

particular relationship to humans but possessed by woman and passing after her death to the daughter (58–61).

Chapter 3 asks how two different things can have the same value for the Keqchi of Chicacnab. From a purely cultural anthropological viewpoint concerning the Maya in general this is the most important part, as it reveals how substitutions of one entity for another entity are a culturally constructed process. Here is where local ontologies are described by referring to the concept of replacement well-known among the contemporaneous Maya and termed *eeqaj* among the Keqchi (90). Kockelman outlines examples for house, office, marriage couple, revenge, dog, adultery, labor, money, and personal names (93–99). In particular, he extends his analysis on the complex of relations between work, men, woman, and money (104–111, 115–122). By this he addresses the different types of replacement and reaffirms the replacement as a local institution and ontology that renders equivalency in regard to their use value as expresses non-equivalency, in particular between men and woman too (116). Most importantly for understanding some ancient Maya concept, the Keqchi of Chicacnab do not consider that something can be a half of something, like “half men,” “half goals,” or “half years” with the exception of loans (118). Thus, for example, in the Maya hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Classic Period we find the expression of *tahn lam* (center diminishing) for something that conceptually refers to a “half *k'atun*” or period of 7,200 days (cf. D. Stuart, Ritual and History in the Stucco Inscription from Temple XIX at Palenque. *PARI Journal* 1.2000: 2; D. Grana-Behrens, La Cuenta de los *K'atuno'ob*. Rituales y regionalismos en el período Clásico Maya. *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 49.2017). Furthermore, Kockelman shows how “changing historical circumstances transform normative standards,” although he does not outline if the Quetzal bird can be or not a replacement for chicken. Instead, he refers to the word *ch'iich'* (something metal) that can be added to *so'sol* (vulture) to render *so'sol ch'iich'* for “airplane.” By this kind of analogy he determines a “kind of commensuration” (103).

Chapter 4 centers on the long-term transformation that the NGO project brought to the small community of Chicacnab and what happened to the local values. Here Kockelman raises the theory that the project PEQ perfectly matched the local system of replacement outlined in chap. 3 in order to achieve new kinds of value. He outlines some conflicts emerging out of the kind of value the NGO's project has established. Especially threatened was the system of (labor and communal) rotation. The PEQ volunteers opted for not to intervene and not to do anything about this (131). Another consequence was that many tourist-taking villagers “hired chainsaw-owning men to cut them wood,” a material required to build new housing locations for the tourists. But less the act of cutting wood was novel than to pay for the man from the money the tourists left to those who are housing them (147). Besides these adversaries, Kockelman considers that “the ecotourism project was too successful. Rather than removing the local system of replacement, it inadvertently resonated with it” (150).

His final chapter concludes with the modes of transformation or frames of equivalence and acts to show the variety of senses of value, ontology, and portability. From a reader's perspective, Kockelman, however, leaves open if and how the chicken and the Quetzal are related in terms of the PEQ project. Instead he speaks of “incommensurate ontologies and portable values” in the subtitle. He also leaves open if the project is ongoing or when it stopped (presumably the first thing).

Daniel Grana-Behrens

Lancy, David F.: The Anthropology of Childhood. Cherubs, Chattel, Changelings. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 533 pp. ISBN 978-1-107-42098-4. Price: £ 25.99

David Lancy is a man on a mission – to prove that Lawrence Hirschfeld's article “Why Don't Anthropologists Like Children?” (*American Anthropologist* 104.2002: 611–627) is not an accurate portrait of the state of the art in the field. Lancy, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology at Utah State University, is no stranger to cross-cultural studies or the anthropology of children, both of which he has written about in his past work, and so well-suited to the task. His overview of existing scholarship on this sub-discipline in anthropology, and its development over the past fifteen years comes across as candid and engaging. The reader emerges convinced that in fact there are quite a few anthropologists out there who not only happen to like children, but are busy breaking new ground in this rapidly evolving field. The success of his argument is in no small part due to the fact, that the book is so well-written and accessible. Lancy does not asphyxiate the reader with his erudition. At times, you almost sense a creative director manqué performing an extreme makeover. His message is simple to both anthropologists and those from other fields. There are lots of raw material and new takes on children, it just has not yet been packaged properly. And, Lancy sets out to do exactly that. The result is a work that will appeal to both specialists and also parents, policy makers and other audiences interested in a view on childhood that gazes beyond the lens of “Western” constructions of childhood. All of this and more makes the second edition of “The Anthropology of Childhood. Cherubs, Chattel, Changelings” a must-read for anyone interested in the study of childhood.

