

Almost brutal honesty is a hallmark of the book as a whole. Pierre R. Dasen, for example, flatly states that his need to pursue psychologically defined questions resulted in more than one problem for his collaborating anthropologist. He ends by stating: “So, Jürg, sorry for the disturbance! [A]nd thanks for accepting me at your side despite of this. I think the disturbance has been worthwhile ...” (269). It seems undeniably true that disrupting the “business as usual” model of field research will result in problems for many anthropologists. But then anthropologists are hardly strangers to risk. As Shahnaz R. Nadjmabadi reminds us about the lessons she learned while working in dangerous border areas of Iran, “[t]heory should not take precedence at all. I should better concentrate on how people related security questions to their lives, identities, communities and care about theory later” (194). If I can draw a parallel, rather than theorizing about how combining insights from different disciplines might lead to greater insight these essays tell us, in all their muddy glory, exactly what went right and what went wrong while pursuing this kind of work.

I was particularly intrigued to find a priest and missionary, Patrick F. Gesch, given a place alongside of anthropologists and other field researchers. As someone who has conducted field research in Papua New Guinea, I always found the attitude of some fellow anthropologists toward long-term missionaries curiously hostile. When I entered the field in 1986 as a young anthropologist pursuing his PhD, I too was filled with our discipline’s general disdain toward missionaries. Encountering numerous Protestant and Catholic missionaries in the field changed my mind. Most of my religious colleagues committed a minimum of five years to the field, carefully learned local languages and lived either near or within the villages of the people with whom they were involved. If I disagreed with them about the need to “missionize” Papua New Guineans, I could not help but admire their long-term commitment to “the field.” To disregard the many insights that missionaries have gleaned from those they have worked with seemed then and still seems to me today to be remarkably shortsighted. Gesch is very forthcoming about the difficulty of being both a missionary and a researcher. But, as Gesch tells the reader, “What is it that I want to do with fieldwork? It is my wish to meet people, to understand what they are talking about, and why they are doing certain rituals which take up enormous efforts from small communities” (53). This sounds a lot like good ethnography to me. We can, I think, recognize differences of intent and technique (whether it is with a priest or a psychologist) without the necessity of condemning the differences in the name of intellectual or disciplinary purity. Or at least, I hope that we can.

As someone who has written about ethnographic field methods, I was intrigued to see how many of the authors were willing to comment on their struggles with specific research techniques. This is not a methods book, but students and practitioners interested in consid-

ering the pros and cons of various methods for the field could do far worse than give this volume a thorough reading. Antje Denner, for example, tells us about how local people can “take over” research methods and define them for their own ends, as when Anir Islanders turned interview situations into a kind of “focus-group” conversation (71). Numerous contributors participated in a variety of “multi-sited” fieldwork, which is a common trend in contemporary ethnographic research. As Stephanie Walda-Mandel notes, it is often required that we follow our migrating collaborators if we are going to have a chance at understanding their complex lives (89). The importance of archival and historical research, both in and of itself and in relation to on-the-ground ethnographic research, is explored by several authors (e. g., von Poser, Mückler). Even our own written notes can become part of the ethnography. Angella Meinerzag, for example, remarks that as the people she worked with became more familiar, her own diary notes became stranger, turning her effectively into one of her own “foreign confidant[s]” (173). I cannot do justice to the wealth of methodological insights that can be gleaned from this volume here. Suffice to say that as someone who has conducted ethnographic field work (including archival and literary research) over a period of more than three decades I not only learned new things but found some of my oldest insights challenged. This alone seems to me to make the book fully worthwhile.

There are other important themes that I do not have time to properly consider. A few of these include: the politics of research (including the history of specific research endeavors), the importance of transferring knowledge in an accessible manner, the emotional difficulties of long-term research, and the necessity of very long-term research. Each time I thought that I had more or less categorized the main themes of this volume, I came up against a new grain of thought or a different way of considering what it is we do when we do fieldwork. Clearly written, these essays should prove themselves useful to undergraduates and professionals alike (across many fields or disciplines). Almost anyone with an interest in “doing fieldwork” would benefit from devoting some of their precious reading time to this remarkable volume of essays.

