

those others created elsewhere in time and space? Guided by theoreticians such as Fabian (*Time and the Other*. New York 1983) and his view of the necessary position of *coevalness* in ethnographic writing and Hastrup (*The Ethnographic Present. A Re-Invention. Cultural Anthropology* 5.1990: 45–61) and her reexamination of the ethnographic present as “shared time and space” the authors reclaim the concept of the ethnographic present as central to how we know what we know. As Hirsch states, “what I have learned, and what I should have already known is that past, present and future are not radically separated (as presupposed by history and historians) but are deeply connected in ethnographically unique ways” (33f.). Reimagining the ethnographic present not as crisis but as a bridge, opens up a space of reflection for knowledge construction. Crucial to this reimagining is what Halstead calls the interfaces between Self and Other which result in the fieldworker “*becoming or re-positioning the other*” (16). In various articles the authors draw attention to their roles, positions or repositions within their cultural fields. How we see others and how they see us, it seems, changes how we know what we know.

Halstead argues that the experiential, embodied knowledge gained in the field is constructed in a shared time and place but that it also goes beyond these moments and stays with us in the “extended field” (11). Grasseni provides insight into her positioning and “ways of seeing” suggesting that they stem from acquiring “skilled visions” or practices. In reflecting on his relations with others Retsikas points out that we will always return from the field and we will never take up living there full-time, thus we are left with a partial perspective, a partial embodiment of a way of life. This brings him to ask if partial embodiment is to be “... deemed adequate enough for offering a vivid account” (126).

I highly recommend this book. It is an important text for ethnographers in any stage of their careers. In particular, graduate students and professionals interested in the issue of the ethnographic present will find this book a stimulating read. The articles provide insight and define possible future direction into the process of ethnographic construction, a process which connects the lives of ethnographers and others in the field to the formation of anthropological analyses.

Denise Nuttall

**Harkin, Michael E., and David Rich Lewis** (eds.): *Native Americans and the Environment. Perspectives on the Ecological Indian*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007. 367 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-7361-0. Price: £ 13.99

Michael E. Harkin and David Rich Lewis have assembled a formidable group of scholars, mostly anthropologists and historians, to extend the debate and discussion of issues raised by Shepard Krech and his influential 1999 book, “*The Ecological Indian. Myth and History*.” Krech sought to assess how the pervasive Western image of Native Americans as natural conservationists (exemplified by the Iron Eyes Cody “crying Indian” and other

tropes) squared with the behavioral realities of resource use by Native American peoples in various times and places, from hunting of Pleistocene megafauna to more recent historical pursuit of buffalo on the Plains, deer in the southeastern woodlands, and beaver in the subarctic, among other cases.

It was not surprising that Krech found discrepancies between image and behavior. After all, imagery is a construction and, axiomatically, *not* reality. He meticulously documented case after case of overhunting or overharvesting, subsequent waste or spoilage of resources, and an apparent absence of overt conservation strategies. More surprising, perhaps, was the heated critical reaction to Krech’s book. Some Native Americans, including scholars and activists like Vine Deloria, disputed the specific findings in Krech’s work but also chided him, a non-Indian, for presuming to characterize the resource-use traditions and knowledge of Native Americans. Also unanticipated, was a warm reception by conservative commentators who saw Krech’s book as affirmation of a contrasting image, Indians as rapacious killers, and justification for eroding Indian lands, resources, and sovereignty. Reverberating throughout these varied reactions is a painful legacy of colonialism: the reduction of real human beings to stereotypes and the continuing power play by various parties to legitimize their conceptions of Indians and Indianness.

The complex aftermath of Krech’s book, including the 2002 University of Wyoming conference which resulted in “*Native Americans and the Environment*,” is discussed in a foreword by Judith Antell, a preface by Brian Hosmer, an introduction by Michael E. Harkin and David Rich Lewis, and an opening chapter and afterword by Shepard Krech III. The latter insightfully counters the critiques of his original work: that the case studies are selective rather than exhaustive or representative, that the historical evidence is incomplete and Eurocentric, that the book is politically incorrect, imperialist, and racist. At the same time, Krech welcomes new research on resources his book did not cover (notably, salmon, caribou, whales, shellfish, and plants) and on the late 20th-century rise of environmentalism in many Native American communities. Also, Krech cites some favorable reviews of his work by Native Americans, dispelling any notion of a monolithic reaction from Indian people.