Lancy avoids the academic tendency to slightly over-cook headings, bringing the reader into the subject matter with incisive socratic challenges. His query/headings “Is there such a thing as childhood?” or “What's so special about human childhood?” are doors of perception pointing the reader towards extant scholarship on the topic. Lancy also provides some historic backdrop, tracing the roots of the anthropology of childhood, and reminding us of the seminal role played by Margaret Mead in the establishment of the anthropology of children. Lancy examines contemporary issues such as the commodification of childhood and children, but observes that this in no way precludes children also being shapers of society. Through the analysis of ethnography beyond the “Western” con-

text, he takes on biology and culture. He paints the contrasting philosophies of middle-class Euro-American society, where the reproductive cycle is taken for granted, highly institutionalized and professionalized. He turns his gaze inward as well, investigating the troubling issue of the Western social surrender of both the reproductive process and our children to government intervention. Chapter 7, titled “The Chore Curriculum,” highlights the role of children as active players in the struggle for family survival. “Living in Limbo” at chapter 8 offers the reader strong insights into the paradox of children who, although biologically ready for adulthood, are placed in a social holding pattern. Chapter 9, “Taming the Autonomous Learner” looks at the role of schooling as a system to transform children into law-abiding taxpayers. Lancy calls the “problem facing children in the neontocracy revolve around the blanket of overprotection that anxious parents throw over them.” The book is critical of “Euro-American” middle-class upbringing in which most parents are portrayed as leading “lives of quiet desperation,” always laboring and concerned whether their children will turn out to become productive members of society, capable of providing for themselves.

If there is a weak point, it lies in the dearth of information or observations on the influence of media on children. Lancy’s thematics cover a panoramic overview on cultural models of infancy; the nature of child circulation; the role of infants in attaching to alloparents; the role of teaching versus social learning in the process of cultural transmission; the role of conflict in children’s play; apprenticeship in craft acquisition and the culture of street children. That is no small feat, but the inclusion of an examination of the crucial impacts of media and mediation upon those thematics would make this work more comprehensive.

That said, the book deserves a wide readership. The ethnographic material with its broad range of perspectives on childhood is refreshing and inspiring. Lancy explores the agency of children in raising themselves, finding their own paths and their influence on their peers, parents, and wider society. It cannot be ignored, when thinking about children’s positions and positioning, that their lives and productive roles are embedded in the global structure of inequality and exploitation. In the end, Lancy has struck a fine balance between acknowledging these structural constraints and introducing the work of anthropologists who are providing new insights into the active role of children in society.

Sandra J. T. M. Evers

LaPier, Rosalyn R., and David R. M. Beck: City Indian. Native American Activism in Chicago, 1893–1934. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015. 268 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-4839-7. Price: £ 27.99

Rosalyn LaPier and David R. M. Beck, both professors at the University of Montana, add to a growing literature on urban Indians’ experiences with their fine monograph “City Indian.” Previous books have focused mostly on the emergence of pan-tribal Indian communities in post-WWII American cities, in particular Chicago and Los Angeles. This project offers a valuable coverage of early mi-

grations among Indian peoples from shrinking reservation spaces starting in the late 19th century to growing urban spaces in the early to mid-20th century, in specific American Indians’ experiences in Chicago between the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition and the Century of Progress World’s Fair of 1933–1934, both of which are described in detail. LaPier and Beck chose Chicago as their case study because of their decades-long research identifying new primary sources produced by American Indians and their belief that despite numbering only several hundred the Chicago American Indian population’s experiences between these two world fairs “epitomized urban Indian development nationwide” (xi) even as it forged its own distinct cultural identity due to Chicago’s cross-roads geography. The book is organized into 8 chapters, followed by a useful 27-page Appendix comprising three tables: Table 1: Chicago population and American Indian population in Chicago, 1830–2010; Table 2: Chicago Indians in the 1920 Census; and Table 3: Chicago Indians in the 1930 Census. It also contains a range of interesting photographs of Chicago’s Indian leaders.

After an introductory chapter (chap. 1) detailing the broader history of Indians in Chicago, and the dispossession of their treaty lands, LaPier and Beck trace American Indian migrations to and through Chicago, focusing on the ways in which, via athletics, encampments and other demonstrations of Indian culture and civic participation, Indians came to know Chicago as a new home and how Chicagoans came to know more about Indians. One of the principal tensions in the story is how some Indian gatherings, including “American Indian Day” celebrations, perpetuated a “traditional” Indian identity, sometimes furthered by Indians themselves that made it difficult for the “new Indian” of the Progressive era to champion Indian rights. As LaPier and Beck write, “[t]he balance between attracting an audience, presenting positive images of Indians, reinterpreting the past, and presenting themselves as modern was indeed a difficult one to achieve and maintain” (128). For the most part, they argue, Indian leaders such as the well-known Carlos Montezuma (Yavapai), who centered his reform activities in Chicago, and the less-known Scott Henry Peters (Chippewa), failed in “changing popular perceptions,” and thus “unfortunately little changed in the long run” (160).

But Indian leaders did succeed in creating new pan-tribal organizations to change those popular perceptions and contributed to a national effort to secure citizenship rights for Indians; Montezuma in particular campaigned for U.S. citizenship for American Indians, which Congress codified in 1924. LaPier and Beck chronicle the rise of such organizations, examining both the conflicts that arose within them, especially between Indian and non-Indian activists, and their efforts to achieve that balance of the usable past of Indian culture and the new modern present of civic life by trying to “take control of the narratives that defined them” (18). The authors provide a coverage of the Indian Fellowship League (chap. 5) and the Grand Council Fire of American Indians (chap. 6), or Indian Council Fire, which arose the same year that the Indian Fellowship League disbanded; the Grand Coun-