

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

BOOK REVIEWS

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3fd2r4k7>

Journal

Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 10(3)

ISSN

1359-0987

Author

Maurer, WM

Publication Date

2004-09-01

DOI

10.1111/j.1467-9655.2004.00208.x

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

tion of a wider spectrum of island histories and events.

BARBARA LAWSON

McGill University

ERIKSEN, THOMAS HYLLAND. *Globalization: studies in anthropology*. vi, 236 pp., bibliogrs. London, Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press, 2003. £45.00 (cloth), £15.99 (paper)

This volume is the product of a workshop on 'transnational flows' held in 2001 with support from the Norwegian Research Council, and the majority of the chapters have been contributed by Scandinavian anthropologists, many based at the University of Oslo. The editor argues that recent attention to 'globalization' has tended uncritically to reject the traditional tools of the discipline, only to reinvent the wheel when it comes to conducting research. The view from Oslo sheds much needed light on the pretensions of such scholarship. As Eriksen puts it, 'quests for symbolic power and professional identity sometimes tempt academics to caricature the positions taken by their predecessors, so that their own contribution may shine with an exceptionally brilliant glow of originality and sophistication' (pp. 5–6). Eriksen wants to 'cut globalization research down to size' (p. 15), and to 'reintegrate it into the methodological mainstream of anthropology' (*ibid.*). These remarks may frustrate readers who wonder whether that methodological mainstream is up to the task, or even complicit with the phenomena that the anthropologist of globalization seeks to understand. Still, Eriksen valuably reminds us of the work on flows, fuzzy boundaries, and change by the Manchester School, cultural ecology, and various Marxisms that constituted much of mid-twentieth-century anthropology.

Eriksen's cautionary tone serves to highlight 'what is new' (p. 14, original emphasis). Here, he singles out: the broad range of kinds of data anthropologists now use; the development of different kinds of relationships with one's informants – 'less multiplex', because it is more difficult to 'share' their lives as fully as one might in traditional 'village' fieldwork (p. 15); the increasing need for multi-sited and multi-layered research; and the attention to macro-historical and macro-social contexts. Each of these, however, could be said to characterize the methodologies of the classical period as outlined by the editor, from Malinowski's *kula* to Worsley and Wolf's critique of isolated case studies, which the editor notes here (p. 15). So, it is not clear to me what is new – when the spotlight is on method, at least. The editor is more concerned to stake out an empirically rich and methodologically sound terrain for studies of transna-

tional phenomena so that such work cannot be easily dismissed as 'not really anthropology' (p. 16) than he is to claim new theoretical ground. And it is the theoretical ground that might need some reworking.

Some of the contributions to the volume suggest as much. Ulf Hannerz reviews recent transnational research by affiliates of Stockholm University. He shows how the 'field' is coming to be seen as a network rather than a site, in projects ranging from the diffusion of solar energy to Apple computer office employees. What this means for theory is not developed, but the introduction of the concept of the network – a network that is not merely 'social' but that includes knowledges, such as anthropological knowledge, in its constitution – is an important innovation. Daniel Miller and Don Slater make explicit the parallel between Trinidadian internet-users and anthropologists, each trying to navigate increasingly fuzzy distinctions between the global and the local. The boundary-work going on among both groups suggests a renewed critique of 'context' as an organizing rubric and an explanatory device in anthropological research.

Critical takes on context emerge in Karen Fog Olwig's chapter about Caribbean family networks, whose members, depending on generation, tend to give different meanings to the spatial contexts through which their families have travelled. Knut Nustad's fascinating chapter examines the phenomenon of IMF audits, showing how in their production they hold together an assemblage of ideas and materialities of society to 'create connectivity' (p. 131). Simone Abram makes a similar argument about policy and planning documents, and seeks an ethnography not 'of' the documents but, provocatively, 'in' them. Marit Melhuus studies blockade and flow in the exchange of human biogenetic substances. The transnationalization of an out-of-the-way village in Norway, and the transportation to Norway of a Norwegian-American town from the Midwestern United States, provide the backdrop to insightful chapters by Marianne Lien and Sarah Lund, respectively. Christian Krohn-Hansen and Signe Howell each explore the diffusion of moral and political values and discourses, like discourses of belonging tied to notions of blood and place, and the legal and ethical apparatuses sustaining the rights of children in an emerging global humanitarianism.

