

Reviews

The Changing World of Mongolia's Nomads, photography and text by Melvyn C. Goldstein and Cynthia M Beall. University of California Press, Berkeley (1994) pp. 1-176. Photographs, tables, figures, index.

Reviewed by John A Young, Professor and Chair, Anthropology Department, Oregon State University.

Goldstein and Beall have produced another spectacular book in the same format as their earlier work, *Nomads of Western Tibet*. Photography depicting the lives of Mongolia's herding nomads who have survived for centuries in one of the harshest environments on this planet adds a stunning effect. The text comes alive as it is illustrated with colorful scenes of nomadic life on nearly every page. But what makes this work more than a mere picture book is substantial ethnographic investigation carried out during three separate visits spanning a total of more than six months starting in the fall of 1990 and finishing in the summer of 1992. This time period is significant because the authors were able to observe the transition from socialist mode of production modeled after Russian collective enterprise to a private market system. As they did in their study of economic reform in Tibet, the authors again have proven their capability to make the most of being in the right place at the right time. The book opens with a brief history of the glory of Mongolian conquests in centuries past and quickly moves to a rich description of the natural resources, material culture, food processing and adaptive knowledge associated with a community of nomads located in Moost, a remote area of Western Mongolia.

The authors explain seasonal migration cycle of the nomads, along with the care and management of horses, yaks, camels, sheep and goats which provide them with their livelihood. That the people studied are pictured and often referred to using their names allows the reader to identify with them in a personal way. Interesting details are provided as well. For example, the caption on one photograph states, "Butter stays fresh for nearly a year when sewn tightly into a (dead) sheep's stomach." We are treated to verbal and visual description of pack trains, to assembling of transportable shelters (*ger*), and the practice of Tibetan Buddhist ritual which has undergone a revival occurring simultaneously with market oriented reforms. The heart of the book is its description and analysis of the *negdel*, or herding collective. The authors go to great lengths to present a clear picture of collective economics and its relationship to household finances and decision making.

Upon their arrival in 1990 the authors found a surprising level of prosperity, including durable consumer goods imported from abroad, and a universal system of schooling that provided an avenue of upward mobility for young people, some of whom move on to work in industrial towns. The collective, despite eliminating great disparities in income,

contained a number of disincentives outlined by the authors. The reported result was a stifling of productivity. As reforms began to be implemented, the collective turned ownership of animals over to nomads who had previously herded them as a delegated task. Many herders were reluctant to give up the advantage of the marketing and other services provided by the collective. Soon they turned the collective into a shareholding company, thus maintaining some advantages of large-scale organization. In general, the translation to a market system meant hardships. Trade goods from abroad disappeared and disposable income declined, trends that evoked a return to traditional crafts, such as felt making, and traditional agricultural supplements, such as growing barley. The more difficult times that came with the termination of state subsidies, however, did not lead to discouragement.

The authors found that people felt empowered by the absence of disincentives, as they were able to benefit from working harder. They were optimistic about successfully providing for their needs themselves. Goldstein and Beall researched only the first year of decollectivization, still too early to provide definite answers to several critical questions. Will extreme economic and social inequities of the past reemerge? Will trade with Xinjiang and other parts of Western China replace the missing trade with East European socialist countries? Will there be destabilizing pressure placed on the environment due to a high birth rate and the expansion of herds still viewed as a traditional form of wealth? If these issues are to be assessed in subsequent phases of the nomads capitalist transition, the authors here provide a solid foundation and exemplary model for other researchers to follow. The essential contribution of this book is its insight into how national policy changes play out in the lives and livelihood of a little-known people who were remote and inaccessible to observers from Western countries.

Native Canadian Anthropology and History: A Selected Bibliography (revised edition) by Shepard Krech III, University of Oklahoma Press, 1994. 212 pp.

**Reviewed by Bruce G. Miller, University of British Columbia
Department of Anthropology and Sociology.**

There can be only sympathy for someone attempting to select three thousand citations out of all of the publications on the anthropology and history of Canadian First Nations. Shepard Krech III's aim in attempting this is to prepare a bibliography for undergraduates to use to in creating well-researched projects in the fields of Native studies, anthropology, and history, and also to direct specialists to useful but obscure sources. The volume is intended to be used together with comprehensive bibliographies, a number of which are listed in these pages. Krech did not omit material which has been poorly reviewed, preferring to allow readers to make up their own minds about quality--surely a good thing given the rapidity with which evaluations change. Krech did omit dissertations, theses and "gray matter," arguing that these are hard to get hold of. The volume focuses on the

literature produced between 1980 and 1990, but there are many earlier citations, and some from as recently as 1993. The citations are organized into 19 sections. The first three chapters concern bibliographic sources; the following eight are entitled “regional and ethnic sources;” and are organized by culture area; and the last eight are “special topics.” These topics are historiography, the fur trade, missionaries, education, health and disease, art and material culture, gender, and political, legal, and constitutional issues. There is an index of authors, which is valuable because in many cases the citations for any single scholar are divided among several chapters. Finally, there is a 26 page introduction to the volume.

Krech has achieved what he hoped; this volume is useful for undergraduate students who are struggling to find their way into the academic literature. The book does, as promised, provide interesting, overlooked citations for professionals. It is helpful for both students and professionals to have in one place in-depth, (although incomplete) bibliographies of such noted scholars as Sally Weaver, Michael Asch, Noel Dyck, Robin Ridington, Catherine McClellan, and many others. These personal bibliographies provide a sense of what Canadian historians and anthropologists have been concerned with, and how interests have shifted over the years.

I wonder, however, what the future will be for volumes of this sort in an age of powerful, new computer-based bibliographies. Many of my own students, for instance, are now quickly able to produce more focused and complete bibliographies than the one on gender in this volume. Furthermore, because of the rapidity of change for First Nations in Canada (perhaps especially British Columbia, where treaties are being negotiated and land claims are currently being contested in court and in negotiation) the section on political, legal, and constitutional issues is already badly out of date. There will without question, be a continuing need for annotated bibliographies that lead readers into the significant debates, but this volume is not intended to do such a task.

Krech’s text introduces his book, not the literature, with some exceptions. Krech reveals his viewpoint explicitly on which he thinks are the best sources covering a given topic, and such passages are the most helpful in the book. There is some discussion of approaches to ethnohistory and of the fur trade literature, both topics appropriately reflecting the author’s personal interests.

There are several relatively minor points that I cannot let pass. First, given the great difficulty in selecting entries, it is unclear to me why citations that do not directly consider Canadian topics are included. Such entries (all very good ones in their own right) concern Iroquoian contributions to the US constitution, treaty issues and ecological histories in Washington state, and so on. Second, it is also unclear why so many obsolete pieces treating alcohol abuse (some written decades earlier than the volume’s targeted period) need be included within the otherwise good section on health and disease. Finally, the editorial decision to use outdated terminology for First Nations seems indefensible. Because such names are no longer accepted by the First Nations themselves, and generally are no longer used by academics working with and situated near these First Nations, it is time to stop justifying these outmoded designations and adopt newer terminology. There is no convincing reason to use the terms *Bella Coola* or *Nootka*, for example, and people ought to get used to this, or at least address the issues that connect the name changing by aboriginal groups and the politics of decolonization.

Voices of Migrants: Rural-Urban Migration in Costa Rica,
by Paul Kutsche. Gainesville: University Press of Florida,
1994. xii, 236 pp.

Reviewed by James P. Stansbury, Department of Behavioral Science,
University of Kentucky.

Kutsche's book is a welcome addition to recent work on Costa Rica and Central America. The goal of the study is to provide a human face to the often dry statistics on rural-urban migration. The author draws generalizations about migration to San Jose from an analysis of interviews with 14 Costa Ricans. Texts of the interviews with 10 men and four women focus particularly on factors related to their move to San Jose.

The book itself is divided into three sections, the first providing sociocultural and historical context for the study. As the author points out, Costa Rica has a unique colonial legacy. As a peripheral area of the Guatemalan captaincy, the area lacked a military class and large quantities of Native Americans to conquer. It subsequently developed a political culture that maintained the rule of a hereditary elite through the formation of a political class, but eschewed hierarchical distinctions in favor of egalitarian ideology.

Ironically, if the rise of the yeoman farmer in part accounts for Costa Rican uniqueness, it is the beginnings of coffee exportation in the 1830s that prepared the roots of Costa Rican underdevelopment. More recently, large scale cattle ranching for beef export has brought consolidation of land holdings and the expansion of rural roads, providing a push factor in urban migration (see B.R. DeWalt 1985). Accompanying this has been environmental degradation, a process the author views as a more quiet force leading to the alienation of rural producers.

Migration to San Jose increased dramatically during the 1960s, and the central city grew rapidly during this decade. The 1970s brought growth to the city's concentric rings of *aglomeración*, with migration tapering somewhat as a result of the economic crisis of the 1980s. Of interest is the relatively high absorption of migrants into the formal sector of the economy, although recent migrants appear to be less secure than those that arrived in earlier waves. Also of note is the fact that most migrants are women, and that migrants are more likely to be employed than urban natives, perhaps due to a willingness to accept less remunerative or desirable work.

The book's second section, presenting the texts of the interviews, is the most important. These interviews are ably translated and edited. Kutsche has written on male sexual identity and gay life in Costa Rica (e.g. P.Kutsche & J.B.Page 1991), and this concern shapes the presentation of the interviews and selection of the interviewees. We are early on introduced to a young hustler and other young men who have informed Kutsche's other work. Nevertheless, subsequent interviewees include a political organizer, a teacher, a bootblack, a fireman, an older successful beekeeper and a produce manager. Women migrants included a single-mother who eventually became a government worker and a domestic worker. The material is sufficiently broad, letting the reader feel some of the diversity and commonality among migrants to San Jose.

The third section presents the author's analysis, providing brief generalizations on the interviews. Perhaps most interesting here are Kutsche's observations regarding increasing psychic costs to migration and the factors predicting migrant success.

The reader of *Voices of Migrants* will find the author no slave to contemporary theoretical fashion. Absent, perhaps for some blessedly so, are references to intertextuality and exegeses on the finer points of discursivity. As Kutsche notes early on, his inspirations are the life history works of Lewis and Sexton, with methodological predecessors in Kluckhohn and Langness. In a later discussion on informant presentations, he refers to issues raised by Goffman whereas the discussion of values employs Kluckhohn's quite serviceable definition. Interpretation is straightforward, and discussions of the author's biases and how they may influence both data and interpretation are honest and sensitive.

Nevertheless, Kutsche's critique of Costa Rican popular ideology reflects a concern for denouncing alienating illusion that is quite contemporary, if problematic. The author begins by suggesting that value orientations constitute

...what we may label "la leyenda blanca," playing off the "leyenda negra" that Protestant historians saddled Spain with. The leyenda blanca, the myth of Costa Rican idyllic society and culture in the "Switzerland of Central America," persists in the face of careful and uncontroverted historical research...(p.208)

Although it is evident that multiple sixteenth and seventeenth-century editions of the *Brevísima relación* in Holland, Britain, Germany, and France had much to do with the perpetuation of the "black legend," I find it difficult to think of the first bishop of Chiapas as a Protestant historian (see A.Saint-Lu 1991). As for the "white legend" of Costa Rica, the historian A.Perez-Brignoli (1989) is one promoter:

... By studying the case of Costa Rica we can get a feel for possibilities and limitations... The life expectancy is one of Latin America's highest. The degree of control over infectious diseases exceeds all expectations. The electoral process and political life is comparable to the United States or Western Europe. All this is true of an underdeveloped country that finds itself in the middle of a deep economic crisis and which shares in no small measure the misfortunes of the whole region (1989:180).

Perez-Brignoli shares the position with Kutsche that Costa Rica is in no way exempt from the forces of the global economy.

Yet for the historian, Costa Rican uniqueness is less myth than political-economic enigma. Costa Rica not only remained aloof from the "black legend" of the 1980s in Central America, but likewise during earlier epochs of crisis. As an example, Perez-Brignoli compares the peaceful resolution of the 1934 banana strike in Costa Rica with the infamous *matanza* following the Salvadoran insurrection of 1932. As he notes: "ruling class behavior defines a pattern of evolution which will have a decisive effect on the future of Central American societies" (1989:184).

It could well be that the egalitarian and exceptionalist orientations in Costa Rican political culture at once define elite obligations and popular boundaries for action, having very real implications for the conduct of social life. To invoke an earlier proponent of

interactionism, this is less about false consciousness than an example of how when “...men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (W.I.Thomas 1966 [1928]:xl). Familiarity with the outcomes of Central American political violence during the last decade suggests that this may not be such a bad thing.

Despite my reservations about Kutsche’s historical and political economic interpretation, his *Voices of Migrants* is a tremendous contribution to a human understanding of urban migration in Latin America. It is best read for the voices themselves, which are ably presented and intrinsically interesting for anthropologists and students of migration. This book also helps fill the underattended anthropological space south of Mesoamerica and north of the Andes.

References Cited.

DeWalt, Billie R.

1985 “Microcosmic and Macrocosmic Processes of Agrarian Change in Southern Honduras: The Cattle are Eating the Forest.” In *Micro and Macro Levels of Analysis in Anthropology: Issues in Theory and Research*, B.R. DeWalt & P.J. Pelto, editors. Pp. 165-186. Boulder: Westview.

Kutsche, Paul, and J. Bryan Page

1991 Male Sexual Identity in Costa Rica, *Latin American Anthropology Review*. 3:7-14.

Perez-Brignoli, Hector

1989 [1985] *A Brief History of Central America*. R.B. Sawrey & S. Stettri de Sawrey, translators. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Saint-Lu, André

1991 *Introducción a Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, 1552. Madrid: Catedra.

Thomas, W.I., editor

1966 [1928] *On Social Organization and Social Personality*. Pp. vii-lviii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Houses in the Rainforest: Ethnicity and Inequality among Farmers and Foragers in Central Africa, by Roy Richard Grinker; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994. xviii, 225 pp.

Reviewed by Robert Harms, Department of History, Yale University

Farmers and foragers in Zaire's Ituri forest, we have been told by anthropologists, exist in a symbiotic material relationship by which farmers produce cultivated food and foragers produce forest products. Indeed, the inhabitants of the Ituri themselves echo this assessment. Nevertheless, Roy Richard Grinker argues in this path-breaking book that the

relationship between Lese farmers and Efe foragers in the Ituri is more complex than it first appears. The foragers bring to the village only small quantities of meat, less than is obtained by the hunting activities of the villagers themselves, and although the foragers receive in return products from village gardens, they also work in those gardens, receiving, in effect, the product of their own labor.

