

included collaboration on some level, but the collaborative ethnography to which I refer promises to extend that collaboration more systematically throughout both fieldwork and the writing process” (x). Collaboration between anthropologists and informants has long been a product of the close relationship. Increasingly, the collaboration act is no longer viewed as merely a consequence of fieldwork – collaboration now preconditions and shapes research design.

This book is about the history, theory, and practice of collaborative ethnography. Lassiter presents a historical, theoretical, and practice-oriented road map for shift from incidental collaboration to a more conscious and explicit collaborative strategy, from authoritative (modern) monologue to polyphonic (postmodern) form, and from “reading over the shoulders of natives” to “reading alongside natives.” In part I Lassiter writes about the history of collaborative ethnography in his own training and development as an anthropologist. He centers the discussion on the U.S. project in ethnography, but he does not exclude other regional developments. Lassiter locates the roots of ethnographic collaboration in the work of anthropological classics like Malinowski and Franz Boas. In this context, he writes about some American researchers: Lewis Henry Morgan (“League of the Ho-dé-no-sau-nee” from 1851 as a first “true ethnography” of American Indians), Alice Fletcher (credited James R. Murie, an educated Pawnee as an assistant to the author “The Hako: A Pawnee Ceremony.” 1904), Paul Radin (“Crashing Thunder,” the biography of a Winnebago Indian. 1926), and more.

In part II he outlines the steps for achieving this more deliberate and explicit collaborative ethnography. Lassiter discusses collaborative research projects involving over seventy-five faculties, students from Ball State University, and members of the African American community of Muncie (Indiana). He writes about ethical dilemmas – “ethics in anthropology is like race in America: dialogue takes place during times of crisis” (84) –, experience and intersubjectivity; he asks about who has the right to represent whom and for what purpose, and about whose discourse will be privileged in the ethnographic text. He suggests that without clear ethnographic texts an open dialogue about interpretation and representation is seriously hindered, and collaborative ethnography cannot be produced.

Lassiter argues that the interrelationship of ethical and moral responsibility, ethnographic honesty, accessible writing, collaborative writing and editing creates the basis for truly collaborative ethnography. “I believe the collaborative model has enormous potential, and though it may indeed be emerging as mainstream, truly collaborative ethnography – where researchers and interlocutors collaborate on the actual production of ethnographic texts – may be appropriate for neither all researchers nor all types of ethnographic projects” (xi).

Lassiter is right when he calls for a more collaborative research in ethnographic fieldwork: in the late 1960s a collaborative (or may be reflexive?) model of research in cultural anthropology emerged as a central concern.

This came partly out of a postcolonial awareness of the neglect by earlier anthropologists of the effects of colonialism both on the people they had studied, and on the process of research itself, and an ethical concern with the possible role that anthropologists may have played in colonial oppression. What a pity that we don’t find in “The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography” many names of European anthropologists and their assistants/informants/collaborators, e.g., Maurice Leenhardt and his fifteen transcribers, Marcel Griaule and Ogotemméli, Victor Turner and Muchona, Johannes Fabian and Tshibumba.

It’s a very important and timely, comprehensive and accessible book, not only for American ethnographers.

Waldemar Kuligowski

Özyürek, Esra: *Nostalgia for the Modern. State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2006. 227 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-3895-6. Price: \$ 21.95

Esra Özyürek’s “Nostalgia for the Modern. State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey” is an important new contribution to political anthropology, memory studies, and the anthropology of Europe. The focus of the book is the Turkish modernization project embodied in the figure of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic. Özyürek argues that recent challenges to the secularist ideology of the Turkish state by Islamists and the implementation of neoliberal economic policies resulted in the privatization and commoditization of Kemalism as secularists organized to defend values nostalgically associated with the early Republic of the 1920s and 1930s.

Chapter 1 centers on oral history interviews Özyürek conducted with “the children of the Republic,” individuals raised in the 1920s who performed important roles in the public sphere in fields such as education. According to Özyürek, particularly in the nostalgic atmosphere of the 75th-year celebrations of the founding of the Republic, these individuals came to embody the state, and their life-story narratives focused on their contributions to Turkish society as part of the modernizing elite. In chapter 2, Özyürek analyzes several exhibits commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Republic in 1998. Named “Three Generations of the Republic” and “To Create a Citizen,” these exhibits were organized by private organizations with financial support from the state. Özyürek argues that public intellectuals used these exhibits to demonstrate that Kemalist values are internalized and privatized by Turkish society. In chapter 3, Özyürek links the privatization of politics to neoliberalism by showing how symbols of Atatürk such as statues and photographs are commoditized and personalized. In chapter 4, she discusses the privatization of Republican day celebrations through the organization of parades and events by civil groups. In chapter 5, analyzing the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Republic in the media, Özyürek argues that Islamists challenge the legitimacy of their secularist competitors in the

political arena by reinterpreting the early Republican years with a view to underlining the use of religious symbolism.

