwork as such, as we hear very little of concrete social interactions in the settings in which he carried out the fieldwork. More details on practice – on the use of sorcery accusations and conspiracy theories in everyday interactions and negotiations, could maybe have helped pushing even further the already very interesting discussion about “causal ambiguity and creativity of human being.” In the introduction

it is suggested that interpretations of HIV/AIDS as the result of either sorcery or conspiracy have some obvious implications for HIV/AIDS awareness, since they divert attention for the sexual transmission of the disease to the doings of an evil agency, and because for “those who hold the belief that some malicious ‘other’ is behind the disease may not take the necessary precautions during sexual encounters” and for them “it is more important to identify this agent than to protect themselves against infection” (13). This is in contradiction with Rödlach's recognition of the insight of (medical) anthropologists since the time of Evans-Pritchard's ground breaking work on witchcraft that “individuals can simultaneously, or at least consecutively, espouse personalistic and nonpersonalistic explanations,” and “even people who expressed very different explanations for the disease simultaneously attributed either sorcery or a conspiracy, or both, to the illness” (6). Rödlach does modify the above and other similar statements in the final chapter on “Applications for the AIDS Crisis,” where he discusses the need to take seriously “cultures of blame,” because, as he argues, taking a starting point in people's concerns, e.g., their experience of a long history of neglect, will help gaining their trust. And it is, I suggest, crucial in the study of local experiences with AIDS, to do what he does in this final chapter: Avoid falling in the trap of reducing people “beliefs” to obstacles to the dissemination of “knowledge.” While the overall analysis of Rödlach leaves no doubt that he wishes to avoid this trap, he does at times struggle with it, in ways which could maybe have been avoided if concrete social interactions, in which sorcery accusations take place and conspiracy theories are debated, were given more space.

All in all Rödlach does, however, give us a fascinating and intriguing discussion of theories of blame and causal ambiguity, and his book is an important contribution to the understanding of the impact of the AIDS epidemic on African societies.

Hanne O. Mogensen

Rösing, Ina: Los católicos paganos y el Padre Nuestro al revés. Sobre la relación del cristianismo y la religión andina. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala, 2006. 94 pp. ISBN 978-9978-22-600-1. (Iglesias, Pueblos y Culturas, 62) Precio: \$ 4.00

Éste es un estudio sobre el sincretismo religioso practicado por catequistas católicos de la región andina de Kallawayá, en el norte del departamento de La Paz, en Bolivia. El problema específico que plantea Rösing puede ser reducido a la siguiente pregunta: son los catequistas andinos “católicos paganos” o “paganos cristianos”? En su respuesta, la autora, comparando perspectivas sociológicas y teológicas, enfoca sobre el modo en que los líderes laicos de la Iglesia católica en aquella región manejan ciertos elementos del catolicismo dentro del marco conceptual y ritual andino. Como tal, “Los católicos paganos y el Padre Nuestro al revés” es una contribución a la discusión, tanto dentro del