What is it, then, that binds the two groups together so tightly? Following John Comaroff, Grinker sees ethnicity as first and foremost a process of symbolic classification. He then goes on to reinterpret the concepts of “farmer” and “forager” as markers of ethnicity rather than simply as markers of ecological adaptations. This allows him to examine the symbolic and structural aspects of the division of labor and to explore relations of inequality between the two groups. He argues that Lese farmers and Efe foragers must be seen as parts of a larger, ethnically differentiated totality.

This book differs from other studies of farmer-forager relations in that it looks at the issue from the perspective of the Lese farmers and examines how the Efe foragers are symbolically and structurally incorporated into Lese society on a basis of inequality. After reviewing several key oppositions (forest/village, wild/civilized, dirty/clean, uncontrolled/controlled) by which the Lese farmers define themselves and denigrate the Efe foragers, he shows how the major opposition Lese men use to define their relations with their forager clients is that of gender: farmers are male and foragers are female. The analogy comes less from Lese theories of race or gender than from theories of how Lese men incorporate outsiders into their houses: both their Efe clients and their Lese wives are outsiders who are incorporated on terms of inequality. The Efe are thus the structural equivalent of Lese men's wives.

The institution by which these relations of inequality are brought together and structured is the Lese “house,” a term that includes Efe clients who do not live in the village, but who participate in a common food production and distribution system with members of a Lese household. He contrasts the Lese house, as a form of social organization, with the Lese clan, which uses a descent model to structure relations among male heads of houses on the basis of equivalency and equality. The two models structure very different kinds of social organizations and social processes.

The house is the focal point of hierarchy and inequality on a day-to-day basis, and it provides the meanings and metaphors by which members understand and represent their relations with one another. Grinker argues that the forms of inequality associated with Lese-Efe ethnicity writ large are discernible in the daily operations of the Lese house. The very process of food production and distribution reinforces the male/female analogy of Lese/Efe relations: the Efe bring meat, which honors the receiver, whereas in return they receive cultivated foods which symbolize their dependency. The marginal status of Efe as members of the house, yet not members of the house, comes in handy for Lese houses dealing with witchcraft. The Efe serve as powerful protectors of the Lese house against the witchcraft of neighboring Lese houses, yet the Efe are not considered capable of bewitching people themselves.

The arguments about the two groups being mutually constituted symbolically, and about the structure of ethnic relations being based on the institutionalized inequalities that make up the house, are convincing. They break new ground in our understanding of farmer/forager relations in the equatorial forest and they show in detail how ethnicity is constructed and maintained. Because much of the recent literature on ethnicity in Africa argues that it is an urban phenomenon created by colonialism and modern politics, it is

useful to see how rural ethnicity is created out of the structures and symbols of everyday life.

Still, this remains a Lese-centric analysis. I can see why Lese men maintain Efe partners who give them honor, reinforce their sense of superiority, and mediate their relations with neighboring houses. But what Grinker fails to explain is why the Efe put up with the relationship. Do they interpret Lese/Efe interactions through a set of counter models and symbols whereby the inequality is reversed? Are they oblivious to the structural and symbolic inequality in the Lese house? Perhaps it is possible after all that they endure the degradation because they need access to Lese gardens.

Coffee, Society, and Power in Latin America, edited by William Roseberry, Lowell Gudmundson, and Mario Samper Kutschbach; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. 304 pp.

Reviewed by Deborah Sick, Research Associate, Department of Anthropology, McGill University.

Stemming from a 1986 conference in Costa Rica on the history of coffee, these diverse readings are linked by a common analysis of a single commodity within a historical materialist framework, covering the period from roughly 1830 to 1950. Though much has been written concerning agricultural export economies, the impacts of export commodity production are often characterized in broad, overgeneralized terms. The commodity approach employed in this collection uses the commonalities of coffee production, marketing, and distribution as points of comparison, while stressing the importance of diverse regional contexts.

As Roseberry emphasizes in the introduction to the volume, despite certain common transformations, “radically different social, economic, political, and cultural contexts” (p. 30) have resulted in the regional variations found throughout Latin American coffee producing societies. It is through Roseberry’s introduction that the material presented in the following essays really takes shape, for it is here that a comprehensive framework for comparative analysis is constructed. Roseberry provides an informative summation of the historic development of coffee production in Latin America and a provocative discussion of the analytic themes that bind these essays together, and points out areas where research has been lacking. In his discussion of land tenure and labor mobilization; the role of merchants, processors and markets; and state ideologies and politics, he emphasizes both commonalities and regional differences, establishing a comparative framework that “concentrates on the local and particular, with questions about the appropriation and mobilization of land and labor, the investment of capital and the organization of markets, and the administration and imagination of power” (p. 31).

Michael F. Jiménez’s initial contribution sets the scene by examining the international coffee market in the century preceding the Great Depression. The essay focuses on the rise in coffee consumption in the U.S. Though many producers exported primarily to Europe,

the tremendous impact of the U.S. (particularly during times of war) on the world coffee economy cannot be overlooked. Jiménez's fascinating account looks at the rise of a new international mercantile elite and the way in which it shaped consumer taste and increased demand by fashioning a discourse linked to perceptions and practices in the American home and workplace. The remaining eight articles are case studies focusing on a number of overlapping themes in Brazil, Puerto Rico, Costa Rica, Colombia, Guatemala, and El Salvador. Two of these essays-- Stolcke's and Samper's-- are comparative efforts.

Verna Stolcke (the only one in this collection to focus on family labor) compares different forms of labor appropriation in various coffee-producing regions. The essay looks at how the hidden dimension of family labor allowed large producers to shift the costs of production and reproduction to the household during economic crises. She concludes by examining how changes in states' policies variously affected the organization of family labor.

The essays by Fernando Picó (on Puerto Rico) and Lowell Gudmundson (on Costa Rica) analyze the relationship between the expansion of coffee production and changing patterns of land tenure, ownership, and inheritance. In both cases the authors find not a dramatic increase in *latifundia*, but a substantial rise in medium-sized family farms. Gudmundson's data are particularly rich, and his analysis of the impacts of land scarcity on class formation and inheritance patterns is insightful, especially as it affected female inheritance.

Echoing the theme of the "internalization' of external conditions" (p. 169), Mario Samper Kutschbach compares the social impact of crises in the international coffee market during the 1920s and 1930s on large and small units of production in Costa Rica and Colombia. Through a comparison of the social and political contexts encompassing coffee production in each country, he argues convincingly that the ability of coffee producers to weather adverse economic conditions is not linked solely to inherent characteristics of the type of production unit (as Stolcke suggests), but rather depends on specific social and political factors in each region. Questions concerning the impact of coffee production on forms of labor organization and appropriation are addressed in the essays by Maricio Font (on Brazil) and David McCreery (on Guatemala). Font argues that the structural changes taking place in Sao Paulo between 1880 and 1930 were the result of complex processes and did not result in the homogenous conversion of *colonos* (unique type of sharecropper/laborers) to proletarians, as some have argued. Rather, a process of differentiation was affecting both *colonos* and elites alike. Unable to monopolize land and state power, rural elites could not prevent independent production by smaller cultivators, and various forms of petty and household production emerged.

David McCreery examines the relationship between *finqueros* (large farmers), laborers, and the state in Guatemala from 1920-1945. He discusses not just the contexts in which coercive labor laws were enacted, but the processes of "negotiation," resistance, and rebellion that accompanied such measures until the 1940s. At that time economic necessity, brought about by population growth and land scarcity, became the basis for compelling labor to seek plantation work. Héctor Pérez Brignoli's essay attempts to untangle the complicated web of explanations surrounding the 1932 rebellion in El Salvador. Following a discussion of several single-cause political and social explanations, Brignoli argues that a number of disparate factors led to the violent revolt involving coffee *peons*, Indian peasants, and communist leaders. Although agrarian unrest, changes in land distribution that accompanied the expansion of coffee, and communist social agitation

fueled rural unrest, much evidence indicates that racism and ethnic conflict between Indians and *mestizos* were equally important factors.

The final essay in the collection returns to the question of the power of large growers. Michael Jiménez's analysis of the alliances and conflicts involving *hacendados*, smallholders, tenants, landless laborers, and the state demonstrates the complex ways in which power was contested and negotiated during the early twentieth century in Colombia. Continually challenged from below, unable to ally themselves with other rising elite forces, and unwilling to concede that the "inferior classes" could become the basis of a productive society, the power of large planters was limited. In the end, Jiménez concludes, though without explanation, that it was these weaknesses that led to the social conflicts and violence of Colombia's recent past.

The ten essays in this book present a unique and important contribution to the study of political economy in Latin America. Though some articles contain minor inconsistencies, (that could be corrected with better proofreading) each author attempts, with varying degrees of success, to analyze the complex factors that have shaped modern Latin American coffee-producing societies. It is an important book, not just for scholars of Latin America, but for anyone interested in understanding the ways in which export agriculture impacts society and how power is created, used, contested, and negotiated given particular global conditions and local contexts.

**Managing the Global Commons. By William Nordhaus;
Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 1994. 213 pp., one
Appendix.**

**Reviewed by Jonathan A. Lesser, Green Mountain Power Company,
South Burlington, VT 05402-0850**

It is hard to conceive of a more difficult policy issue to analyze than global climate change. The climatological dynamics are mind-numbingly complex, while the scope of the policy issues raised, encompassing economic, ethical, social, and even political aspects, seems limitless. Views on global climate change range from doom sayers who predict, and perhaps even look forward to, humanity's eventual demise; to nay sayers and Pollyannas, who either deny the existence of global climate change or even welcome it.

Any author willing to analyze the subject dispassionately and suggest concrete policy approaches invites wilting criticism. Yet it is crucially important to develop just such analyses, economic or otherwise, for without them decision makers will have nothing on which to base policies except thoughtless bilge. *Managing the Global Commons* does not pretend to be the definitive policy analysis of global climate change. Instead, its author, economist William Nordhaus of Yale University, develops a dynamically linked economic and environmental model that provides insights into economically efficient strategies to address global climate change. Thankfully, Nordhaus does not pretend, at least in this book, to be the moral philosopher of our time, endlessly debating the "fairness" of imposing climate change on future generations. For clarity of purpose and exposition, he

is to be commended, as this allows the reader to distinguish the economic aspects of global climate change from the ethical ones.

In the book, Nordhaus develops and presents his DICE model (Dynamic Integrated model of Climate and the Economy.) This model incorporates an economic growth model that is linked dynamically to a model of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, atmospheric concentrations, and resulting environmental damages. In essence, the model can be “solved” for the trajectory over time that yields an optimal path of economic growth, defined as the path yielding the largest net present value of wealth. The optimal path must trade off the standard economic decisions of resource allocations that increase wealth with the changes in GHG emissions and their resulting environmental costs.

Using the model, Nordhaus also examines several policy alternatives, including stabilizing emissions at 1990 levels, reducing emissions 20 percent below 1990 levels, delaying actions by 10 years, and doing nothing. He then addresses the effects on these policies of uncertainties in the values of key parameters, including the rate of time preference, future population growth, relationship between increased GHG emissions and temperature change, and the climate change damage function. Nordhaus constructs numerous sensitivity analyses, as well as a decision model of information gathering and learning.

Nordhaus has several important conclusions. First, he shows that the value of additional information is large, suggesting a significant benefit from additional climate change research. Second, he suggests that the existing uncertainties warrant higher carbon taxes and greater GHG emission control rates. He also points out the critical importance to overall economic efficiency of how the revenues collected are used. Third, he finds that the level of the carbon tax changes little with the arrival of new information. Fourth, he correctly points out that, regardless of future mitigation efforts, past GHG emissions have already consigned us to future climate change and, thus, adaptation to a new climate is imperative.

Not surprisingly, the conclusions reached by Nordhaus have already been attacked. D. Chapman, V. Suri, and S. Hall (1995), for example, criticize Nordhaus’ conclusions based on their use of different parameters in the DICE model. As a result, they argue for more stringent curbs on GHG emissions. But their arguments, like many others, confuse economic efficiency criteria with ethical frameworks and considerations of intergenerational equity.

Whereas Nordhaus does not delve into fairness issues, he does pay special attention to one of the most vociferous of these disagreements: the role of discounting future costs and benefits in the context of global climate change policies. The disagreements, which rage both between individual economists, as well as between economists and philosophers, encompass questions of what is an efficient discount rate and, more fundamentally, whether the use of any positive discount rate can be justified in light of the present generation’s commitment to future generations (T.Brennan 1995; J.Lesser and R. Zerbe 1995). Nordhaus addresses these alternative views on discounting succinctly. Although he does not challenge the ethical arguments themselves, he does challenge successfully the misuse of such arguments in analyses that are, ostensibly, based on economic efficiency (W. Cline 1992).

What is the best way to address global climate change? Nordhaus does not say, except to note that humans must adapt to future climate change. No doubt, faced with an ever expanding set of facts and uncertainties concerning global climate change, we can all arrive at widely different answers, as there is no monopoly on ethical values or core

philosophies. Nordhaus uses the DICE model to address one aspect of global climate change policies. And, although economic efficiency surely will not be the sole decision criterion for future policy decisions, it must be an integral one because, regardless of one's ethical viewpoint, resource scarcity cannot be disputed.

References Cited

Brennan, T.

1995. "Discounting the Future: Economics and Ethics." *Resources* 120 (Summer): 3-6.

Chapman, D., V. Suri, and S. Hall.

1995. "Rolling DICE for the Future of the Planet." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 13(3):3-9.

Cline, W.

1992. *The Economics of Global Warming*. Washington, D.C: Institute of International Economics.

Lesser, J., and R. Zerbe.

1995. "What Can Economic Analysis Contribute to the Sustainability Debate?" *Contemporary Economic Policy* 13(3): 88-100.

Braid of Feathers: American Indian Law and Contemporary Tribal Life, by Frank Pommersheim; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995. 267 pp.

Reviewed by Allen C. Turner, Ph.D., J.D. Box 7704, Redlands, CA 92375

I like thin books with thick subject matter. I also like book titles that herald the contents. This book does both. In an essay of 200 pages, Frank Pommersheim, a Lakota tribal judge, artfully braids together the variegated feathers of tribal sovereignty. Experience, Culture, History, Language, Politics, and Law, not just Acts of Congress (treaties, statutes), decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and executive action (orders and regulations) shape, limit, and ultimately enhance or diminish tribal sovereignty. The author, sometimes poetically, sometimes polemically, but always pointedly argues that tribal courts are the fundamental institution of legitimate, authentic tribal self-determination.

