einer Vielzahl von Facetten und Sichtweisen zu dokumentieren. Die Neuauflage hat es nicht nötig, den ursprünglichen Text zu aktualisieren und durch die Einbindung von jüngeren Begriffen wie etwa den der ". . . scapes" anstelle von "worlds" gleichsam zu modernisieren. Finnegans Sicht und Vorgehensweise ist urbane Ethnographie pur und auch zwanzig Jahre nach dem Erscheinen der ersten Ausgabe ohne den oft überbordenden Sprachduktus der Postmoderne aktuell und befruchtend, auch für jene, deren Forschungsschwerpunkt weder auf Musik noch auf Europa liegt.

Michael Schlottner

Gingrich, Andre, and **Marcus Banks** (eds.): Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond. Perspectives from Social Anthropology. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006. 303 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-189-9. Price: $ 25.00

This book, edited by Andre Gingrich and Marcus Banks, promises to shed light on neo-nationalism as a social and political phenomenon from an anthropological perspective. The contributors provide us with twelve case studies of the emergence of neo-nationalism in social and political life; ten from Europe, one from Australia, and one from India. The case studies are preceded by an introduction and two conceptual and methodological chapters, both from an European perspective, and followed by an "afterthoughts" chapter.

In the first substantive chapter, Gingrich sketches the main characteristics of both the neo-nationalist parties and the countries they appear in. He comes to a sort of categorisation based on regional, historical, and political factors; without, however, presenting an exhaustive list. In the next chapter, Banks tries to make the distinctive methodological approach of the book explicit through case studies of the BNP and the NF in Britain, paying special attention to the broader context of "neo-nationalist" parties and to the case study as an instrument.

Part II, case studies from Western Europe, starts with M. Gullestad's analysis of the social and political environment of the Progress Party in Norway, without going too far back in history. P. Hervik pays more attention to these historical factors that played a role in the emerging of the Danish People's Party in particular, and Danish neo-nationalism as a societal phenomenon in general. T. Sunier and R. van Ginkel mainly do the same thing for the List Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands, offering a good overview of the most important factors, although not categorising them according to the classical supply-demand system used in all-important works in political science. R. Pinxten compares neo-nationalism in Belgium's two regions, Flanders and Wallonia, while J. Stacul does the same for Italy, but goes much more into detail by reporting from his fieldwork in a specific northern community. T. Fillitz provides a more quantitative analysis of certain referenda in Austria to explain the popularity of the Freedom Party. He is also the first to put some weight on the role of party rhetoric. The part on European case studies is finished with a chapter in which G. Gaillard-Starzmann extensively digs into French history to contextualise the FN's electoral success, while he at the same time sheds light on the other parties in France. Trying to wrap up, but still relying heavily on a case study of Austria, G. Seiser makes a sharp analysis of the farmers' situation in the EU and their role in the success of the Freedom Party. The same goes for M. McDonald, who sketches the relation between the EU and the emergence of radical right parties, drawing upon fieldwork in both European institutions and the French FN. After all this, it is relieving to have a comparative chapter by M. Banerjee, who draws lines between her Indian case and the previously described European cases. Although focusing more on its specific historical context, B. Kapferer and B. Morris attempt to do the same for the Australian case of Hanson.

The book offers a comprehensive overview of the countries in which nationalism has (re)emerged, although there are some general remarks to be made. First, neo-nationalism as such is not precisely defined. The conceptualization is confusing and some authors refer to the phenomenon as neo-nationalism, others as right-wing populism, and again others as extreme right, neo-populist, or far right. The reader is confused about whether he is reading about a societal evolution or its incarnation in certain parties. He is also not sufficiently informed about the characteristics of these parties; which should be included or excluded? Which are populist rather than "neo-nationalist"? This is also the first reason why it is a shame that this work makes no clear references to works within sociology or political science, disciplines that have studied the phenomenon for quite a long time and that do offer a clear framework.

Second, the "distinctive anthropological perspective," which the editors claim to have taken in the book, does not become very clear in each contribution. The book title suggests the authors have based their analyses on ethnographic fieldwork, such as interviews with party members or participative observations amongst the rank-and-file. Although authors like Stacul, McDonald, and Banerjee explicitly refer to their own fieldwork, most authors only suggest they are drawing upon ethnographic research. Consequently, we had expected much more detailed analysis at the microlevels and mesolevels; for example, looking at community levels, certain groupings, or important party leaders. Although describing the social, political, and historical context of a societal attitude or the emergence of a radical right party is useful and vital for its understanding, this work does not add that much to existing literature. There are several classical works, mostly in political science, that offer elaborate descriptions of the context at the macrolevel. This is another reason why it is regretful that there are no references to or uses of these works.