Harkin and Lewis’ introduction establishes a thematic framework for the subsequent chapters. They also introduce three definitions of “ecological” as a reference point to bind the various authors’ discussions. “Ecological<sub>1</sub>” is the basic notion of population-environment interaction. “Ecological<sub>2</sub>” addresses sustainability, the ability of a population to persist in the same environment over time. “Ecological<sub>3</sub>” involves discourse with political support for sustainability through conservation measures. While Harkin and Lewis view Ecological<sub>3</sub> as an artifact of recent industrial society, they also note that Krech appears to conflate all three meanings in his analyses. Only a few contributors to this volume make overt use of these definitions. Moreover, not all of the authors directly address Krech’s arguments.

Part 1 of the book includes Krech's opening chapter followed by two essays which are, perhaps, the most critical of his work. Darren J. Ranco, a Penobscot Indian and anthropologist, argues that Krech's recommendation to abandon the colonial stereotype of the "ecological Indian" ignores the complex cultural politics of today's world. Adapting Marshall Sahlin's ideas on the indigenous "invention of tradition," Ranco notes how local usages of "ecological Indian" imagery have become a necessary part of Native American strategies for combating neocolonialism, loss of lands, and ecocide. His own involvement with the Penobscot Indian Nation's recent dealings with the EPA to control dioxin pollution of the Penobscot River, a major source of the people's fishing and hunting livelihood, demonstrates the dynamics involved.

Harvey A. Feit continues the argument that Krech's work values European rather than Indian understandings of and experiences with the environment, thereby endorsing unequal power relations. At issue is Krech's contention that Northern Algonquian people involved in the fur trade learned conservation practices from European traders. Feit turns this argument somewhat on its head by examining the case of restocking of the Charlton Islands in James Bay with beaver by the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) and Cree hunters in the 1830s. By the 1850s, according to Feit, HBC traders were beginning to understand principles of beaver population dynamics and carrying capacity, and conservation practices such as rotational trapping, from their Cree clientele, not the other way around. Feit concludes that Krech's misunderstanding of history is confounded by misrepresentation of contemporary Northern Algonquian desires for dual self-government and protection of their legally defined indigenous rights to land and wildlife.

Part 2 contains several chapters addressing debates concerning (over)hunting of large game. Robert L. Kelly and Mary M. Prasciunas review the extensive research on late Pleistocene megafaunal extinctions in North America. They conclude that climatic change and habitat degradation were the most likely causes for the extinction of 35 genera of mammals around 13,000–10,500 B.P., rather than overkill by Clovis hunters or the spread of hypervirulent diseases by humans and/or their dogs. Kelly and Prasciunas also note the convoluted logic of those seeking to repeal treaty-based hunting and fishing rights of contemporary Native Americans by invoking images of their Pleistocene ancestors as wanton overkillers of large game. Nonetheless, their parting message is that humans everywhere have been and are capable of bringing about extreme depletions or local extinctions and that no human groups or societies are "natural conservationists." Rather, it is more fruitful to understand the conditions under which conservation behaviors become desirable and/or prestigious.

In a similar vein, Ernest S. Burch Jr. finds the debate about Native Americans as *either* rational conservationists *or* rapacious overkillers as a polarizing discussion that should be abandoned. He musters a wealth of ethnographic and ethnohistorical information on long-term

hunting patterns among Iñupiat of northwestern Alaska and Caribou Inuit of central arctic Canada as they were impacted by European technological and market interventions. Burch contextualizes subsistence practices in terms of their cognitive aspects along a continuum from rational to arational action with both intended and unintended consequences. He notes that both Alaskan Iñupiat and Caribou Inuit saw subsistence resources as essentially unlimited in supply and whose presence or absence in any particular place was controlled by spirits rather than human harvesting pressure. While this perspective did not lend itself to a rational conservation strategy, fortuitous conservation effects were often produced by a combination of error, ignorance, and magical actions. Burch goes on to demonstrate how the introduction of breech-loading rifles to Iñupiat led to extermination of caribou and mountain sheep populations in the late 19th century with consequent cycles of human starvation, dispersal, and further animal overkills. He concludes that the Inuit, and by extension Native Americans generally, were no wiser than anyone else with regard to conserving resources.