Braid of Feathers is an essay in advocacy; it advances the message that inherent tribal sovereignty will be made manifest by an enlightened tribal judiciary. Indeed, that tribal judiciary is the means by which residual sovereignty will be enhanced. This book makes it clear that tribal courts are the institutional key to Native American Indian political survival. Eclectic and erudite, Pommersheim speaks from his inestimable experience as a Lakota tribal judge. His scholarship is enriched by his intimate knowledge of reservation life and Indian people. His sources range from Black Elk's visions to the Holy Bible,

from tribal constitutions to the Constitution of the United States, from Treaties with tribes to treatises by eminent scholars.

Pommersheim's erudition, however, is not without limits. He cites typical law school resources -- cases, statutes, law reviews, and treatises -- embellished, it would appear, by whatever is within arm's reach on his own bookshelf -- the Holy Bible, Rolling Stone, the World Almanac. And although he does address potential contributions of "other disciplines, such as politics, history, economics, philosophy, and linguistics," (p. 105) he fails to suggest just how they might enhance "a better understanding of the reality and dilemma of tribal cultures and Indian law."

The book is divided into three parts. By centering his discussion in Part One on The Land -- the reservation -- rather than on Capitol Hill, Pommersheim draws attention to the core rather than the periphery. In so doing, he departs from the more common perspective in Indian Law in which the emphasis is on federal and state preemption of tribal sovereignty rather than its retention or enhancement. (See Chapter One, "The Reservation as Place"). The reservation is the site of the continuing sovereignty battle that rages over establishment, and diminishment, and control of the tribal home land base. I don't think he makes the point clearly enough, however, that reservations are usually not grants to Indians but are sacred homelands that are set aside, reserved from, grants to the United States. Nor does he show how the reservation system fit into the Jeffersonian program for social assimilation through cultural evolution (cf. J. Lobsenz, 1982: 4-5; A. Turner 1987: 322-324).

Pommersheim's analysis of the colonial context (Chapter Two) examines the constitutional, legislative, and judicial sources of federal Indian law: the law of conquest. He clarifies the distinctions between: (a) the legislative treaty-based tribal powers and federal obligations, (b) the federal trust relationship derived from decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and (c) the "pernicious 'plenary power' doctrine" (p. 40). Treaties are contracts between the tribes and the United States as coequals and as such are, or should be, the cornerstone of tribal sovereignty. They are, after all, the "Supreme Law of the Land" (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl.2).

The trust relationship is a guardian-ward relationship that recognizes the potential for overreaching by the more powerful United States. This doctrine reduced, or indeed elevated, some tribes to "domestic dependent nations" (citing *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, [1831] 30 U.S. [5 Pet.] 1, 17). Ultimately the fates of the tribes rests with the plenary power of Congress to abrogate treaties and to terminate the trust relationship with tribes. Pommersheim, with whom I agree on this point, finds this power to be most insidious and constitutionally unfounded. He suggests that in its decisions in *Kagama v. United States*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886), and *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock*, 104 U.S. 621 (1882), "the Court simply converted its perception of congressional practice into a valid constitutional doctrine without any legal support or analysis" (p. 47).

Emphasis shifts, in Part Two -- Justice, Liberation, and Struggle--to the task of building tribal courts. Pommersheim's focus on tribal courts as the "crucible of sovereignty" (Chapter Three) balances the emphasis on the erosion of sovereignty found in Charles F. Wilkinson's *American Indians, Time, and the Law* (1987). Pommersheim's view from the tribal bench also stands in useful counterpoint to that of Judge William Canby of the Ninth Circuit appellate bench, whose excellent primer examines federal law about Indians (1981). (These three books-- Pommersheim, Wilkinson, and Canby--are the essential trilogy for a quick comprehension of the field of Indian law. To this I would

add Felix Cohen's classic treatise, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (1942) which first synthesized the field).

Pommersheim's advocacy begins with the fundamental problem of establishing courts with legitimacy. To vest a court with legitimate jurisdiction-- i.e. the right to speak the law with authority-- it must be grounded in agreed principles, be they implicit or explicit. He notes, almost in passing, that the "existence of tribal adjudicatory mechanisms... may have preexisted or existed in tandem with formally recognized [by the Secretary of Interior] tribal courts" (p 61). Here he cites, for example, the classic study by lawyer Karl Llewellyn and anthropologist E. Adamson Hoebel (1941) on Cheyenne jurisprudence.

Pommersheim, however, fails to take the next logical step of advocating the application of the methodology of anthropological jurisprudence to the discovery of contemporary Indian law. It is not as though the method lacks merit or utility. After all, Llewellyn, a founder of the "Realist Movement" in modern jurisprudence, used an anthropological approach to discover mercantile law and to document it in the Uniform Commercial Code! (R. Danzig 1975: 621, 626; W. Schnader 1967, A. Turner 1992: 391, 397-398; W. Twining 1973).

Instead, Pommersheim trips over the obvious and falls into the rather elusive vagaries of "Liberation, Dreams, and Hard Work" (Chapter Four) wherein he seeks "for relevant insights from other disciplines, such as politics, history, economics, philosophy, and linguistics" (p.105). I quarrel not with the contributions potential, and real, of those disciplines but wonder "Whether Anthropology" that "science of man" upon whose road Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes (1886) set lawyers seeking a foundation for their profession.

I do not mean to discount in any way the value of Pommersheim's broadly based humanism or his implicit call for the incorporation of indigenous philosophy, metaphor, and culture into the body of tribal jurisprudence. But I do wonder why anthropology is not accorded a role. Is it because of some probably well-deserved antipathy of the Studied toward the Scholars? Analysis of the reference structure of this otherwise erudite chapter suggests that Pommersheim's otherwise eclectic bookshelf houses neither Leopold Pospisil's *Anthropology of Law: A Comparative Theory* (1971) nor John van Willigen's *Anthropology in Use: A Source Book on Anthropological Practice* (1991).

Part Three--Issues in the Western Landscape--examines a few nettlesome areas wherein a truly sovereign tribal presence would be advantageous. Tribal-state relations (Chapter Five) are contoured by reference to the standoff between tribes and the states over such issues as taxation, land use, and natural resource allocation. His analysis of the Court's complex decision in *Brendale v. Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakima Indian Nation*, 409 U.S. 163 (1989) is keen. But the decision shows the disarray of the United States Supreme Court with respect to a cohesive federal Indian jurisprudence. The essence of that decision is that "yes, tribes can," and "no, tribes cannot" (and anything between) regulate land use on fee lands inside the reservation boundaries. Pommersheim suggests that the *Brendale* decision is made more coherent by reference to individual property rights associated with allotment properties sold into fee simple. Thus, an individual has relative freedom from tribal regulations on those more "private" lands (p.151). Although I do not disagree, I submit also that the Court bases its current decisions on erroneously decided precedent: e.g. the baseless assertion that "Indian reservations are parts of the states" *White Mountain Apache Tribe v. Arizona* 649 F.2d. 1274, 1281-82 (9th Cir. 1981). Such language, coming as it does from a federal court of appeals, corrodes the metal forged in the crucible of sovereignty.

In his next to last chapter (Chapter Six), Pommersheim offers some important suggestions about tribal economic development that could benefit from a broader perspective. But it does emphasize the need for caution in bringing on board any and every federal help program without first attempting to assess the consequences of its adoption.

In his concluding chapter, Pommersheim foresees a “New West” wherein Native Americans are full players contributing not just their exploitable natural resources but, more significantly, their vision, their spirituality, and their philosophies to a new solidarity. With a legitimate legal culture in place, this ideal is not naive but hopeful. Braid of Feathers could only benefit by including a chapter, (or by integrating such material chapter-by-chapter), showing case decisions from the numerous tribal courts across Indian Country and published in the *Indian Law Reporter*. These decisions show how tribal courts are addressing a wide range of legal issues.

Likewise, I am disappointed by the lack of discussion of the problem of appellate jurisdiction. What body of law would govern Indian appellate decisions? Are tribes like states whose supreme courts have final authority except in constitutional matters? Or are tribal courts to be like federal district courts whose law is articulated by circuit courts of appeals? Would the same court of appeals review, say Hopi and Navajo trial court decisions? Or would the fundamental linguistic and cultural distinctiveness of these immediate neighbors undermine the legitimacy of any appellate decision speaking to these two sovereigns? Would Hopi courts better be reviewed by a Puebloan appellate jurisdiction and Navajo with their cogenor Apache neighbors. If tribal jurisprudence is linguistically grounded (p. 105ff), would it not make sense to establish linguistically based rather than territorially based appellate jurisdiction? And what does this imply for full faith and credit? Would a decision made, for example, at a Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Court be valid universally, or just among other Shoshoneans? other Uto-Aztecans? other Idaho tribes? other “Basin-Plateau socio-political groups” (J. Steward 1938)? other states?

Although my notations may sound both positive and negative, it is the positive that I emphasize, for this work is to be regarded as a singular contribution. I hope that this review will encourage more, rather than fewer, people to seek out and digest this important work. I particularly recommend it to the tribal bar and bench, to federal and state agency personnel working on or on behalf of Indian reservations, to humanists and social scientists, and to those who would exercise “plenary authority” over the tribes -- members of the United States Congress.

References Cited

Canby, William.

1981. *American Indian Law in a Nutshell*. St. Paul: West.

Cohen, Felix.

1942. *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Reprinted, 1972, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Danzig, Richard.

1975. A Comment on Jurisprudence of the Uniform Commercial Code. *Stanford Law Review* 27: 621-635.

Holmes, Oliver W., Jr.

1886. The Law as a Profession. *American Law Review* 20: 741-742.

- Llewellyn, Karl, and E. Adamson Hoebel.
1941. *The Cheyenne Way: Conflict and Case Law in Primitive Jurisprudence*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Lobsenz, James E.
1982. 'Dependent Indian Communities': a Search for a Twentieth Century Definition. *Arizona Law Review* 24(1): 4-5.
- Pospisil, Leopold.
1971. *Anthropology of Law: A Comparative Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Schnader, William A.
1967. A Short History of the Preparation and Enactment of the Uniform Commercial Code. *University of Miami Law Review* 22: 1-12.
- Steward, Julian H.
1938. Basin Plateau Socio-Political Groups. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 120. Washington, DC: Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Turner, Allen C.
1987. Evolution, Assimilation, and State Control of Gambling in Indian Country: Is *Cabazon v. California* an Assimilationist Wolf in Preemption Clothing? *Idaho Law Review* 24: 317-338.
1992. Prolegomenon to a Forensic Cultural Anthropology. *American Journal of Trial Advocacy* 16: 391-415.
- Twining, William.
1973. *Karl Llewellyn and the Realist Movement*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- van Willigen, John.
1991. *Anthropology in Use: A Source Book on Anthropological Practice*. Boulder: Westview.
- Wilkinson, Charles F.
1987. *American Indians, Time, and the Law: Native Societies in a Modern Constitutional Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Becoming West Indian: Culture, Self, and Nation in St. Vincent, by Virginia Heyer Young. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993, 229 pp.

Reviewed by Helen I. Safa, Professor of Anthropology and Latin American Studies, University of Florida.

National identity has long been problematic in the small, open and dependent islands of the Caribbean, where a history of slavery and colonialism have brought about marked racial, religious and linguistic differences. Formation of a national identity was particularly difficult in the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean, where absentee plantation ownership predominated, and slaves generally were more prevalent than in most of the Hispanic Caribbean colonies. In the Hispanic Caribbean, by contrast, the

planter elite developed a strong sense of identification with the colonizing powers, and miscegenation between the white elite and black slaves led to the rapid rise of an intermediate free colored group (S. Mintz 1974; F. Knight 1990).

In *Becoming West Indian*, Young challenges the generally held view that national identity is only weakly formed in the English-speaking Caribbean. Young presents an ethnohistorical study of St. Vincent, a small island in the eastern Caribbean that remained under British rule until it was granted political independence in 1969. A major part of her book is devoted to an ethnographic study of a rural village conducted in 1972, complemented by two shorter field trips in the 1980s, and by archival research.

She argues that despite racial and class divisions, the village has a well-established Creole culture characteristic of the English-speaking Caribbean. She generalizes from this village to the whole island nation. Young appears to contradict herself, however, when in referring to the village she notes that “although cultural systems, thoughts and values are shared, there is low social cohesion, marked differences in living standards, and recognition of status differences” (p. 92). Shared culture should be expressed in some form of village solidarity, but there is no solidarity. Young's notion of rural culture as the basis of national identity is difficult to accept, and it is equally difficult to consider the village as “representative in some degree of the nation” (*ibid.*). Despite some mobility from the village peasantry into the urban middle class in recent years, the class and racial divisions of the village clearly are more marked in the capital, the center of the island's economy and home to its elite.

The disdain with which villagers regarded the national carnival, and their recreation of a more “authentic” version, suggest a sharp cultural divide between rural and urban residents, even on so small an island as St. Vincent. The peasantry, who form the bulk of the village population, probably do share a common culture born of years of struggle to obtain land and to make a living from it, first in arrowroot and now in banana production. But there is little evidence that this culture is shared with the elite, who remain quite Eurocentric in their orientation.

Young notes that in the colonial period, St. Vincent had the highest degree of absentee plantation owners of all the Windward Islands. Owner absenteeism, combined with a strong profit orientation, resulted in abysmal conditions on the sugar estates. As a result, emancipation was followed by a massive emigration of former slaves to work in Trinidad, Guiana, and more recently, to the U.S., especially New York City. The impact of emigration on national identity deserves more attention than Young gives it. An important effect of emigration may be to reinforce a sense of national unity in opposition to other islanders met abroad, while also serving to create a pan-West Indian identification in others. Because of its poverty and large-scale emigration, St. Vincent is a classic example of a “remittance society,” in which all classes are dependent on income from abroad, as Young's data demonstrate. Remittances enabled leaseholders to finally acquire land from reluctant estate owners, who preferred to let their land lie idle rather than divide it up; Young notes that even today land is still concentrated among large owners.