“Nostalgia for the Modern” is an important contribution to the historical and comparative analysis of modernization projects. The Turkish case is of particular interest as it entails a state-driven secularization policy in an Islamic society the results of which still mark contemporary politics. Özyürek also shows how the culture of Kemalism has changed in recent decades due to democratization, the threat of alternative ideologies, and neoliberalism. She argues that it is the memory of the early Republic, consumed in the form of nostalgia, that plays an important role in shaping the culture of Kemalism in the present. According to Özyürek, there is a convergence between the privatization of politics and neoliberalism resulting in the commoditization and personalization of the cult of Atatürk, which contrasts with the distancing, official culture of Kemalism of the past. Özyürek also shows how the entry of Islamist parties into politics has resulted in a competition between secularists and Islamists in their respective claims to the legacy of the Turkish revolution.

“Nostalgia for the Modern” raises a number of important questions which are not, however, necessarily answered in this book. These questions include the extent and meaning of the internalization of Kemalist culture by individuals and groups in Turkish society constituting a new civil movement, what the social basis of Kemalism consists of, and what contemporary Kemalist culture actually entails. The major shortcoming of the book is the general level of discussion and the lack of ethnographic detail at the micro level which would enhance our understanding of the effects of the Turkish modernization project at the subjective and communal level. Despite the use of participant observation and oral history, and her professed interest in the private and emotive spheres, Özyürek does not bring us any closer to an understanding of Kemalist subjectivity. The elderly Kemalist women she describes come across as no more than types, and she chooses to go no further in her analysis than the public performances of her interlocutors. There is little discussion of the younger generation of Kemalists at the individual level beyond superficial anecdotes. Özyürek suggests that public intellectuals respond to critiques of Kemalism as a top-down project enforced upon Turkish society by narrating and exhibiting the history of the modernization project as embraced by society. But her anecdotes involving ordinary individuals go no further than implying that it is the original, elitist understanding of Kemalism as a means of transforming an underdeveloped society from above that latter-day Kemalists share. An important issue here is the extent to which contemporary Kemalism may be viewed as a civic movement as distinct from the early Republican period, or whether it is more useful to speak of continuity in terms of an anti-democratic and elitist approach to society. Discussing in greater detail the social basis of Kemalism in the present would help clarify this issue.

A related problem is the fact that the term Kemalism is used to refer variously to the state, a political party, a civic movement, or a social stratum. In addition, given the multiethnic, multireligious, and multilingual heritage of the Ottoman Empire, the discussion of secularism and Islamism without reference to ethnicity and nationalism oversimplifies the representation of Turkish politics and society. Similarly, the reference to Kurdish nationalism as a threat to Kemalism of the same order as Islamism is misleading, as Kemalism and Islamism share a commitment to Turkish nationalism as against Kurdish (and other) nationalisms. In setting the stage for her discussion of the culture of Kemalism, it would have been useful for Özyürek to refer to the ethnic-religious heritage of Turkish society and the important contemporary issue of Turkish (and alternative) nationalisms. While focusing on the early decades of the Republic and the post-1980 period, the book makes practically no reference to the 1950–1980 period, which was of great importance to the democratization of Turkish society, the opening up of the public sphere, and the strengthening of alternate ideologies including Islamism. Another issue concerns the convergence between Kemalism and neoliberalism: it is the case that many contemporary Kemalists oppose neoliberalization policies, some even expressing opposition to Turkey’s close relationship with the European Union.

“Nostalgia for the Modern” is a well-organized, well-argued, and well-written study which will be of great use to readers interested in the comparative study of modernisms, political anthropology, memory studies, and the anthropology of Europe, and is particularly suited for undergraduate teaching. Leyla Neyzi

Quinn, Frederick: *In Search of Salt. Changes in Beti (Cameroon) Society, 1880–1960.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2006. 175 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-006-9. Price: \$ 70.00

Dommage que ce petit livre “à la recherche du sel”, pratique et bien présenté, d’un ancien attaché culturel de l’ambassade U.S. à Yaoundé, n’ait pas paru voici 20 ans ; il forme en effet un excellent compendium à partir de bonnes enquêtes menées sur place voici 40 ans, et des archives du Cameroun. Son défaut majeur est de ne guère tenir compte des livres et travaux publiés depuis 1984, même si certains de ces ouvrages sont mentionnés dans la bibliographie. Le rédacteur de ces lignes a commencé ses recherches en même temps que son ami Quinn, mais il les a continuées depuis . . .

Le titre laisse songeur : les Beti fabriquaient leur propre sel (chlorure de potassium) à partir de plantes. Dans leurs migrations continues, même si l’attrait du ‘sel des blancs’ (ClNa) jouait un rôle, celui des étoffes et des armes à feu paraît plus décisif, ainsi que la nécessité pour eux de quitter périodiquement leur environnement surexploité : ils “mangeaient la forêt”.

L’introduction présente les vieux témoins classiques en 1966–69, qu’on revoit avec plaisir dans un bref cahier photographique. L’auteur retrace avec humour et