Dan Flores offers a probing historical analysis of the complex conditions which led to the near extinction of buffalo on the Plains. This entailed a "perfect storm" of westward migration of the Lakota throughout the 18th century and their subsequent population growth after adopting horses, guns, and buffalo hunting. By the early to mid-19th century their participation in the expanding buffalo robe trade with various fur companies was contributing to major declines in the buffalo population which was further compromised by severe droughts and loss of grasslands in the 1850s–1860s. The mid-19th century also saw competition from the Canadian Métis buffalo trade on the nearby northern plains, the establishment of the Oregon, Mormon, and Bozeman trails bringing incursions of white immigrants through the buffalo lands, and U.S. government assignment of Indian tribes to particular "buffalo zones" or hunting grounds. The zone arrangement quickly broke down as Lakota warred against the Crow in the 1860s to gain access to the latter's rich hunting grounds. While white market hunters pushed the shrinking pockets of buffalo to the brink of extinction in later decades, much of the damage had already been done by nearly a century of Indian migrations, dislocations, wars, and active involvement in the fur trade political economy. Not surprisingly, Flores endorses Krech's goal of more historically-informed analyses of Native American economy and society.

Part 3 has two chapters which consider the Plains Indian-buffalo relationship in contemporary America. In the first, folklorist John Dorst compares displays at natural history museums, particularly how emphases upon Indian buffalo jump vs. mounted equestrian hunting methods become powerful cultural texts with meanings about communalism and individualism in mainstream society. Dorst concludes that the symbolic and ideological resonance of the ecological Indian icon as part of popular culture was largely unexplored by Krech.

In the following chapter, Sebastian Braun examines the late 20th century “buffalo commons” literature, a genre which envisions a restoration of herds and pristine Great Plains landscapes. It also elevates the buffalo as a symbol of American virtues, such as wildness, freedom, and self-sufficiency, while ignoring the place of buffalo in Plains Indian culture. The irony of this vision becomes apparent when Braun surveys recent tribal buffalo programs such as Pte Hca Ka on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation. That program began as a non-profit endeavor to preserve herds in a wild state as a means of healing and restoring Lakota cultural values. However, costs of maintaining the herds forced a shift to tribal administrative management and a focus on herd development as a business venture involving tourism and recreational hunting. Braun notes that the Lakota and other Plains Indians, struggling to make ends meet on impoverished reservations, maintain highly variable attitudes about and approaches to managing buffalo. This diversity of opinion and behavior is conveniently masked over by the ecological Indian stereotype. Here Braun departs from Ranco and agrees with Krech in arguing that ecological Indian imagery is not used by or for Native Americans but rather by non-Indians to serve the interests of the dominant society, often at the expense of Native Americans.

Part 4 examines traditional ecological knowledge with two chapters on Northwest Coast peoples. In the first, Michael E. Harkin analyzes the ethnoecology of the Kwakwaka'wakw in an effort to reveal interactions between belief and resource use behaviors and possible conservationist strategies. Following Judith Berman, he constructs a model based on reciprocity and predation, the predominant modes of interacting with other beings, in this case salmon. These modes are reflected in the annual ceremonial cycle with shamans ritually paying respect to salmon and attempting equilibrium in the cycle of exchange during the productive harvest season (April–November). The winter ceremonial season symbolically reverses the ecological vectors by allowing humans to combine the roles of predator and prey simultaneously, exemplified by the potlatch where hosts are giving away food but also “devouring” their guests as wealth. Harkin uses this elegant interpretation to argue for a Kwakwaka'wakw ethnoecology based on instability or catastrophe rather than homeostatic self-regulation. While such beliefs may reflect environmental events over long historical timescales, Harkin concludes that they did not constitute an ethic of conservation or produce an environmental praxis that conserved resources, given the cultural emphasis on excessive killing and consuming of salmon. Fraught with contradiction and mystification, ecological ideologies, in this light, share more with poetics and philosophy than practical resource management.