She also points to the prestige of British political culture as a symbol of national identity in St. Vincent, despite the fact that property requirements for voting disenfranchised large segments of the population for much of their history. She claims it was the respect for British culture that caused the slaves to side with the planters against the Black Caribs, who were themselves descendants of Maroons (runaway slaves) and Carib Indians who had been granted land rights in St. Vincent by the British and French.

The abrogation of these land rights led to war in 1795 and the defeat of the Black Caribs, which forced their mass relocation first to Roatan and then British Honduras (now Belize).

Young attempts to explain the slaves' allegiance to their masters by depicting plantation society as a "source of cultural identification" for slaves, which is difficult to comprehend given their oppressed status on the estates. The peasantry in the English-speaking Caribbean may have come to admire the law and order established by Westminster-style democratic politics compared to the violence in Haiti, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and other countries. Admiration for British culture also served to maintain a Eurocentric orientation, however, especially among the elite. Eurocentrism almost certainly stifled the sense of national identity and denigrated the African-derived components of Caribbean culture. A sense of national identity may be emerging in St. Vincent among the peasantry, but it does not appear to be shared with the elite. Thus Young's challenge to the prevailing view that national identity is weak in the English-speaking Caribbean remains unconvincing, at least to this reader.

References Cited

Knight, Franklin W.

1990. *The Caribbean: The genesis of a fragmented nationalism* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mintz, Sidney W.

1974. *Caribbean Transformations*. Chicago: Aldine.

Cultivating Crisis: The Human Costs of Pesticide Use in Latin America, by Douglas L. Murray; University of Texas Press (1994); xiv, 177 pp.

**Reviewed by William M. Loker, Department of Sociology,
Anthropology and Social Work, Mississippi State University.**

Cultivating Crisis came to me for review at a time when I had been reading a couple of other books on related themes (S. Stonich 1993, J. Vandermeer and I. Perfecto 1995) as well as reflecting on my own impressions gained from recent anthropological fieldwork in Central America. All three books--Murray's, Stonich's and Vandermeer and Perfecto's--deal with the political ecology of agrarian crisis in Central America. My recent fieldwork in Honduras put me dramatically back in touch with that crisis after a ten-year absence. What is evident from these books, and from my own experience, is that despite an overall reduction in political violence, which has allowed Central America to vanish from the headlines of U.S. newspapers, the region is gripped in its most serious crisis in recent history. This crisis is driven by multiple factors including population growth, extreme levels of social and economic inequality, and the exhaustion of both contemporary

development models and the natural resources that support household incomes and agricultural exports in the region.

As Murray's book (and the others) make clear, it is not a pretty sight when viewed in human terms--from the perspective of the people living this crisis--or in ecological terms--from the point of view of the survival of nonhuman species and ecosystems. And unfortunately, the complexity of the interlocking crises leave little cause for optimism.

Development funds are being withdrawn from Central America as USAID and other donors move on to other more pressing crises, leaving the aid-dependent economies of the region to stumble through the denouement of the political and economic crisis of the 1980s, including: a surfeit of guns (now in criminal hands) left over from various insurgencies and counter-insurgencies; "free trade" zones of maquiladora sweat shops; and various regional versions of "Economic Structural Adjustment Packages." Murray's book makes one wonder if the withdrawal of USAID is an entirely negative phenomenon, given the human and environmental costs of USAID's predominant development paradigm: export agriculture.

To confess, I picked up Murray's book prepared to be disappointed. What more can be written or said about pesticide abuse in the Third World after the classic, *Circle of Poison* (D. Weir and M. Schapiro 1981)? How serious could pesticide poisoning be, in the context of the need to intensify food production on a limited, unequally distributed and deteriorating land base? But Murray's book is convincing regarding the magnitude and importance of pesticide abuse in both human and ecological terms. The premeditated, profit-driven, evil practice of dumping dangerous pesticides on Third World markets (meaning Third World people) continues unabated, despite *Circle's* devastating critique. Murray effectively analyzes the forces underlying this phenomenon and begins to document its seriousness.

Cultivating Crisis focuses on two main cases of pesticide abuse: cotton and non-traditional exports (NTAX). Geographically, the focus is on Central America with additional material from the Dominican Republic. The subtitle of the book is quite misleading in this sense. The book does not offer comprehensive coverage of Latin America--aside from a few sketchy references to the Cañete Valley in Peru, South America is barely mentioned. There is also little discussion of the use of pesticides in the banana industry, a major user of pesticides and the subject of recent lawsuits throughout Central America by thousands of workers sterilized by the use of the herbicide, DBCP. Murray has also missed the story on the chemicals most widely used by small farmers in Central America: herbicides, especially the notorious paraquat (Gramoxone). My fieldwork in Honduras indicates that this class of chemicals is the pesticide most widely used and abused in Central America, with excessive rates of application, unsafe handling and tremendous potential for negative health effects among the small farmers who use it. If anything, however, these oversights should only serve to increase our alarm regarding pesticide abuse in Central America. The situation as described by Murray in cotton and NTAX is extremely serious. That this is only the partial story is truly alarming.

Murray has done an exemplary job in documenting the rise and fall of cotton in Central America. This boom began in the late 1950s and continued until the late 1980s. The boom was centered on the Pacific Coast of Central America: in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala. The boom was made possible by pesticides; its undoing was largely caused by pest resistance and the rising costs of production driven by increasingly heavy and frequent doses of pesticides. Live by the sword, die by the sword. Sadly, while fortunes were being made and lost, those who suffered from pesticide use were the hundreds of

thousands of workers--mostly seasonal, poorly paid, migrant laborers--exposed to increasingly toxic chemicals. Cotton is the heaviest user of pesticides, both in the U.S. and the Third World. When inserted into the social context of Central American agriculture, cotton proved extremely dangerous. Poor working conditions, low educational levels, rapid turnover among workers, and other conditions conspired to increase pesticide exposure rates among workers in the region. Also, pesticide companies and salespersons are the main source of information on pesticide use, an obvious conflict of interest. Field research reported by Murray demonstrates that official statistics "so dramatically under represented the actual rates of [pesticide] poisoning that they were almost meaningless" (p. 46).

The second case treated by Murray is the boom in nontraditional exports, or NTAX as they are often referred to in the literature (see B. Barham, et al. 1992 for a recent review). NTAX include fruits, vegetables, and flowers for export to northern markets. NTAX were widely promoted by USAID in the 1980s as the solution to the Central American agrarian crisis. High value products, it was claimed that they were scale-neutral, or even scale-negative, and thus appropriate for small farmers in Central America and the Caribbean. (This view has been challenged by P. Rosset 1991). NTAX have grown dramatically in Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean, not to mention Chile, Colombia and some other South American countries. Unfortunately, these crops are highly susceptible to pest damage, especially when monocropped in tropical environments. Thus, NTAX cultivators have been forced and/or encouraged to jump on the "pesticide treadmill" as means of guaranteeing yields and meeting the cosmetic standards of exporters selling to finicky U.S. consumers, just as cotton producers did thirty years ago. Murray documents the health effects of the principal pesticides used by farmers and farm workers in the NTAX industry. He also documents the increasing problem of pesticide residues on produce imported into the U.S. from the region. U.S. government controls of contaminated imported produce are scandalously lax. Remember that next time you eat an imported melon or snowpeas from the region.

What's to be done? Murray disparages the "safe use" movement --the attempt by chemical companies to curb the worst of pesticide abuse through programs of education and the promotion of safer handling and application of chemicals. According to the author, there are too many structural barriers to safe use practices in the region. Promotion of safe use must come from third parties, not connected to the chemical corporations who have a vested interest in selling more chemicals or the growers who have a manifest unconcern for worker safety. The logical candidate for such a role is the government. But governments lack the human resources, infrastructure and, in many cases, the will to tackle this problem. If anything, in the era of structural adjustment and shrinking state budgets, the prospect for effective control over and education regarding pesticides, is slim indeed. Integrated pest management (IPM) has great potential in the region (as elsewhere) but has been hampered by a lack of commitment and many of the same structural barriers plaguing safe use. Who will pay for IPM? Governments? Growers? Non-government organizations? Until a commitment is made to reduce pesticide use through IPM and other regenerative agricultural techniques, the people and environment of Central America will continue to suffer the ravages of chemical poisoning.

In summary, Murray's book is informative and thought-provoking, if incomplete. It adds yet another piece to the drama of deteriorating human well-being and environmental degradation in Central America. It does little, however, to move us beyond chronicles of a crisis foretold or toward a solution to this crisis -- or rather the interlocking, multiple

crises, of which pesticide abuse is but one symptom. As social scientists, we are very adept at documenting these crises. What can we contribute to their solution?

References Cited

- Barham, Bradford, M. Clark, E. Katz and S. Schurman.
1992. Non-traditional Exports in Latin America. *Latin America Research Review* 27(2):43-82.
- Rosset, Peter.
1991. Sustainability, Economies of Scale and Social Instability: The Achilles Heel of Non-traditional Export Agriculture? *Agriculture and Human Values* 8(4):30-37.
- Stonich, Susan.
1993. *I am Destroying the Land: The Political Ecology of Poverty and Environmental Destruction in Honduras*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Vandermeer, John and Ivette Perfecto
1995 *Breakfast of Biodiversity: The Truth about Rainforest Destruction*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.
- Weir, David, and Mark Schapiro.
1981. *Circle of Poison: Pesticides and People in a Hungry World*. San Francisco: Institute for Food and Development Policy.

Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation, by Andrew Armitage; Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1995. xiii + 286 pp.

Reviewed by Kingsley Palmer, Deputy Principal, Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra, Australia.

This is a comparative study, as the title suggests, covering three colonial jurisdictions; Canada, New Zealand and Australia. The focus for the work is 'assimilation,' a policy more readily associated with the late 1950s than with the present in Australia and New Zealand, at least. The author defines the assimilationist years for Australia as "1930-70" (p. 14), which helps to provide some time frame within which to judge this account. It is not clear from what follows, however, whether this is a historical account or a contemporary one, nor whether policies based on welfare, assimilation and integration are differentiated.

The book starts with a general introduction to the subject of colonialism and a brief explanation for the choice of the "comparative" method. Reasons are also provided for the choice of the three study areas, along with a description of sources and methods. Chapters Two through Seven describe the Australian (pp. 14-69), Canadian (pp. 70-135), and New Zealand (pp. 136-184) situations. For each area, Armitage devotes one of the chapters to "Child Welfare Policy," giving clear direction to his approach to the subject. As he notes in

the Preface, he is a 'social worker' whose primary concern has been with "child welfare policies" (p. xii). He further notes, "Child welfare policies serve as a [sic] detailed examples of how general policies of assimilation have been pursued" (pp***). By documenting the indigenous policies put in place by colonial regimes, particularly with respect to children, Armitage hopes to clarify the administrative reasoning that led to these policies.

One of the major problems with a book that attempts to cover a great deal of ground is the necessary tension between detail and generalization. The Australian material is covered rapidly and with difficulty. Wisely limiting his field to New South Wales, Queensland and the Northern Territory, it is still almost impossible to reflect the true state of over 200 years of policy accurately in just a few pages. Whereas an overall impression of a shift from initial contact and conflict to protection, through to welfare and assimilation is achieved, the reader is left wondering whether such a summary account can contribute much to the debate. Moreover, the data are limited, with 1986 figures being the latest quoted. There is no reference to the major land rights reforms of the 1970s--the Northern Territory Land Rights Act, 1974--or the National Land Rights legislation of the 1980s (never enacted), all of which had considerable impact on the rising tide of self-determination for indigenous people in Australia. Most important of all, no mention is made of the creation by the Federal Government of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) in 1989, which represented a major step in self-determination for indigenous Australians, and perhaps, in times to come, for some form of limited regional self-government. Nor is there any mention of either the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody or the huge body of materials that were developed as a consequence.

Of course things change very rapidly in a country like Australia. Even five years ago, however, Armitage's following statement would not have held true: "the general assumption of Australian writers and officials is that, eventually, Aboriginals will be assimilated into white society... it is generally believed that... in the end there will be one integrated society living under one set of public institutions and laws" (pp. 68-69). This flies in the face of all the available evidence: Australia's multicultural policy, its various recognitions of Customary Law, the granting of land rights, the recent High Court decision to recognize Native Title and the subsequent Commonwealth legislation affecting such recognition to the whole of Australia. The statement may have been true twenty five years ago but it reflects neither government policy nor a general public view today.

The chapter covering Canada's history of native policies is even more compact. Covering over 450 years (rather than just over 200), the author is, nevertheless, clearer about the divisions of time, separating early contact from later phases and distinguishing assimilation, integration and finally self-government. I am not in a position to comment on the accuracy of the summary, for summary it must be, except to note that once again the data are disappointingly dated for a book published in 1995. I could find neither figures post-dating the 1986 census nor any reference to recent events. The chapter ends on the banal note that, "the current period of administrative activity tends to be characterized by uncertainty, conflicting objectives and political manoeuvring" (p. 99). One wonders what period in history was not so characterized. The chapter on child welfare policies in Canada has some recent references, but depends quite heavily on detail extracted from other writers (e.g., pp. 109-113 provide details of a 'residential school'). The overall effect is impressionistic and general rather than specific, with only superficial analysis.

The two chapters on New Zealand follow in similar fashion. The author notes in particular that the Treaty of Waitangi provided a very different context to that evident in both Australia and Canada. The treaty "gives added force to the cultural and political

reality of a Maori community sufficiently organized to assert direct influence on the development of social policy” (p. 184). Despite this positive assertion, however, Armitage earlier states that, “the policies of integration established in the 1960s... remain in effect in the day-to-day operation of New Zealand social and educational services” (p. 159). Integration is differentiated from assimilation (pp. 142-146) which raises broader questions about the scope and focus of the whole work.

The last two chapters represent a comparative analysis of the three study areas. In comparing the “similarities and differences” the author selects six issues for attention: social policy, labeling of indigenous peoples, instruments of government policy, separation of children, regional and demographic differences, and recovery of indigenous peoples. The main instruments for comparison are tables that set out comparative data but introduce novel policy period definitions (“Paternalism: Protection;” “Paternalism: Assimilation;” “Integration” and “Pluralist”). This is puzzling in the light of the previous chapters where such categories are more or less absent. At the beginning of the last chapter, Armitage states, “it has been shown that Australia, Canada and New Zealand had, in common, a general policy of aboriginal assimilation” (p. 220). The chapter then goes on to “understand aboriginal assimilation” by looking at trace relations, colonialism, ethno nationalism and social policy. Although the descriptive accounts of the four issues are adequate, it is difficult to see exactly where the analysis is going except to some general conclusions about the nature of colonialism and the powerless state of indigenous peoples when their land is appropriated.