Wayne Fife (wfife@mun.ca)

Powell, Dana E.: Landscapes of Power. Politics of Energy in the Navajo Nation. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018. 309 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-6994-3. Price: \$ 26.95

As I was reading Dana E. Powell’s “Landscapes of Power. Politics of Energy in the Navajo Nation,” I heard on the radio that the Navajo Nation Council had voted to shutter the Navajo Generating Station, a 2.25-gigawatt coal-fired power plant, one of the largest in the United States and the country’s third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide, a significant greenhouse gas. Environmental activists lauded the closure of this polluter and

symbol of settler colonialism. Since it opened in 1974, the plant has delivered electricity and water primarily to the residents of Phoenix, Los Angeles, and Las Vegas, while nearly 40 percent of the Diné (aka Navajos) remain without electricity or running water. And yet, the coal-fired station was also one of the reservation's largest employers, paying high wages and generating significant revenue for the tribal government. So when the Phoenix-based owners decided to decommission the plant, the tribally-owned Navajo Transitional Energy Company considered purchasing and operating the facility and reopening its associated coal mine to protect nearly 600 jobs. Instead, goaded by a determined community of Diné activists, the newly elected Navajo Nation President pledged to transition away from economic dependence on fossil fuels.

Activists set the stage for this turn of events in 2008–2009 with the successful campaign to stop the construction of the proposed coal-fired Desert Rock Energy Project, which Powell – an activist herself – details in this thoughtful and insightful ethnography. Desert Rock would have been built in Burnham, New Mexico, near the eastern edge of the Navajo Nation. A joint venture of the Navajo Nation and Sithe Global Power, a multi-national energy development corporation, it would have been the first energy project owned in part by the Navajo Nation government itself. Tribal leaders characterized the project as an emblem of self-determination through its power to create jobs, generate tens of millions of dollars in tribal revenue, and challenge the authority of the state government of New Mexico, which opposed the plant. By contrast, Desert Rock's opponents viewed the plant as antithetical to sovereignty and sustainability, in light of the partnership with multinational developers and investors, the anticipated adverse health effects of mercury and carbon emissions, and the increasingly apparent effects of climate change. At the root of the debate, then, were different conceptions of tribal sovereignty.

“Landscapes of Power” argues that the struggle over Desert Rock sparked a debate over the morality of continued reliance on extractive energy, united “long-standing critiques of colonialism with emerging concerns over sustainability” (6), and produced “new visions of development, fresh interpretations of sovereignty, alternative values surrounding expertise, and novel objects of cultural production” (5). Over the course of five chapters, she offers a history of energy extraction (including oil, coal, and uranium) and its political milieu; describes the rise of energy activism and an emerging environmental justice movement; and analyzes the debates over sovereignty and self-determination, the hearings held to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and visual artifacts employed by anti-Desert Rock protestors. Short interludes chronicle Powell’s experiences as an ethnographer, efforts at decentralized solar power in the Navajo community of Klagetoh, and the challenges and commitments of a family living off the grid in the Chuska Mountains.

Powell situates her ethnographic study of Diné energy activism within its broader historical context. Since 1923, when the Bureau of Indian Affairs created the Navajo Tribal Council to approve oil leases on the reservation, energy and politics have gone hand-in-hand. By the late 20th century, coal had become the foundation of the Navajo economy, but just as important was the development of an enduring resistance movement in the 1970s in opposition to proposed coal gasification projects and uranium mining.

“Landscapes of Power” focuses on that opposition as it emerged against Desert Rock and endeavored to shift the terms of the debate away from the false dichotomy of jobs vs. environment, toward a consideration of the impacts of the project on the surrounding community and the opponents’ “moral visions of how the world ought to be” (183). She shows that, contrary to the claim that outside agitators were manipulating protestors, indigenous groups – Diné CARE (Citizens Against Ruining Our Environment) and Doodá (No) Desert Rock – led this environmental justice campaign, and she highlights the leadership of Diné women.

Powell’s most important contributions are her discussions of the public hearings and various artistic and performative protests. Opposition to the proposed plant was widespread. Of the 325 people who spoke at hearings held throughout the region, only 38 supported Desert Rock. The record of these hearings was never published, so Powell gives voice to the Diné by presenting the arguments made by both sides as they reflected on the future of the Navajo Nation and invoked not only scientific knowledge but also indigenous knowledge based on land tenure, ceremonial teachings, and historical experience. The chapter on visual artifacts would have benefited from color images, and she might have elaborated a bit more on the political context of Jack Ahasteen’s cartoons for the *Navajo Times* to clarify his oblique commentary on Desert Rock. Nonetheless, her explication of protest art is particularly lucid and compelling.

“Landscapes of Power” is an important book. It is marred somewhat by small errors of fact and the conflation of corporate greenwashing with mainstream environmentalism. But these are minor flaws that do not detract from the book’s overall quality and significance. Its accessible prose makes it a good choice for the classroom. “Landscapes of Power” will spark interesting discussions among undergraduates and graduate students in anthropology, Native American and ethnic studies, and the history of environmental justice movements. For scholars of the modern Navajo Nation it is essential reading.

Marsha Weisiger (weisiger@uoregon.edu)