

time and the complexities of types of knowledge that are evoked and deployed in practice and discourse.

In Chapter 8, “Anonymous Introductions,” Candea describes one of the modalities of becoming known through the seemingly paradoxical process of *not* being introduced to strangers by name, especially not at the beginning of an interaction. This process allows disconnection between people to be held in abeyance until a chain of connection can be established through interaction; the process itself presumes what I have characterized above as “knowability.” Thus its function contrasts with popular explanations that fall back on stereotypes of Corsican “secrecy” or “closedness.” Candea concludes with a reflection on how this process relates to the anthropological enterprise, which by default often posits entities (Corsica, Corsicans) as “known” before engaging readers in a necessarily partial, situated process of discovery of connections, practices and relationships.

Overall, this is a stimulating and eloquently written book that highlights, with subtle examples, the complex interplay between fixity and fluidity in discourses and practices of identification. Candea succeeds in showing the fragmentary, situated, emergent, and inconsistent nature of these discourses and practices while pointing to the threads of shared or common experiences and sentiments about Corsican things, people and language that are (also situationally) constructed. Alexandra Jaffe

**Coleman, Simon, and Pauline von Hellerman** (eds.): *Multi-Sited Ethnography. Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods*. New York: Routledge, 2011. 219 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-96524-8. (Routledge Advances in Research Methods, 3) Price: £ 80.00

The collection of essays gathered in the book under review emerged out of intense sets of debates and conversations, prompted by a workshop entitled “Problems and Possibilities in Multi-Sited Ethnography.” This workshop held at the University of Sussex in June 2005, gathered people of different institutional backgrounds and affiliations in Europe, Africa, and the United States. As we can read in the “Introduction”, none of contributors – with the exception of Kaushik Sunder Rajan – has been part of Marcus’s “school” of anthropology. George Marcus himself was present at the workshop, but he contributed in a lively fashion to conversations during the coffee breaks. Simon Coleman and Pauline von Hellerman, editors of the volume, present the experiences of this specific workshop in a book that is not meant to be read as a program but as an “extended provocation.” They are working at the level of metacommentary, examining the ways in which multi-sited practice might produce useful ethnography.

We all know the convention (in Marcus’s words, “Malinowskian complex”) that an ethnography has involved the idea of a relatively long stay in a field site of choice. This site was understood as a container of a particular set of cultural and social relations, which could be studied and compared with the contents of other sites. Ethnographic fieldwork involved intensive dwelling and interaction with “native” or “local” in order to understand his

or her “native point of view.” The field sites in this convention become a sociocultural unit, spatially and temporally isolated. Such a positing of people, places, and cultures is criticized. One of key voices in this critical discussion is Marcus’s project of multi-sited ethnography.

The project called “multi-sited ethnography” was broadly discussed for the first time in George Marcus’s article “Ethnography in/of the World System. The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography” (*Annual Review of Anthropology* 1995.24: 95–117). This article purports classic convention of ethnographic fieldwork. Looking at culture as embedded in macroconstructions of a global cultural order, this project uses traditional ethnographic methodology in various locations both spatially and temporally. Marcus suggests that multi-sited ethnography cannot be reduced to focusing on one single site. The “world system” was seen by Marcus as a framework within which the local (communities, values, norms, commodities, etc.) was contextualized or compared. In his terms, multi-sited ethnography involved a spatially dispersed field; the research tracks a subject across spatial and temporal boundaries. Marcus suggested those strategies like literally following connections, associations, and also putative relationship, which were at the heart of designing multi-sited research. Another important element of Marcus’s project was a great interdisciplinary approach to fieldwork, bringing in methods from cultural studies, media studies, science and technology studies, migrants studies, and many others.

The volume here, entitled “Multi-sited ethnography. Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods,” is organized in three parts. Part A contains articles which have used Marcus’s concept to follow transnational lives, one of the most popular and even “normal” applications of multi-sited ethnographies (Kanwal Mand; Ester Gallo; Bruno Riccio). In Part B we can find maps, “distributed knowledge systems,” within some global institutions and within the research team itself (Ingie Hovland; Dinah Rajak; Michael A. Whyte, Susan Reynolds Whyte, and Jenipher Twebaze). Part C is focused on more experimental forms of multi-sited strategies. These explorations also concern the limits and problems of this project, especially within the academic institutions (Werner Krauss; Kathryn Tomlinson; Kaushik Sunder Rajan).

Each of the three parts is furthermore prefaced by brief commentaries from persons who contributed in the original workshop in Sussex (Michael Crang; Andrea Cornwall; James Fairhead). The book as a whole is framed by an introductory chapter by Marcus and the final one by James Ferguson). Marcus expressed his contributions in the spirit of Carlo Ginzburg on microhistory. The title of Marcus’s article is inspired by Ginzburg’s essay “Microhistory. Two or Three Things That I Know about It” (*Critical Inquiry* 1993.20/1: 10–35). Like microhistory to famous Italian historians, multi-sited ethnography to American anthropologists is an attractive style or newer variant on an older tradition of inquiry. For Marcus this kind of ethnography is a reform or reimagination of the Malinowskian complex in which he was brought up as a student. Today, the Malinowskian ethos of ethnographic

fieldworks as focused, sustain that intensive life in communities of distinctive difference is endangered, like endangered species. Obviously, many social and cultural anthropologists operate in the frame of limits governed by the Malinowskian complex. Marcus suggested that attempts to do multi-sited strategy push ethnography – and even “the culture of fieldwork” – to the limits of its classic professional aesthetic or “feel.” The creations and implementations of an alternative practice of research are possible where disciplinary metamethods are most effective. Where? “Where ethnographers are made at the critical point in the mode of professional reproduction”, Marcus answered. Multi-sited ethnography has been most critical, creative, and directly interesting where it has been involved in the study of distributed knowledge systems.