This book's major contribution is to provide a summary of the history of government policies in the three countries and a potted overview of the events of colonization. As a comparison of policies, however, it lacks the focus and definition of a work that identifies the major issues and brings them to a compelling comparison. This is, for the most part, a consequence of a failure to clearly define the policy terms. The author has conflated “assimilation” with the context of a whole range of other issues and policies from which it is in fact distinct. It is rather as if the author sees “assimilation” as a matter of colonialism and exploitation, a generic terms that encapsulates the history of indigenous peoples in three countries. Clearly, the situation is not as simple as that. The result is that tough issues and complex policy strands are ignored or become lost in generalizations and summary statements.

Social Ecology, Edited by Ramchandra Guha; Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology. Delhi: Oxford University Press. 1994. x,398 pp.

Reviewed by Satadal Dasgupta Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Prince Edward Island.

Social Ecology is a collection of sixteen papers on social ecology in India, all but one of which are excerpts from previously published sources. In a crisply written introduction to the volume, editor Guha points out the increasing public concern for the various forms of environmental degradation in India. Guha observes that while natural scientists as well

as environmental journalists and activists have made significant contributions to the understanding of social implications of environmental degradation, the “environmental crisis has caught the social science community unawares” even though it is “well within the purview of social sciences” (p.2). He argues, perhaps correctly, that any concern with ecological variables in India has been viewed as irresponsible and as an irrelevant constraint to the urgent efforts for development because of the emphasis on rapid industrialization and development after independence from British rule in 1947 and the consequent intellectual domination of economics.

Guha argues in favor of creating an “environmentally oriented sociology” and suggests that the inclusion of “ecological infrastructure” at the base of the four existing broad categories of sociologists’ “model of society”-- economy, social structure, polity, and culture, arranged in a pyramidal fashion -- will not only incorporate ecology in the theory of society but will also allow an examination of its reciprocal relations with the four major societal elements. The four sectional themes used to organize the sixteen papers are presumably based on this model of environmentally oriented sociology, each section indicating one of several directions the study of social ecology might take in India.

The five papers included in the first section, ‘Nature and Culture,’ focus on the close interdependence among nature, society, and culture. The section starts with a paper by Radhakamal Mukherjee, one of India’s revered pioneers in sociology who pointed out as early as 1930, when the paper was originally published, the interactive and dynamic relationships between nature and culture. In another interesting paper, M. Gadgil and K.C. Malhotra show how nine different castes in the western region of the Maharashtra state have coexisted for generations adapting to specific niches of their environment. The effects of environment on the social structure and culture are further demonstrated by J. Mencher who shows how the differences in settlement patterns and authority and caste structures between two southern states, Kerala and Madras (now Tamilnadu), can be explained in terms of differences in the intensity of monsoon rains, water tables, and other natural features. The final two papers of the section, by M. Gadgil and V.D. Vartak and by M. Dove respectively, deal with the sacred uses of nature and their implications for conservation and the dialectical relation between nature and culture as evident in the natives’ view of the “jungle.”

The second and longest section, ‘The Sociology of Resource Use and Abuse,’ includes six papers dealing with, as the title of the section indicates, use and abuse of four major natural resources --water, forest, pastures, and fisheries -- and their implications for social structure. The first two papers examine how use of water affects social structure: R. Mukherjee’s paper argues that use of water as a scarce resource contributes to certain specific types of community organizations; N. Sengupta’s paper draws attention to the social relations that emerge based on irrigation works. The paper by E. Whitcombe has, as the editor points out, “a markedly contemporary ring” in that it shows the negative consequences of the canal systems built during the British period in northern India. Although they contributed to higher productivity and income as farmers shifted to the cultivation of cash crops, the large canal systems also brought water salinity, water logging, and spread of malaria. The last three papers of the section deal with the use of common property resources: the first two, by N.S. Jodha and by V. Vidyarthi, discuss the importance of common property resources to rural economy and the negative consequences of their depletion for the rural poor. The last paper by J. Kurien and T.K. Thankappan Achari deals with the disastrous effects of large trawlers on fishermen using the traditional artisanal craft.

Competition for resources among different groups is further illustrated in the three papers included in the third section: 'Competing Claims Over Nature.' Excerpts from V. Elwin's (1939) classic ethnography *The Baiga of Central India*, for example, describe how British colonial officials' establishment of commercial forestry and effort to wean the tribe away from "inferior" shifting cultivation caused irreparable damage to the Baiga economy and culture. The second paper, authored by the editor of the volume, describes a similar conflict between the state forestry and local peasants in the Kumaun region to whom access to forests and pastures was crucial for their economic activities. In the last paper, written especially for the volume, R. Sukumar provides a highly interesting analysis of the conflict between wild life and humans competing for the same natural resources.

The final section of the volume, 'Towards an Environmental Renewal,' includes only two papers, both of which, according to the words of the editor, are "at once reflective and programmatic" and offer diagnoses of "the social processes behind ecological degradation even as they outline the elements of an environmentally benign, and socially humane, strategy of development" (p.319). In his paper, A.K.N. Reddy cautions against injudicious adoption and application of modern technology by developing countries without first assessing their effects on the natural environment and the existing sociocultural conditions. A. Agarwal in the last paper also illustrates the connection between intensification of resource use through modern technology and environmental degradation and poverty.

The volume, meant primarily for use by students, will no doubt serve as an excellent text for a course on social ecology. As the first such volume of readings on social ecology in India, the book indeed provides a "compact and analytically sophisticated overview" of the field, as claimed on the jacket. The publishers must be congratulated for the Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology series, not only for the superior quality of the volumes published so far, but also for their careful printing and fine production.

Land in African Agrarian Systems. Thomas J. Bassett and Donald E. Crummey, editors. Madison, WI. and London: University of Wisconsin Press. 1993. xi, 418 pp.

**Reviewed by Stephen P. Reyna, Professor and Chair of Anthropology,
University of New Hampshire, Durham.**

The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, during its Center for African Studies 1988 spring symposium, considered the topic of land in African agrarian systems. The resulting volume, *Land in African Agrarian Systems*, includes an introduction and thirteen papers analyzing African land tenure in the 1970s and 1980s. Below I give readers some appreciation of the substance of these papers and of a research priority that they suggest.

The volume is divided into three sections: one addressing questions of flexibility and conflict in indigenous landholding systems, another concerning access to land and agrarian politics, and a third considering agricultural performance under conditions of

radical agrarian reform. (Papers, with the exception of the introduction, are discussed in the order that they appear in the volume.)

There are five papers in the first section. John Bruce's piece responds to criticisms of indigenous tenure systems concerning their adequacy with regard to investment security, efficient resource allocation, the securing of credit, and land transfers. Steven Lawry and Mahir Saul write respectively about Lesotho and Burkina Faso. Their case studies emphasize the flexibility of indigenous tenure systems by explaining how land borrowing and leasing arrangements accommodate the needs of landless and commercial farmers in areas with different population densities. Saul further challenges the unilinear evolutionary model of land tenure that sees changes in tenure as inevitably leading to individual private property. Richard Werbner and Thomas Bassett analyze conflicts over land use and control in pastoral development. Werbner considers how "competitive and disunited elites" accumulate land in Botswana. Bassett explains how a "technocratic" approach to livestock development generated conflict that obstructed both the expansion of livestock production and agricultural intensification in the Ivory Coast.

The second section consists of three articles. Michael Watts seeks to understand the "dissent" between husbands and wives over access to land in Gambian households due to a "tightly regimented" production regime introduced by an irrigated rice development project. He argues that this conflict involves "interpretive struggles over socially dominant representations" that are resolved through "negotiation." Fiona Mackenzie continues the analysis of struggles between men and women for access to land. She shows how Kikuyu men in Kenya seek to control land claimed by women through the manipulation of customary inheritance rules of the *mbari*, the basic, "traditional" kin and territorial unit. Peter Bloch considers changing patterns of land access in an irrigated rice project along the Senegal River showing how local elites, some with national political connections, seek to exclude subordinate groups, including women, from access to improved land. There are five articles in the final, radical agrarian reform section. Okoth-Ogendo assesses tenure reform policies in eastern and southern Africa, on the basis of which he concludes that agrarian reform, as currently practiced, is unlikely to produce any "turnaround." Dessalegn Rahmato evaluates the consequences of Ethiopia's 1975 radical land reform decree. His evidence shows that peasant production, despite a massive channeling of resources to the collective sector, outperformed cooperatives and state farms. Michael Roth analyses the impacts of Somalia's land reform which also began in 1975. His data suggest increased peasant insecurity, rural land speculation by urban elites, and reduced flexibility of indigenous tenure systems with little progress made toward either productivity or equity. Merle Bowen focuses upon what happens when a country, in this case Mozambique, abandons an orthodox socialist path of agricultural development based on collective agriculture with a heavy reliance upon state farms in favor of one oriented to private and peasant farming. She finds, for one irrigated rice scheme, that output is up; but that this is "at the expense of greater inequality." The final contribution to the volume, that of Terence Ranger, analyses agrarian reform in the communal areas of Zimbabwe. Ranger shows how the category of "communal tenure" is a colonial construct. He further documents how established commercial farmers have succeeded in shifting the discussion from land redistribution for land hungry poorer farmers to tenure reform within Communal Areas, a discussion that furthers their interests.

Thomas Bassett has written a fine introduction that summarizes the authors' major findings, compares and integrates these, and--on the basis of this analysis--argues the volume's central conclusions: that present tenure reforms are not a "cure-all" for African agriculture, and that future reform strategies had best work with the "strengths" of

indigenous systems if they propose to have any chance of success. I would go further and propose that the volume suggests an important research priority.

Downs and Reyna (1988) and Reyna (1987) have argued that African land distribution is becoming increasingly inequitable. The essays in this volume support this view. However, they document that the processes by which land inequalities are maturing are complex. Certainly, men acquire land at the expense of women; equally certainly, elites are concentrating land at the expense of everyone else. But, as Watts informs readers, women contest land grabs by their men, so that gender inequalities are not a foregone conclusion. Further, the concept of "elite" turns out to be extremely intricate. There are different sorts of local elites--including chiefs, nobles, religious leaders, regional officials, and regional businessfolk--as well as different sorts of national elites such as politicians with positions in the central government, officials in non-African bilateral or multilateral government agencies, and the officers of national and multinational firms. Sometimes these different elites can be in alliance, as appears to be the case Bloch describes for Senegal. At other times, they are in competition, as Werbner emphasizes for Botswana. Evidence from other areas of the globe with long established patterns of land concentration indicates that such distributions can be associated with indifferent agricultural performance. This means that explanation of growing inequalities in land distribution, especially as these are related to output and productivity, may be central to improving African agricultural performance, and thus should be accorded a priority in forthcoming African land tenure researches.

Finally, Thomas Bassett and Donald Crummey, the volume's editors, are to be congratulated. They have crafted one of the richest documents concerning African land tenure to ever appear. It is a must read for those interested in agriculture, development, and Africa.

References

Downs, R.E. and S.P. Reyna (editors).

1988. *Land and Society in Contemporary Africa*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Reyna, S.P.

1987. The Emergence of Land Concentration in the West African Savanna. *American Ethnologist*, 14(3):523-541.

An Occasion for War: Civil Conflict in Lebanon and Damascus in 1860, by Leila Fawaz, University of California Press (1994) xv, 302 pp.

Reviewed by Akram Khater, Department of History, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Leila Fawaz's book, *An Occasion for War: Civil Conflict in Lebanon and Damascus in 1860*, is a mixture of rich historical detail and bare thread analysis. This discordant combination stems from the author's central purpose for writing this book. As Professor Fawaz states in her preface, she consciously digs up the events of the civil conflicts of the nineteenth century in order to find lessons pertinent to the civil war that wracked Lebanon

from 1975 till 1990. In particular, she is looking for clues on how to (re-)gain communal harmony in a sectarian Lebanon. Such a formidable task, by any means, clearly constrains Professor Fawaz into walking a thin line of objective history even when she is aware of the subjectivity inherent in any historical narrative. Professor Fawaz believes that clues to understanding these incidents of sectarian strife are to be found in the relationship between state and society. Specifically, she believes that weakening of central state power--Ottoman in these cases--and the disruption of traditional urban-rural leadership networks, coupled with socioeconomic changes, led to a political space that was filled by sectarian networks. In other words, sectarianism is a sociocultural construction that is induced by external factors. In the remainder of the book Professor Fawaz attempts to demonstrate these arguments through a historical narrative of the events.

Starting with sketches of these areas before the outbreak of hostilities, Professor Fawaz writes of societies that maintained some semblance of harmonious co-existence between sects. Yet such communal equilibrium was upset by a variety of historical changes. After the 1830s, both Damascus and Mount Lebanon were being drawn into the world capitalist system. Trade and agriculture were the two conduits through which European capitalists obtained raw material for their factories and in return sent finished goods for the markets of Beirut and Damascus. In the process, local industry and merchants--mostly Muslim--were hurt by European competition for markets and primary material. At the same time a new bourgeoisie--mostly Christian and Jewish -- prospered as the go-between for local markets and international financiers. Politically, these economic changes exacerbated the decline in the control of the existent elite, which was mostly made up Muslim, with some Christian, families. At the same time the Ottoman empire was suffering from economic distress caused by a similar growing dependency on the West. Political reorganization meant to alleviate the financial difficulties of the central government translated into weakened control over the outlying provinces, including Mount Lebanon and Damascus.

With the stage thus set, Professor Fawaz proceeds to write of the conflicts. Alternating between Damascus and Mount Lebanon, she writes of the events of the conflicts, Ottoman and European responses to the violence, and settlements reached in both places. Professor Fawaz chronicles the incident of Damascus as a clear case of violence perpetrated by Muslims against Christians. Whether in telling of the events leading to the outbreak of death and destruction, or in the story of atrocities committed, she clearly and squarely places the blame on the Muslims of the city of Damascus. Although she punctuates her description by telling of many prominent Muslims who tried to assist the attacked Christians as much as possible, she leaves no doubt that other leaders of the community participated directly and indirectly in the violence visited upon the Christian quarters. Moreover, she argues -- quite effectively -- that the local Ottoman governor and garrison did nothing to stop the massacres, and if anything, many of the irregular soldiers took active part in the atrocities. In sharp contrast, Professor Fawaz paints a most laudatory picture of the special Ottoman emissary Fuad Pasha, who was sent to re-establish order in the region, and of his decisive actions in meting out justice and paying retributions for the Christians of the city.