To conclude, the book has its value as a rich description of several cases of "neo-nationalism" in Western Europe. Its merit lies in drawing the lines to EU issues on the one hand, and to other countries like India and Australia on the other. As the theme re-

lates closely to disciplines like sociology and political science, it is regretful that so few references have been made to sociological and political scientific work. That said, this is an innovative work within the discipline of social anthropology, which offers no works with such an overview. Lien Warmenbol

Gravers, Mikael (ed.): Exploring Ethnic Diversity in Burma. Copenhagen: NIAS Press, 2007. 283 pp. ISBN 978-87-91114-96-0. (NIAS Studies in Asian Topics, 39) Price: £ 16.99

Burma or Myanmar, as the country is officially called, is a multiethnic state. Though no trustworthy census has been taken since 1931, one may estimate that roughly two thirds of the country's 55 million inhabitants are ethnic Burmans (Bamar) who mostly settle in the valleys of the Irrawaddy and Sittang Rivers in the heartland of Burma. The outer regions bordering India, China, and Thailand, comprise two thirds of the country's territory and are inhabited by a wide range of ethnic minorities. The media focus on the confrontation between the military (*Tatmadaw*) regime and the democracy movement led by Aung San Suu Kyi – both are dominated by the Bamar – distracts our attention from the "ethnic" dimension of the political conflict in Burma. "Exploring Ethnic Diversity in Burma" is thus a most welcome contribution not only to our understanding of the current situation in this important Southeast Asian country, it also enriches theoretical discourses on ethnicity and nationhood. The volume contains seven papers which were presented in September 2002 at the International Burma Studies Conference in Gothenburg, Sweden. The fourth paper, written by the distinguished linguist and anthropologist Frederic K. Lehman (Chit Hlaing), was originally conceived as a critical commentary of the other conference papers but later expanded to a stimulating, brilliant article on "Ethnicity Theory and Southeast Asia, with Special Reference to the Kayah and the Kachin."

The editor, Mikael Gravers, is a Danish social anthropologist who has written extensively on the Karen and on nationalism and ethnicity in Burma. In his book "Nationalism as Political Paranoia in Burma" (Richmond 1999), Gravers discussed the historical processes which made the ethnic divisions in Burma escalate into political violence haunting Burma for almost five decades. Gravers's introductory article reflects on the contradiction between state power and ethnicity in Burma. While the present-day Burmese army is dominated by Burmans, the colonial army contained whole regiments of Karen, Kachin, Chin, and members of other minority groups. The British deliberately "constructed" the ethnicity of various linguistically and culturally heterogenous groups, such as the Karen, in an effort to counterbalance Burmese nationalism. The military government tries the other way. The official list of 135 "races," i.e., ethnic groups, in today's Burma tends to downgrade the importance of the large minority groups such as the Shan and Karen by splitting them in many smaller ethnic groups. Thus, ethnic classsification is highly politicised as Gravers observes: "The discourse of ethnicity connects the individual, the group, and the state in an existential struggle of representations. It is, however, very important to emphasize that ethnicity in itself does not generate violence" (6).

Gravers explores in detail the politics of ethnicity in precolonial Burma where ethnicity did not play a very prominent position in society. Non-Burman *mìn laùng* (pretenders to the throne) usually concealed their ethnicity (Mon, Karen, Shan, etc.) in an attempt not to alienate potential supporters from the Burman majority population. But there were instances when ethnicity counted. For example, in 1757, when the future Burman king Alaunghpaya launched a campaign to conquer the Mon-dominated Pegu kingdom in the south, "he appealed to the local Burmans to side with him against the Mon and the Karen (but not the Shan)" (10). In colonial Burma, however, ethnic classification became more rigid. The British based their concept of ethnicity on natural and primordial differences. This legacy still influences perceptions of ethnic diversity in modern Burma. Gravers discusses in detail the prospects of a new Panglong initiative, which was proposed, in 1994, by leaders of various minority groups forming a so-called "Ethnic Nationalities Solidarity and Cooperation Committee." The Committee debated whether a new federal Burma should be structured on the basis of the eight main ethnic groups ("created" under Britsh rule) or accomodate the aspirations of all 135 officially recognised "races." Gravers fears that the obsession with ethnicity, which characterises the discourse of nationalism among minority elites, will lead to an impasse. He concludes that "[n]ationalism and ethnicism have evolved into a political paranoia under which every move has become suspicious" (27).

Mandy Sadan's essay is on the construction of the ethnic category "Kachin" under British rule and in the postcolonial state. The author points out that "Kachin" is not a self-referential term of identity. It is definitely not an indigenous term: "Even when a corpus of more than a quarter of a million lexical items is examined, the term 'Kachin' is found not to appear at all" (45). The only term which may be considered an indigenised equivalent of "Kachin" is *Jinghpaw amyu ni*. Roughly translated as "'roots and branches' of the Jinghpaw," this term evokes a "concept of the multiplicity of clans and lineage segments" (53 f.). Sadan stresses the crucial unifying rule of the Church and Christianity for the self-identification of the Kachin as one single and coherent ethnic group in present-day Burma.

The third contribution, by Sandra Dudley, deals with the reshaping of Kayah (Karen-ni) identity in the Thai exile. Dudley collected numerous interviews with members of the 22,000-strong Karenni refugee community in Thailand. In her theoretical framework Dudley follows Anderson and Gellner's assumption that ethnicity was not important in the emergence of nationalism outside Europe prior to the "colonial constructions." She views the emergence of a Kayah ethnic identi-