“Multi-sited ethnography. Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods” is a remarkable and important volume. The editors present an interesting debate on multi-sited ethnography. This original and highly significant collection not only regards the current condition of ethnographic fieldwork but the condition of the research method of human sciences as well. Obviously, Marcus’s project is controversial in many levels. But for me, one condition of ethnography – in any variants and situations – is permanent. Ethnography has always involved not only a single site but multiple sites: at the minimum, the field as a site of research and the academy as the site of interpretation. So it goes.

Waldemar Kuligowski

**Coté, Charlotte:** *Spirits of Our Whaling Ancestors. Revitalizing Makah and Nuu-chah-nulth Traditions.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011. 275 pp. ISBN 978-0-295-99046-0. Price: \$ 24.95

In “Spirits of Our Whaling Ancestors,” Charlotte Coté presents remarkable insights into how Makah and Nuu-chah-nulth concerns about their right to hunt whales are intertwined with cultural revitalization efforts. As a Native scholar, with family ties to the Aboriginal groups she has studied, Coté presents fishing rights issues from a perspective that is both compelling and challenging. Her “insider” position is still fairly rare within social science research and writing, which makes her contribution especially important. The book expands our understanding of the issues she addresses, and at the same time it presents an opportunity to rethink questions about how a researcher’s social/cultural/political position is relevant to the knowledge she or he produces.

In the foreword to Coté’s book, Micah McCarty (Vice-Chair of the Makah Tribal Council) introduces her as a Native ethnographer. He states that the book offers an “inside perspective on modern aboriginal self-determination” and is a “proud affirmation of family history” – it “sheds light on our sacred traditions and helps safeguard their endurance” (ix–x).

In the first sentence of her acknowledgment pages Coté identifies herself as a member of the Tseshah community, a subgroup of the Nuu-chah-nulth Nation, which is located in Canada, on Vancouver Island. Coté also has

family ties to nearby Makah communities, in the United States of America. She presents herself as someone pursuing “scholastic dreams” (p. xi) with the support of her family, her community, and her ancestors. The book is based on research done while at the University of California, Berkeley. Coté currently teaches at the University of Washington.

In the introduction chapter, “Honoring Our Whaling Ancestors,” the author begins by telling in a personal narrative style about the emotional excitement she experienced when her sister called her in 1999 with news that Makah community members had successfully hunted a grey whale. Coté introduces conflicts between aboriginal whaling supporters and environmentalist, and presents some background on cultural traditions associated with whale hunting. She notes that her book is aimed at explaining “how reviving our whaling tradition has cultural, social, and spiritual significance and will reaffirm our identities ... [and strengthen] our communities by reinforcing a sense of cultural pride” (6). Her claimed focus is more on cultural continuity than on cultural disruption.

Coté builds on “written and archival material and archaeological data, balancing these with Native oral stories and narratives” (10). In discussing efforts to “de-colonize” research, she cites several Native scholars. Her mention of Alex Thomas, who gathered cultural information in Coté’s own communities from 1910 to 1923 is especially interesting.

Chapter 1, “The Centrality of Whaling to Makah and Nuu-chah-nulth Life,” explains the economic, social/political, and religious importance of pre-contact whaling traditions. Versions of a traditional story concerning Thunderbird, Whale, and Lightning Serpent are provided as an introduction to her depictions of precontact social patterns and spiritual practices. A detailed discussion of a whaling chief’s *pa-chitile* (to give), or potlatch is included in this chapter as well.

Chapter 2, “Worldviews Collide. The Arrival of *Mamahn’i* in Indian Territory,” depicts colonial contact pressures on traditional practices and beliefs, with special attention to the demise of whaling activities. Coté sees missionary work and other “education” efforts as tied to the same assimilationist agenda that supported restrictions on cultural practices, new political structures, and outside control of economic activity.

Chapter 3, “Maintaining the Cultural Link to Whaling Ancestors,” shows that even when whaling practices ended, a social memory of whaling traditions lingered within naming systems, songs, stories, ceremonies, and artwork. Coté presents her own genealogy here as well, traced back to her great-great-grandfather Sayach’apis, who was noted in early ethnographic accounts.

Chapter 4, “The Makah Harvest a Whale,” explores how events during the 1960s and 1970s played a role in a renewal of self-determination and cultural revitalization efforts in subsequent decades, and how environmentalist and animal rights efforts figured into this. Coté notes legal challenges launched by Native groups starting in the late 1800s, and explains her community’s growing awareness of environmental protection issues with reference to