Events in Mount Lebanon were hardly portrayed in so clear-cut a manner. There, Professor Fawaz argues, the blame for violence rests more or less equally with both parties. On one hand, she highlights the belligerent attitudes of the Christians' leadership, secular and religious, toward the Muslim communities and their political chieftains. Furthermore, in her narrative of the civil war she points to many instances where it was the

Christians, particularly the Maronites, who launched attacks on Druze communities. And although she acknowledges that numerous massacres were committed by Druzes against Christian communities, especially in southern Lebanon, she is quick to note that the Christians were not absolutely guiltless but rather leaderless. In other words, their loss did not result from their status as victims, but rather from tactical problems coordinating efforts against their highly unified enemies. Ultimately, this conflict was also squelched with the arrival of Ottoman and French troops who forcibly separated the belligerents and set about restoring order. Even more than in Damascus, in Mount Lebanon European consuls played an important role in arriving at a settlement of the problems that would guarantee relative peace in that region. With each European power supporting a particular sectarian community, (French and Catholics, British and the Druzes, Russians and the Greek Orthodox), and the Ottomans attempting to reassert a centralized control over Mount Lebanon, negotiations were complicated and drawn out. A resolution was reached by which Mount Lebanon would be governed, however, as a semi-independent province, by a Christian Ottoman administrator approved by the European Powers.

Professor Fawaz concludes by drawing comparisons between the 1860 and 1975 civil conflicts in Lebanon. Here, again, she finds re-affirmation of her belief that as long as strong central governments maintained a balance between the different sectarian communities, then social relations were harmonious. Furthermore, she finds a twentieth century equivalent for disruptive socioeconomic changes in the ascendancy of a Christian bourgeoisie faced with a dispossessed Shi'ite community. Finally, she points to the susceptibility of internal factions to manipulation by foreign forces during a period of crisis.

Overall, Professor Fawaz clearly presents in this book an impressive and exhaustive archival research into the history of the civil conflicts of Mount Lebanon and Damascus. Furthermore, for the first time we have a well-written and comprehensive narrative of the events of these conflicts. Yet, this book is less successful in many other respects. Most evident is the lack of a strong analytical framework that brings together the various elements of the book. For example, although Professor Fawaz spends at least one third of the book on describing the conflict in Damascus, she does not make use of it in her final analysis, and one is left wondering why she included that whole section in her narrative.

Equally troubling is the cursory attention that Professor Fawaz pays to the changes in the social and economic structures of Mount Lebanon and Damascus. Despite her claim to a history that straddles the society-state nexus, Professor Fawaz distinctly places greater causal weight on the political structures and maneuverings. In fact, she has done little to integrate the elements of social and economic change in analyzing why peasants in Mount Lebanon and urbanites in Damascus resorted to sectarian violence. Whenever she touches upon social historical issues, she does so with overly general statements resorting to the same essentialist descriptions of Lebanese society which previous observers have exhausted. For instance, the Druzes are portrayed as warlike and far too homogeneous in their political outlook. Honor is presented as a monolithic structure that cuts across social structures in a wide swath with little attention to the variations that existed within this sociocultural institution. One could dismiss such criticism as overly particular, if it wasn't the case that Professor Fawaz goes to great pains to nuance all the political maneuverings at the same time that she indulges in such frivolous generalities. This is not a case of lack of ability -- for Professor Fawaz distinguishes herself with exacting attention to detail--but rather a failure to take into serious account the socioeconomic factors that led to civil

conflict in Mount Lebanon and Damascus, and that later influenced the outcome of these historical events.

Such failure is hardly academic. If one is to accept the purpose of Professor Fawaz's travails, namely the construction of a solution for Lebanon's current problems from the lessons of the past, then the final question is: are the lessons complete? Unfortunately, the answer is no. Professor Fawaz contends that the lack of a strong central government to keep harmony between various communities is the ultimate cause of the conflicts. What she fails to acknowledge, however is that such equilibrium can never be maintained for a long time, regardless of the central government, because the latter is in many ways a reflection of the mosaic of communities. It is only when these communities find a common sense of identity and purpose that a strong central government can emerge. Thus, by paying almost exclusive attention to the political details of the conflicts, Professor Fawaz has failed to truly straddle the society-state nexus, and thus to provide her readers with a complete account of the conflicts. Yet, despite these shortcomings I would recommend *An Occasion for War* as a very good narrative history of these particular civil conflicts, as well as a starting point for understanding sectarianism.

**Claims-making as Social Science: A Review of
Environmental Values in American Culture, by Willett
Kempton, James S. Boster, and Jennifer A. Hartley;
Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press 1995. xii, 226 pp., 4
appendices.**

**Reviewed by Thomas Greider, Associate Professor of Community and
Environmental Sociology University of Kentucky.**

This book is easy to read. It will likely be popular among environmentalists globalist-oriented politicians, and social scientists who have adopted the now taken-for-granted mantra about “global environmental change” and the anthropogenic “causes” of such. The premises of this book fall easily in line with a number of “global environmental change” books written by people who are funded by NSF, NOAA, and NASA. Indeed, the first paragraphs of many of these books are interchangeable and are familiar to many. In the words of Kempton, Boster, and Hartley:

The natural world is constantly changing. But today's multiple simultaneous changes are unprecedented and, in the view of some scientists, potentially catastrophic. For the first time, the primary driving force of planet-scale change is humanity, with our growing numbers and increasingly disruptive activities. Major global-scale changes include ozone depletion, species extinctions, and global warming. Scientists cannot predict the ultimate effects of these global changes--their scope and pace have no precedents in human history and few precedents in the geological history of the earth (p. 1).

With this book, Kempton and colleagues aim to explicate the belief systems and values that they contend are located at the foundation of popular environmentalism in the U.S. To do so, they undertook a two-stage investigation, beginning with open-ended interviews that are intended to have people explain their insights and beliefs in their own words. The second stage of data collection involved a structured interview format, with composite statements developed from an analysis of transcripts from the initial open-ended interviews. Data-collection methods are extensively described. For doing so, the authors are to be applauded. The scrutiny this description invites, however lays bare a footing that is far too shaky to support the claims that Kempton and his colleagues seek to make either about the components and causes of popular environmental values in the U.S., or about the cultural models that exist across the American public.

At the outset I want it understood that I *do not* share the authors' unquivering acceptance of the "global environmental change" premises. I have absolutely no idea whether global warming, for example, will occur during the next decade or sometime during the next century (although I always wonder what those other scientists--S. Fred Smith or Robert C. Balling for example--might have to say as they are seldom [never] noted in the first paragraphs of books such as this). As a sociologist, however, it is absolutely clear to me that some groups of people, including (unfortunately) many social scientists, are making claims about catastrophic, human-caused global environmental change, and are calling for all sorts of political and social action in the name of those claims. The authors of this book have incorporated such claims into their research design and, with the inclusion of other equally questionable research techniques, have thereby produced a tract, rather than a social science book.

I focus this review on the authors' methods, their findings, and their interpretations of their findings. After reading the book several times, I am forced to conclude that the authors stretch the limits of their data by confusing facts with interpretations and by simply confusing their readers. Uncontrolled systematic bias runs throughout their qualitative and quantitative methods and interpretations. The following is a main conclusion that cannot be supported by their methods, data, inferences, and interpretations:

In short, we found a coherent, shared set of environmental beliefs and values, but contrasting beliefs and values that might be an alternative are neither shared nor a coherent set.... In a sentence, lay environmentalism is built upon cultural models of how nature works and how humanity interacts with it, and is motivated by environmental values.... American environmentalism represents a consensus view, its major tenets are held by large majorities, and it is not opposed on its own terms by any alternative coherent belief system (pp. 215-216).

The primary data collected by the authors came from semistructured interviews and a "survey." Semistructured interviews were conducted with 46 informants which included "twenty lay informants as well as approximately five each from four specialist groups: grassroots environmentalists, coal industry workers, congressional staff working on environmental legislation, and automotive engineers" (p. 20). Turning to Appendices A and B, we learn more about the informants. There were 43 usable interviews. Of the 20 lay informants, 14 came from a "near-urban community" in New Jersey; the remainder came from "rural central Maine. The Maine interviewer... grew up in the area and selected informants from acquaintances with a diversity of backgrounds" (p. 228). We also learn that "approximately two-thirds of those approached [in the New Jersey community] declined to be interviewed" (p. 228). We are left with the unstated assumptions that we should simply trust the interviewer's selection of "acquaintances," that those who declined

to be interviewed are similar to those who participated, and that residents of the Northeast are similar to residents of the Intermountain West, for example. Given the forceful new social movements gaining support in communities throughout the West, such as the property-rights movement and the “Take Back the West” movement, (which the authors cavalierly dismiss in a footnote) there is little basis for confidence in these assumptions.

Respondents for the “fixed-form survey” were selected according to an unconventional strategy that does not permit any type of generalization beyond the respondents themselves. They were chosen from environmental groups, residents of northern and southern California suburbs, dry cleaning store owners, and sawmill workers enrolled in retraining classes. The Earth First! group consisted of 31 respondents (out of an unknown number of prospects) who attended either a national meeting in Vermont or a regional meeting in Wisconsin. The authors report (p. 233) that the fieldworker who attended the meetings judged “that overall the sample is pretty representative of Earth First!” Without additional information, one is hard-pressed to determine the population to which generalizations might be inferred from the survey results. The Sierra Club group consisted of 40 individuals selected randomly from the membership list (containing an unreported number of names) of the Orange County, California, Chapter; a total of 28 completed questionnaires were returned. The “lay sample” consisted of 25 people who “were interviewed in three California cities.... Seven people were asked to complete the survey during the 40+ minute BART (subway) ride between Walnut Creek and San Francisco. In Southern California, ten were interviewed during a door-to-door canvass of homes in Carlsbad (a middle-class neighborhood); eight more were interviewed on the beach near Huntington Beach” (p. 233-4). This type of “lay sample” hardly merits much confidence. Dry cleaners in the Los Angeles area constitute another group. The authors received completed questionnaires from 30 people out of 80 who originally agreed to participate. The fifth group consisted of laid-off sawmill workers enrolled in retraining classes at a community college in Oregon. “Of the forty-eight surveys passed out to those who volunteered to participate, 27 were completed and returned” (p. 234). No explanation is offered for why so many of the dry cleaners and sawmill workers who originally agreed to participate opted out of the study.

The questionnaire consisted of composite statements written to reflect ideas drawn from interviews with informants. Responses to the statements consisted of a six-point Likert scale indicating strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. For the analysis, the authors intentionally reduced the variability across respondents by standardizing responses “so that all respondents' responses... have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. This reduces differences among the respondents in their different interpretations of the Likert scale both in response bias (agreeing with more of the items than other respondents) and in variance (using more extreme responses than other respondents)” (p. 234-235). The authors claim that “very little information was lost in this recoding, as it correlated with the original six-point scale with a Pearson r of .997” (p. 232). Here, the authors are confused about the nature of “information.” Information on response variability across their five “samples” cannot be obtained from anything presented in the book. Perhaps more importantly, the authors assume that there is no qualitative difference between a response indicating “slightly disagree” and one indicating “strongly disagree.” The appendix in which the “survey” data are presented is unenlightened. Categories remain collapsed and presented as “the percentage agreeing with the statement.... The second line is the strength of the answers on a scale from 0 to 2, with 0 being either 'slightly agree' or 'slightly disagree,' 1 being the middle strength, and 2 being 'strongly' agree or disagree.... [T]he agreement number alone

contains most of the information in the data set (p. 254). No, it doesn't. The decision to analyze the collapsed categories undermines the strength of conclusions from their factor analysis in Appendix A "that there is a single belief system present, with approximately 50 percent of the beliefs and values shared. There is a single consensus, although there is still substantial variation among individuals" (p. 236). Eliminate variation and diversity is precluded. The survey itself is constructed in a questionable manner, filled with double-barreled questions or statements. Indeed, multiple components are intentionally introduced into a given statement: "our survey's statements often try to build an argument, to see how many informants will subscribe to the whole argument.... A disadvantage [of this technique] is that in multipart statements we do not know whether informants are agreeing with every fact included, or more generally with the gist of the argument" (p. 232). The limits of this approach by far outweigh any benefits it might produce.

Here are two examples: Statement 29 (p. 231) reads "The environment may have been abused, but it has tremendous recuperative powers. The radical measures being taken to protect the environment are not necessary and will cause too much economic harm." Statement 141 (p. 134) reads "We should return to more traditional values and a less materialistic way of life to help the environment." No one can know what any response to these statements mean.

The semistructured interviews were designed to elicit the environmental beliefs and attitudes of the informants and, amazingly, to teach informants the "Truth" about global warming and then elicit their policy preferences. The authors state that their reasons for conducting the study were that "it was of academic interest to us, that research and publication were part of our university jobs, and *that we hoped to improve public understanding of global warming*" (p. 168, emphasis added). "[T]he interviewer gave a short briefing on global warming to provide background information. The briefing was designed to be similar in length and detail to an in-depth article in a weekly news magazine" (p. 227). "Our briefing summarizes current scientific knowledge on global warming. We show a pie chart of causes... (p. 81). The briefing is reproduced in Appendix C. Statements of "Truth" and "Fact" abound: "I'm going to briefly describe what some scientists are saying about the greenhouse effect. The greenhouse effect makes it hotter... Many scientists expect... [I]f the scientific studies are correct.... [T]his chart shows what contributes most to the greenhouse effect. The biggest part, over half, is burning coal, oil, and natural gas for energy.... Scientists estimate that if we cut the amount of these gases we produce in half, we would slow down the process a lot. They estimate that cutting by three-quarters would stop it" (p. 250-1). The authors presented to informants one particular definition of Truth--the one in which they are True Believers--and, as is normally the case in politicized "research," called on the authority of Scientists for legitimation of their truth-claims, first "some scientists," then "many scientists," and finally "Scientists." In law, such a tactic would be labeled "leading the witness;" in social science, it is the introduction of systematic bias and claims-making into the research design.