By contrast, Stephen J. Langdon argues that the Tlingit symbolic repertoire, as codified by mythic charters like the Salmon Boy story, is integral to understanding how these people formulated their knowledge and responded to resource fluctuations and environmental

changes over the *longue durée* of at least 4,000 years in southeastern Alaska. In essence, Salmon Boy instructs humans how to properly treat and respect salmon (humans in fish form) to ensure their future return after harvesting. Langdon commands an impressive combination of archaeological evidence and ethnoarchaeological interpretation focused on complex remnant wooden-stake weir and fish trap structures in the Prince of Wales archipelago. He argues that a shift to new tide-pulse fishing techniques in the period between 1150 and 700 B. C. required lower labor costs and less alteration of stream environments than prior methods, allowing greater numbers of pink and dog salmon to reach their spawning grounds. This “relational sustainability” or logic of human-salmon engagement developed as a behavioral realization of cultural principles formulated in the Salmon Boy charter. Langdon’s analysis runs counter to that of Harkin and other contributors to this volume who view environmental ideologies or ethnoecologies as largely unconnected to rational planning, innovation, or conservation of resources. His holistic blend of archaeological, ethnohistorical, and ethnographic data make this a particularly compelling essay.

Part 5 includes two chapters concerning contemporary resource management issues. The first, by Larry Nesper and James H. Schlender, examines the emergence of the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) after a federal court ruling in 1983 upheld treaty-based off-reservation hunting, fishing and gathering rights for 11 bands of Lake Superior Ojibwes in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. GLIFWC evolved as an agency to facilitate cooperative management of resources between tribes and various state conservation departments while coping with a hostile backlash from non-Indian residents who saw their recreational fishing and hunting threatened. Schlender, an Ojibwe and attorney who administered GLIFWC for nearly two decades, is in a unique position to interpret the explosive cultural politics surrounding these events. As a tactical inversion of the “Crying Indian” image, white protestors accused the Ojibwes of “raping the resources.” By the 1990s GLIFWC was developing into a complex organization that conducted its own wildlife biology research, engaged in habitat restoration projects and, perhaps most significantly, was infusing its work with a strong Ojibwe consciousness that was part of a general cultural renaissance.

In the final chapter, David Rich Lewis explores the unresolved plans of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians to store high-level radioactive waste on its reservation near Salt Lake City. Living in an area already saturated with hazardous waste sites and military bombing ranges, part of the Goshute community views a radioactive site as an economic opportunity and a means of cultural survival in a marginal environment which has always challenged their existence. However, other Goshutes oppose the plan. Utah political leaders and environmentalists have attempted to derail the project fearing threats to public health and safety but also resenting a sovereign tribe in defiance of state power and interests. In this heated conflict, opponents of the project use the

icon of the ecological Indian as a weapon to delegitimize Skull Valley Goshute plans.

Political ecology is not utilized as an interpretive framework in this book, at least not overtly. This seems like an oversight in view of the many case studies involving contested use of resources or environments. Also, for a work ostensibly concerned with ecology and cultural imagery, this volume is largely devoid of photographs, artwork, graphs, tables, or models which might help illustrate some of the processes discussed by the authors. Exceptions are the chapters by Langdon and by Kelly and Prasciunas. These caveats do not detract from the book's overall quality and contribution.

No doubt, some readers will see the ecological Indian as a straw man readily knocked down by historical and ethnographic accounts of actual resource use. Others may appreciate the way that this tenacious imagery has infiltrated the culture of contemporary Indian-White relations, either as a tool of oppression by neocolonial interests or as a symbolic resource to be exploited by Native Americans in their own defense. Standing apart from these arguments are suggestions that at least some Native Americans may have developed conservationist behaviors that complemented environmental ideologies. Yet, the dominant theme of this collection is that people everywhere, despite ideologies of respect toward other beings, have been capable of overkilling, overharvesting, and degrading the environment. Particularly destructive, of course, has been Western industrial society which developed formal conservation strategies *after* consuming and degrading much of the planet's biota. We should be wary of simplistic, mystifying images, whether the "ecological Indian" or the "Oriental." As anthropologists we want to know how these cultural constructions emerge, whose interests they serve, and how they are reproduced. Harkin and Lewis's book is a thoughtful and thought-provoking exploration of these issues which will be profitably read by anyone interested in environmental anthropology, Native North America, Indian-European relations, and cultural identity. Robert Jarvenpa

**Hill, David T.:** *Journalism and Politics in Indonesia. A Critical Biography of Mochtar Lubis (1922–2004)* as Editor and Author. London: Routledge, 2010. 266 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-56281-2. (Routledge Studies in the Modern History of Asia, 63). Price: £ 90.00