In his epilogue, Keith Hart notes that it might not be 'ethnography' as a method that connects the contributors in this volume, so much as intertwined personal and professional concerns and experiences, including but not limited to ethnographic experiences. '[O]ur methods and sources are much broader and idiosyncratic than we often let on', he writes (p. 219). I am left wondering, in the end,

whether the mutual intrusions of world and study are in fact the defining feature of the reflexivity evident in this volume and in anthropological practice more generally. Attending to that reflexivity may ultimately fray the distinction between 'new' theory and 'old' method on which many hang their future anthropological hopes.

BILL MAURER

University of California, Irvine

GARROUTTE, EVA MARIE. *Real Indians: identity and the survival of Native America*. xv, 223 pp., tables, illus., bibliogr. London, Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 2003. £32.95 (cloth), £12.95 (paper)

Eva Marie Garroutte takes a bold step by trying to answer a problematic question for the settler societies of North America. She asks, who are the Real Indians? Based on published and unpublished sources, two dozen interviews with a variety of native individuals, and participation in the intertribal communities of Tulsa and academia, Garroutte challenges existing definitions of 'Indian' identity and develops a postcolonial perspective that she terms Radical Indigenism, which she argues is a more useful perspective for thinking about Indianness.

The first four chapters are designed as a critical evaluation of what Garroutte considers the four most common concepts used to define Native American identity. Legal, biological, cultural, and self-identifiable definitions are each discussed in their own respective chapters, and each is analysed and determined to be inadequate or at least potentially oppressive to Indian people. Her goal in the first four chapters is to demonstrate the malleability of these definitions and to show how each can be manipulated for political, social, or economic advantage.

With the prominent definitions put in their place, the reader is next presented with the tenets of Radical Indigenism and its applicability for conceptualizing Indian identity. The orientation of Radical Indigenism is grounded in two points, that of entering tribal philosophies and that of entering tribal relations. Entering tribal philosophies means that scholars are expected to follow community prescriptions and learn as an equal rather than an expert. Entering tribal relations is the directive for researchers to live in the native community and take on the commitments and sacrifices that come with membership. The native community is the authoritative voice that judges the legitimacy of the research and regulates the dissemination of results.

Using the proposed style above, Garroutte introduces a kinship-centred definition of Indian identity offered in opposition to those

criticized in the first four chapters. On the basis of field research among native peoples in Eastern Oklahoma, including the Cherokee community of which she is a member, Garroutte argues that kinship in native communities is distinct from Euro-American definitions in that it is characterized by both relationships of ancestry and particular expectations of reciprocity. She contends that Indianness is a condition of spiritual being that connects the past, present, and future generations. The second aspect is that of reciprocity, or the active relationships maintained through generosity and sharing both within and outside of ancestral kinship relations. The conclusion is that Real Indians are defined as those who share an inherited connection to the indigenous populations of North America and maintain reciprocal relationships with one another, as well as those who are willing to behave in ways sanctioned by this kinship network, such as those individuals variously adopted by native communities. The book concludes with a call for scholars and native communities to open an intellectual and practical space for Radical Indigenism.

Upon reading Garroutte's book, I felt a sense of validation, as the methodology defined in Radical Indigenism should be familiar to anthropologists since it is not so far removed from that of collaborative ethnography. The result is that Garroutte's kinship model is similar to that developed by anthropologists working with similar communities in Eastern Oklahoma. Ethnographers like Albert Warhaftig, Robert Thomas, Sue Roard-Calnek, and Jason Jackson have described the populations that Garroutte identifies as 'Real Indian' to be participants in intertribal social networks that are embedded within, but differentiated from, the numerically larger populations with legal, biological, cultural, or self-identifiable claims to membership in a federally recognized tribe. Thus, Radical Indigenism complements both the methodology of a collaborative anthropology for Native North America as well as its existent models.

Garroutte's major contribution is her argument that privileging indigenous philosophy can bring a measure of closure to the dissension that has occurred in some academic-native relationships. She reminds the reader that indigenous philosophy is a coherent system of knowledge that has persisted for centuries and has remained separate from yet is as valid as the Euro-American system upon which the academy and those that clamour for its validation currently rely. As she argues, native philosophy 'can contribute to the survival of Indian people even as it teaches the academy about philosophies of knowledge it has failed to see and understand' (p. 107). Though I disagree with her generalized usage of 'the academy', as many anthropologists have