In addition to methodological issues, I believe there are many ethical issues involved in presenting the kind of "briefing" the authors gave to informants. Let me give an example by way of an analogy. Suppose we conducted a survey among anthropologists (Scientists) who are familiar with the culture of Southern Paiute people. We ask the anthropologists if they believe in the reality of water babies (the spirits who Southern Paiute people believe live in springs). The Scientists would probably respond that they do not believe in the reality of the spirits --the spirits do not really exist. In subsequent interviews with Southern Paiute people, should we then "brief" them on water babies, inform them that

according to Scientists water babies do not exist, and help “improve public understanding of” physical reality? Of course not, and most sociologists and anthropologists would probably agree that this would constitute bad research. It would be bad research and borders on the unethical. So, too, is the “briefing” given to informants by Kempton and colleagues.

I am even more disappointed in the authors' analysis of the qualitative data gathered from their informants. The primary goal was to identify the cultural models (“models that are shared within a culture or social group” [p. 11]) by which Americans define and interpret nature and the environment. Recall that their informants included 20 lay people and 23 informants (“specialists”) who were grassroots environmentalists, coal industry workers, congressional staff working on environmental legislation, and automotive engineers. Normally, textual analysis would be conducted *within* each group and then *across* the five groups to determine similarities of “models in order to draw the conclusion that the models represent cultural models that are shared social constructions of reality. The authors failed to analyze or present their data in this manner, thus leaving the reader unable to determine independently whether there is a “coherent shared set of environmental beliefs and values,” or whether “American environmentalism represents a consensus view.”

Chapter 3 is titled Cultural Models of Nature: “We begin our examination of how laypeople view environmental problems by describing the cultural models Americans use to understand nature and humanity's interaction with it” (p. 39). I expected quotes from the “laypeople” only, but the authors used quotes from a few of the “specialist” groups while omitting other “specialist” groups. The following nine models, subsumed into “three sets of general environmental models,” (p. 39) are described: Human Reliance on a Limited World (quotes from nine lay people, no specialists)

1. Humans are part of the environment and depend on it.
2. The planet is limited in size.
3. Our wastes do not disappear but enter cycles and return to us. Nature as Interdependent, Balanced, and Unpredictable (quotes from five laypeople, three coal industry workers, one environmentalist, three congressional staffers, no automotive engineers)
4. Different parts of nature are so interdependent that changing one part can have chain reactions on a series of others.
5. Interdependencies in nature are so complex that the interdependencies cannot be predicted in advance.
6. Because interactions are impossible to predict, humans should not interfere with nature. Causes of Environmental Concern (quotes from four laypeople, four environmentalists, one congressional staffer, no coal industry workers, no automotive engineers)
7. Nature has been devalued by modern economic and social systems.
8. Lack of contact with nature leads to a lack of concern.
9. Primitive people placed high value on the environment.

One example will be sufficient to indicate the zealous and overly eager labeling of a few quotes from a “cultural model.” Model 8 “was raised by only four of our six environmentalists, not by other informants” (p. 55). Nevertheless, the authors assert that this is a “cultural model” (p. 56), apparently because “majorities of most groups” in their “survey” agreed with double-barreled statements the authors assert reflected “such matters.”

Chapter 4 is titled Cultural Models of Weather and the Atmosphere and “covers cultural models that laypeople apply to the specific problem of global warming” (p. 63). Quotes from 14 of the 20 laypeople and 1 coal industry worker are included in this chapter. The following “cultural models” are asserted to exist by the authors.

10. A cultural model of pollution: one quote is given, which “illustrates the interview data from which the pollution model is inferred.... From statements such as this from many different informants [reviewer’s comment: How many? From which groups?], we infer a cultural model of pollution” (P. 64).

11. “The American view of ozone depletion being caused by spray cans is probably a simple cultural model” (p. 68) (quotes from three laypeople and one coal industry worker).

12. “...a simplified model of plant photosynthesis and respiration” (p. 68) (quotes from two laypeople).

13. “In sum, many people already have a sense of how much temperature fluctuates and what effects hot weather has upon humans. This mixture of simple concepts and *cultural models about temperature* is used to interpret global warming” (p. 75, emphasis added) (quotes from five laypeople).

The authors assert more cultural models in Chapter 4, titled Environmental Values.

14. “It appears that a cultural model of retribution or punishment is being invoked here” (p. 114) (one environmentalist is quoted).

The authors use their “survey” data to support their contention that this is a cultural model. Statement 78 is: “If any species has to become extinct as a result of human activities, it should be the human species.” Roughly 24 of 30 Earth Firsters, 6 of 27 Sierra Club members, 6 of 29 members of the “public,” 10 of 30 dry cleaners, and 2 of 26 out-of-work sawmill workers agreed with this statement. Even assuming the reliability of their data (an inappropriate assumption), it is a stretch to suggest that these responses represent a “cultural model.” The authors’ assertion that “a cultural model of retribution and punishment” exists may represent little more than wishful thinking on their part; the assertion is certainly not warranted by their “data.” Still more cultural models are asserted to exist in Chapter 6: Cultural Models and Policy Reasoning.

15. “[Survey respondents] strongly prefer a preventive strategy, applying a cultural model something like that invoked by the traditional saying ‘a stitch in time saves nine’” (p. 128).

16. “How do people imagine ‘doing without some things’? An austere past is the best cultural model available to conceptualize a low-energy future” (p. 138) (one layperson is quoted).

17. “... cultural models relating to automobile fuel efficiency merit more careful analysis than our present data allow” (p. 145) (one environmentalist and one automotive engineer are quoted).

18. “National polling also supports our conclusion that energy taxes are opposed due to specific cultural models rather than resistance to taxes in general” (p. 152) (no specific quotes are given).

19. “The cultural model explaining poor corporate environmentalism was not that corporate officers were bad, but that industry is entirely directed by the profit incentive” (p. 156) (one layperson is quoted).

20. “We have only scratched the surface of cultural models of institutions related to global environmental change” (p. 158).

“Purposive sampling” is an accepted technique in social science research, but it is recognized as nonrepresentative and cannot be the basis for broad generalization. The

authors' data and analysis simply do not warrant the generalizations they make to "Americans" or the American "public." Examples of misuses of their data follow: "The following chapters in this book present our findings on the environmental beliefs and values of Americans" (p. 15). "Our survey suggests that this model is held by a substantial majority of the public" (p. 73). "Two practical results flow from Americans' use of the oversimplified model of photosynthesis and respiration..." (p. 73). "Some of the quotations from our interviews, and the complex pattern of survey responses, suggest that there is much more to the question of life-style change than we have captured here. American opinion is divided as to the potential contribution of changing technology versus 'the way we live,'... Majorities believe that..." (p. 135). The authors' choice of words to generalize from their data reflects an inadequate and nonscientific understanding of research methods and sampling. Given their dismissal of probability sampling early in the book ("Although, it could have been done for some subgroups, such as the general public, *we judged the gains to not warrant the delay*" [p. 22, emphasis added]), the authors might be accused of misleading readers in the name of a globalist political agenda based on the claim of global environmental change.

Although I believe the research design to be fundamentally flawed, some examples of anthropological insight can be found in this book. There is, for example, a brief discussion devoted to the notion that changing language (words) may reflect more fundamental cultural change (swamps become wetlands, jungles become rainforests). The idea of, and empirical search for, cultural models associated with the environment and nature is to be applauded and continued, albeit with considerably greater attention to research and analytic techniques.

Unfortunately, the problems with this book far overshadow any contribution to the social scientific understanding of such cultural models. Just as unfortunately, the book is likely to erroneously provide additional encouragement to environmentalists, globalist politicians, funding agencies, and social scientists who share the now taken-for-granted claims of "global environmental change" and the political agenda incorporated in those claims. The political agenda invariably includes the development of "policies" to force "significant sacrifices" on everyone. I end this review with such an agenda from the authors (p. 212): "The strong endorsement of environmental values by the diverse groups studied in our survey may well reflect a general willingness for the American public to make significant sacrifices for the sake of the environment.... Policies must be crafted and leadership provided to overcome divergent individual and group self-interests."

RESPONSE TO REVIEW OF Environmental Values in American Culture

Willett Kempton, Senior Policy Scientist, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, University of Delaware.

The reviewer has read the book carefully and offers a detailed evaluation. He lists the major cultural models we found--a good summary I wish we'd thought to include in the book. I appreciate his approval of our course of study: "the idea of, and empirical search for, cultural models associated with the environment and nature is to be applauded...".

Beyond those points, however, the review's heavy mortar and rocket attacks seem mostly aimed in the wrong directions.

The review leads by challenging the book for adopting the “mantra” of global environmental change. This is an odd criticism--whether or not environmental change is occurring is marginally relevant to our study of lay people's beliefs and values about environmental change. Given that the reviewer is so concerned with the correctness of predictions of climate change (by climatologists, not by our book), it is curious to find indicators suggesting that the reviewer may not even be familiar with the relevant literature. For example, the critic S. Fred Singer is referred to as “S. Fred Smith”, and the reviewer admits having “no idea” whether global warming would occur during a decade or a century.

Next, the review criticizes our use of physical science in a more fundamental way, taking a radically relativist position on the use of physical science by social scientists. By including in our interview a summary of the scientific findings on global climate change, the review contends, we have “introduced systematic bias”, and the research “borders on the unethical”--strong language. He likens our presentation of scientific research findings to a hypothetical interview of Southern Paiute people, in which the researcher tells informants that, according to scientists, the spirits they believe in do not exist. Two flaws in this unusual criticism stand out.

First, we were not aware that our American informants had deeply held religious beliefs about environmental change. We invoked scientists' authority to say that, for example, fossil fuels create more greenhouse gases than do spray cans (with CFCs). Does the reviewer seriously believe that we have disturbed American systems of religion and myth? If such issues are really serious “ethical” concerns of the reviewer, we suggest that he begin this ethical crusade by trying to remove evolution from biology textbooks. By the reviewer's criterion, there would be much more serious ethical problems in telling fundamentalist children that scientists believe in evolution.

The second flaw is that the review is misleading. It suggests--without saying explicitly--that we biased our answers by presenting information in a briefing, then asking questions about the same information. Had this been our design, the National Science Foundation never would have funded the project, and the book manuscript never would have passed peer review at MIT Press. In fact, the sequence of our interviews was: first, we got uncontaminated data, second we gave a briefing, third we asked questions that didn't make sense unless the informant knew the information in the briefing (about global climate change). Rather than introducing “bias”, this interview sequence makes it possible to ask sensible and comparable questions about policy preferences, despite the informants' wide variety of background knowledge about the phenomena in question.

Another large set of criticisms are methodological. Many of these methodological criticisms will be familiar to any ethnographic researcher who has been reviewed by a survey researcher, criticisms of: our sampling, sample size, wording of questions, etc. Others are just odd, for example, that we should have divided our qualitative interview sample before extracting cultural models (as explicit verbalization of cultural models is rare, we would have averaged fewer than one response per group--hardly a good basis for comparison).

Answering the review's methodological criticisms point-by-point, we feel, would try the patience of most readers of this journal. In some cases he is right--for example, had we the luxury of more time and money, we would have preferred to cover the US public with a proper national sample. In most cases, however, he is missing the point. The reason for

using semistructured interviewing, or ethnographic methods, is that the researcher suspects that the respondents view the world in very different ways from the researchers, and are capable of telling about their views. This strategy paid off--we found some rather surprising differences in the way experts and voters see several environmental issues.

In some ways, the most telling criticism of the review is that this volume is consistent with "books written by people funded by NSF, NOAA and NASA." With slurs like this, who needs compliments? We are glad to have our work compared with some of the best researchers in this area--whether physical science or social science. We are pleased to have made a small contribution to putting social science on the platform with the natural sciences, taking a serious part in understanding human dimensions of environmental change. We're guilty as charged.

THE FUTURE OF THE ENVIRONMENT: Ecological Economics and Technological Change, by Faye Duchin and Glenn-Marie Lange, with Knut Thonstad and Annemarth Idenburg. New York: Oxford University Press (1994). xiii, 222 pp.

Reviewed by Jae Edmonds, Senior Research Scientist, Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Washington DC

The principle of "sustainable development," as articulated in the Brundtland Commission report (1987) encompasses the pursuit of economic well being in the present without compromising the ability of future generations to provide for their own well being. But while the general principle of "sustainable development" is one to which everyone subscribes, it is by no means clear how this principle should be implemented in the real world of scarcity. At the very heart of the problem of achieving "sustainable development" is the essence of the economic problem, the allocation of scarce resources to competing ends in the present and over time. It does not make the problem easier that one of the resources to be allocated is the environment.

In *The Future of the Environment*, Duchin and Lange therefore set out to explore this intellectual territory, and specifically the problem of simultaneously providing economic goods and services in increasing measure to an expanding fraction of the world's people and the protection of the environment for ourselves and future generations. The authors are well qualified for this undertaking. Faye Duchin is the Director of the Institute for Economic Analysis at New York University, and Vice President of the International Society for Ecological Economics. She has taken up the work that was initiated by her Institute's founder, Nobel Laureate, Wassily Leontief. Glenn-Marie Lange is a colleague of Duchin's at the Institute for Economic Analysis.

The work presented in this book was carried out over the three years leading up to the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992 (Duchin et al., 1992). To understand and appreciate this book, the reader should recognize from the outset that the bounds of the

problem that Drs. Duchin and Lange have taken on, although broad, are not unlimited, and somewhat different from what one might imagine from the book title alone. The central focus of the book is the interactions of the economy, technology and industrial emissions of carbon, sulfur, and nitrogen oxides. The three gases are used as indicators of anthropogenic impacts on global and regional environmental systems, but the mechanisms by which anthropogenic by-products affect the environment are left outside the boundaries of the book. For example the issues of demographics, the interaction between human activities, land-use change and anthropogenic emissions, or agricultural emissions, are not considered. Neither are the impacts of anthropogenic activities, such as on biodiversity, climate change, acidification, or CO₂ fertilization. The boundary of the work is the industrial smokestack. This is an observation and not a criticism. Research without boundaries descends into uninteresting generalities. The book also limits its focus to the next thirty years, 1990 to 2020. This is a period in which important changes will be taking place, and it is therefore a critical slice of time. From the perspective of long-term environmental issues such as climate change, however, this focus is rather shorter than most global studies have adopted. The book is laid out in two parts. The first part, entitled *Methods and Results*, presents an overview of the Our Common Future (OCF) scenario which was developed to explore the implications of changes in technology for the economy and emissions of three gases.