Mochtar Lubis wurde 1922 in Westsumatra als Sohn eines Beamten der niederländisch-indischen Kolonialverwaltung geboren. Er genoss eine westliche Ausbildung und teilte die bürgerliche Weltansicht der sumatranischen Oberschicht mit anderen bekannten Angehörigen der indonesischen Elite wie Sutan Sjahrir, Hatta und Agus Salim: Nationalistisch und zugleich prowestlich, sowohl gegen die "überholten" indonesischen Traditionen als auch gegen den Kommunismus gerichtet. Sein Leben lang würde er ein "Kommunistenfresser" bleiben und geißelte die "Rückständigkeit", Heuchelei und Korruption in Indonesien, die seiner Meinung nach vor allem durch die traditionelle, feudalistische javanische

Kultur verursacht wurden. Mochtar Lubis, der von seinen Verehrern gerne als Gewissen der Nation betrachtet wurde, gehörte zu einem kleinen Kreis von nicht nur kritischen, sondern auch mutigen Meinungsmachern. Für seine offenen Äußerungen mußte er jedoch einen hohen persönlichen Preis zahlen: Beide Präsidenten, Soekarno und Suharto, steckten ihn jahrelang ins Gefängnis und beide ließen seine Zeitung *Indonesia Raya* schließen. Die offene, prowestliche Haltung und ausgezeichnete Beherrschung der niederländischen und englischen Sprache sorgten schon früh in seiner Karriere dafür, dass er auch im Ausland als Vorzeigefigur der freien indonesischen Presse bekannt wurde. Im Jahre 1958 erhielt er den philippinischen "Ramon Magsaysay Award for Journalism and Literature", der als "asiatischer Nobelpreis" betrachtet wird. Sein Roman "Senja di Jakarta" (Dämmerung in Jakarta), in dem die politische sowie wirtschaftliche Krise Indonesiens während der Soekarno-Regierung angeprangert wird, war bezeichnenderweise die erste englische Übersetzung eines Werkes der indonesischen Literatur überhaupt. Dieses Buch erschien zunächst im Jahre 1963 in Großbritannien; die indonesische Fassung wurde erst im Jahre 1970 in Indonesien gedruckt. Mochtar Lubis blieb für ausländische Journalisten und Wissenschaftler bis zu seinem Tode im Jahre 2004 ein gesuchter Kommentator aktueller Angelegenheiten seines Landes.

Der Autor dieser unautorisierten Biographie über diesen indonesischen Journalisten und Schriftsteller ist zweifellos der bestinformierte westliche Wissenschaftler zu seinem Subjekt. Im Jahre 1980 kontaktierte er Mochtar Lubis zum ersten Male, um ihn über sein Vorhaben zu informieren, eine Doktorarbeit über ihn zu verfassen. Die Dissertation war acht Jahre später fertig, gefiel Mochtar Lubis aber gar nicht. Obwohl David Hill viele Aufsätze über Mochtar Lubis veröffentlicht hat, erschien die Dissertation nie im Druck. Im letzten Kapitel (174–188) berichtet der Biograph offenherzig über sein kompliziertes Verhältnis zu Mochtar Lubis während fast eines Vierteljahrhunderts. Das Leben und Werk von Mochtar Lubis werden in diesem Buch kritisch gewürdigt. Es wird nacherzählt, wie er zur inspirierenden Gallionsfigur der Meinungsfreiheit wurde, wobei die wichtigsten Lebensstationen Revue passieren. Hill nimmt jedoch Mochtar Lubis den Nimbus des unabhängigen und zu Unrecht unterdrückten Schriftstellers. Er weist auf die engen Beziehungen hin, die Mochtar Lubis zu gewissen Armeekreisen hatte, und zwischen den Zeilen wird auch deutlich, wie sehr Mochtar Lubis von der eigenen sumatranischen Ethnozentriertheit befallen war. Seine engen Verbindungen mit leitenden Führungspersonlichkeiten aus Sumatra sind auffallend, und man könnte m. E. sogar von einem "Anti-Java-Syndrom" sprechen. "Java" wird von Mochtar Lubis immer negativ mit Feudalismus, Linkspopulismus, Aberglauben und "Mystik" assoziiert. Seine viel beachtete Rede "Manusia Indonesia" (Der indonesische Mensch) von 1977 (später auch in Buchform erschienen) könnte problemlos als eine heftige Polemik eines Repräsentanten aus den sog. "Außengebieten" gegenüber "Java" gelesen werden. Die Allüren von Soekarno als traditioneller javanischer König erregten Mochtar Lubis'