The power and usefulness of this book comes from three sources, the discipline of the global modeling system the authors have adopted, the data base that undergirds it, and attention to detail as demonstrated in the case studies that populate the second and largest part of the book. The book is very strong on its presentation of data including both the assumptions that go into scenario development and model results. The authors have assembled a wealth of information, which is made available here for fellow researchers and decision makers alike.

The authors employ a Leontief model of the global economy--specifically; Leontiefs model as set out in Leontief et al. 1977. This framework offers tremendous insights into the interconnectedness of economies, and insures a consistency that cannot be guaranteed outside of a framework in which physical and financial accounts are forced to balance.

Although the book is rich in detail about the potential evolution of the global economy, the authors in letting the results speak for themselves, leave the reader the task of assessing what to make of all this work. But it is easy to get lost in the details. Drs. Duchin and Lange are clearly closer to this issue than anyone else, and their opinions and assessments would be most welcome. In contrast, many books on similar subjects contain nothing but opinions, and their lack of analysis and research leave serious readers feeling empty. Duchin and Lange offer some thoughts in the early chapters of the book that serve to whet our appetite for more. For example, the authors put forward a conclusion that there are serious problems with achieving sustainable development. But the leap from the book's details to the final conclusion is too great. Why does this research lead the authors to that conclusion? What are the tradeoffs between economy, technology and the environment? At the end of the 13 data-rich chapters the book simply ends with a case study of transportation, and moves immediately to technical appendices and references without stopping to sum up. A concluding chapter rewarding the reader for persevering through the preceding ten score pages would have been a valuable addition.

Nevertheless, the book has a great deal to offer to the reader interested in a serious, detailed discussion of the forces shaping the first quarter of the next century.

References

Brundtland Commission.

1987 *Our Common Future*. World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Duchin, F., G. Lange, K. Thonstad, and A. Idenburg.

1992 *Environmentally Sound Strategies for Economic Development: An Input-Output Analysis*. Final Report to the United Nations under contract #CTPS/CON/112/91.

Leontief, W., A. Carter, and P. Petri.

1977 *Future of the World Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

When Capitalists Collide: Business Conflict and the End of Empire in Egypt. By Robert Vitalis. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995. 282 pp.

Reviewed by Kirk Beattie, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Simmons College, Boston, MA.

With this book, Robert Vitalis has made an important and novel contribution to the literature on newly industrializing countries. The novelty of his approach is reflected, first of all, by his decision to focus on investors as political and economic agents, and second, by his presentation of an alternative model for analyzing interest conflict and industrial development.

As Vitalis notes, most scholars of developing countries have assumed a zero-sum clash of imperialist and nationalist business interests. In addition, many scholars have assumed that the classic European developmental pattern, with its significant intersectoral (rural vs. urban interests) or class fraction-based confrontations, serves as an important guide for understanding the developmental path of late developers. For example, in the case of Egypt the common heretofore accepted wisdom (the work by Anwar Abdel-Malek [1968] is perhaps most noteworthy in this regard) has been that industrial development was blocked by British imperialist interests, that a private Egyptian challenge to those interests appeared in the form of the Bank Misr group in the 1920s, but that Bank Misr types ultimately proved incapable of playing the expected, classic role as builders of national capitalism and democracy, and were forced to take on stronger, Western imperialist partners. This, in turn, left the country languishing under the authoritarian rule of large landed interests, headed up by the monarch, who was backed by British imperialist guns. More “serious” attempts to industrialize Egypt could not occur until both the king and the British yoke had been removed, objectives that were realized in the aftermath of the 1952 military coup.

Vitalis succeeds in debunking this common vision of Egypt's developmental record, greatly improving upon the solid efforts by Davis (1983) and Tignor (1984). Though

Vitalis provides useful insights to Egyptian development prior to 1922, he has devoted most coverage to the period from 1922 to the mid-1950s: i.e., the period during which Egypt was under a quasi-limited-pluralist monarchical regime and, from 1952 on, a military authoritarian regime. He begins by noting that local or Egyptian-based capitalists were organized in rival investor coalitions or “business groups” during this period. Taking them as his major unit of analysis, he argues that they were among the most powerful private institutions governing Egypt's political economy (p. 11). While recognizing that much of the earliest industrialization activity in Egypt was undertaken by foreign or Egyptianized (*mutamasriyun*) business groups (e.g., Cassel, Soares, Salvago), Vitalis asserts that, over time, Egyptian or Egyptian-based interests ('Abbud, Bank Misr) were able to become the preeminent actors in the fields of industrial and commercial development. Importantly, in contrast to the “classic” European developmental pattern, these rival groups' interests were almost always cross sectoral, combining rural agricultural and urban nonagricultural activities.

Vitalis is at his best in documenting the profit-motivated, rent-seeking behavior that was at the heart of the competition between these groups whose leaders needed the Egyptian government's approval and assistance for their projects. This need produced the complex interplay between the business groups and political powerholders: the king, influential cabinet members, major political party leaders, and key British and American embassy personnel. As Vitalis reveals, businessmen like 'Abbud were ready to embrace radically different political partners, whether liberal democrats or monarchical authoritarians, in attempting to enhance their competitive advantage. Equally important was their readiness, not to mention their need, to form joint ventures with foreign companies that possessed the capital, technologies and expertise to ensure many large-scale projects' feasibility. Even the Bank Misr group, long painted as the quintessential representative of the national bourgeoisie, is revealed as having been consistently eager and willing to take on foreign partners to advance its group interests.

Egypt's slowed development cannot be chalked up to a deficit of ambitious and able entrepreneurs ready to lead Egypt's industrialization. Instead, what Vitalis presents is an image of numerous powerful business conglomerates, virtual oligarchs, whose intense rivalries with one another, combined with shifting foreign competition and partnership, significantly slowed the pace of Egypt's industrialization. Delayed industrialization was a particularly prominent and damaging outcome in those key areas of the economy where the stakes were especially high: electrification and the development of fertilizer production.

The biggest problems with this book, in my opinion, are as follows. First, it is of great importance to Vitalis's argument to define local capital in the most inclusive fashion possible. For Vitalis, local capital “refers to investment originating inside Egypt by investors whose relevant horizons are primarily the Egyptian market” whereas foreign capital is used “to refer exclusively to investment originating outside Egypt's borders by investors whose relevant horizons are not primarily the Egyptian market...” (p.13). By these definitions, as Vitalis is well aware, individuals with Armenian, Greek, Italian, Jewish, Syrian and Lebanese identities, many of whom held foreign passports even if they or their ancestors had been born and raised in Egypt, are classified as local capitalists. And because many individuals from these communities were indeed powerful economic actors, especially in pre-1956 Egypt, their inclusion as local capitalists makes it appear as though local capital was the large, vibrant group that Vitalis describes--a group well capable of leading capitalist development in Egypt. The problem with Vitalis' inclusivity is twofold:

first, some of these individuals were every bit as Egyptian in their hearts, and in their national sentiments, as anyone else in the country claimed to be, but others were not; second, most of these individuals were perceived by the bulk of the population as being foreigners (*khawagat*), no matter how long they or their families had resided in the country.

This latter perception, or misperception, deeply affected the political attitudes of those Egyptians with regard to those “foreign” or “Egyptianized” individuals. For example, completely missing from Vitalis' discussion is any reference to the Young Egypt (Misr al-Fatat) party; nor is there much attention paid to the Muslim Brotherhood organization. Yet both of these organizations acquired their mass followings. The Brotherhood's, of course, dwarfed that of Young Egypt, in large measure due to their xenophobic outrage over foreign control of the Egyptian economy--and they weren't thinking about just foreign capitalists as defined by Vitalis. Indeed, this xenophobia directly informed (I would argue misinformed) Egypt's post-1952 regime leader's behavior vis-à-vis individuals from those communities. As one nonsocialist regime leader (Kemal al-Din Hussein) told me, the first rounds of nationalizations and sequestrations in the 1960s were still not upsetting to him and others of his ilk “because the names of those affected so clearly demonstrated the continued [post-1956] strength of foreigners in the Egyptian economy.”

Vitalis goes to considerable lengths to reject Waterbury's vision of an “exogenous capitalist monolith” dominating the pre-1952 political economy, terming it “extremely misleading” because investors were not organized along a line pitting “indigenous” members of the bourgeoisie against “foreign” members (p.13). His representation makes all kinds of sense in terms of validating his analytical argument; and Egypt itself might have been better off had xenophobic leaders not made such a distinction. But such a distinction was made, with all that portended for the Nasser regime's political-economic behavior.

Along these same lines, it must be noted that by concentrating almost exclusively on the behavior of the business oligarchs, the veritable captains of industry, some sight is lost of the lower-ranking members of the bourgeoisie who helped manage the big companies, ran businesses of their own, or provided professional and technical expertise in so many areas: people who made the “modern” sections of Egypt and Alexandria veritable “European” enclaves and thereby fostered the xenophobic reactions to their presence and their exclusive hiring practices. When regime leaders made Egypt an inhospitable environment for these individuals, who exited Egypt by the thousands in the 1950s, the country's developmental prospects were almost certainly as least as impaired by this than by the departure of the 'Abbuds.

Second, the pitfalls of limiting the scope of one's political analysis to the relationship between “big” capital and politics are clearly in evidence. Again, in particular, the growth of the massive Muslim Brotherhood organization, including the strengthening of Islamic capitalists, is largely ignored by Vitalis; yet the strength of that organization was among the most critical factors shaping both domestic and foreign political actors' behavior from the late 1940s until the mid-1950s. It would also be most intriguing, in light of recent developments in Egypt, to see how the emergence of Islamic capitalists affected the political-economic game in that earlier period.

Vitalis' research is highly commendable. He has painstakingly exhausted the written records for information to support his argumentation, having mined Egypt's National Library, National Archives, and major newspapers' morgues, as well as plowing through British and U.S. Foreign Service cables, U.S. presidential and ambassadorial documents,

and Sir Miles Lampson's unpublished diaries. He also conducted personal interviews, albeit on a fairly limited scale, with knowledgeable actors. Additional personal interviews might have provided him with a slightly different interpretation of matters insofar as local perceptions of foreign control is concerned.

All told, this well-crafted book is an excellent addition to the literature on political-economic change in Egypt. It also provides invaluable lessons and sets a fine, high standard for students of political-economic change in general.

References.

Abdel-Malek, Anwar

1968 Egypt: military society; the army regime, the left, and social change under Nasser. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Random House.

Davis, Eric

1983 Challenging colonialism: Bank Misr and Egyptian industrialization, 1920-1941. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tignor, Robert L.

1984 State, private enterprise, and economic change in Egypt, 1918-1952. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Wisdom for Sustainable Development. Edited by Nancy M. Williams and Graham Baines, 1993. Canberra: Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University.

**Reviewed by John Cordell, Faculty of Environmental Sciences,
Griffith University, Queensland 4111 AUSTRALIA**

A notable accomplishment of the comparatively shortlived (1983-1989), yet far-sighted IUCN Ecology Commission's Working Group on Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), was a special workshop held at the Australian National University in April 1988. This gathering, very likely one of the first multidisciplinary seminars to focus explicitly on the topic of TEK, or at least on its contemporary resource management applications, was also inspired by the 1987 Brundtland Commission report, *Our Common Future*, which among other things, drew attention to the potential contribution of indigenous groups to sustainable development.

IUCN subsequently directed its TEK Working Group to explore ways to implement this particular aspect of the Brundtland Commission's findings. The point was to go beyond documenting TEK for its own sake, or for cultural preservation, and to start to identify new outlets and uses for spheres of indigenous knowledge that had been ignored

or inadequately valued in the past by western scientists. These efforts culminated in the present volume, which contains the proceedings from the 1988 Workshop in Australia. The editors, Graham Baines, who chaired the IUCN Working Group, and Nancy Williams, an Australian Aboriginal specialist who chaired the Australian Workshop, have more than an abiding interest in TEK. They are concerned with raising the profile of TEK in resource management circles. They note the untapped potential of TEK; under certain conditions it can be a conservation tool, a reservoir of natural history wisdom, in lieu of, or to augment scientific knowledge. The editors and several contributors also see a role for TEK in development assistance. If the book has a take-home message and perspective for future research, this is it: get practical.

The book provides insight into what made the IUCN's TEK Working Group tick, how it was able to network loosely, yet effectively, as an international association of concerned scholars. It stands as a tribute to the group's ideals and commitment to educate western scientists and policy-makers about the benefits of working with indigenous groups as full-fledged partners in resource management. One of this book's interesting features, for TEK aficionados--it was definitely state-of-the-art in '88--is that it serves as a benchmark for the phenomenal surge of research and popular interest in what was not so long ago largely the exotic shores of ethnobiology and folk taxonomy.

In the turnaround time the book took to see the light of print (five years is not uncommon these days for edited volumes), much has changed. For one thing, TEK has become widely commodified and is the target of numerous debates raging over intellectual property. In certain quarters, Canada particularly, it is also a self-determination rallying cry for indigenous peoples.

Today, people wield the acronyms TEK and IK (Indigenous Knowledge) hardly without batting an eye. Entire resource centers, like the Leiden Ethnosystems and Development Programme, and journals are devoted to TEK and IK (e.g. *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor*). Acquisition and uses of TEK and IK are also being actively promoted as an inherently worthwhile undertaking, not just by the IUCN, but quite a few international agencies--UNESCO, UNEP, WWF, Canada's International Development Research Centre (see G. Morin-Labatut and S. Akhtar 1992).

With 22 chapters presented as short essays, thought pieces and overviews, the book condenses a vast amount of information, and indicates something of the breadth of work and directions in TEK studies emerging from the academic cocoon of ethnobiology. Sections on background and methods cover matters of definition, conceptual and field research underpinnings in linguistics, ethnohistory, and archaeology. Various chapters touch on passages from some of the classics in the field, like Bulmer's *Birds of My Kalam Country*.

It would have been illuminating to expose more of TEK's intellectual roots in cultural anthropology (cognitive anthropology, ethnobotany, ethnoecology) and relation to biology, particularly biosystematics. The third section contains a handful of case study vignettes, with an area emphasis on Aboriginal Australia and Papua New Guinea. Rather than extrapolating anything universal from these cases, where they do excel is in documenting some important occurrences and survivals of TEK in what are perhaps unexpected places and contexts still not fully appreciated (e.g. parallels in the management of fire and consequences of controlled burning in Aboriginal Australia and North America; contemporary resource management uses of TEK in coastal marine settings).

The volume as a whole also reveals how sharply TEK issues, and the emphasis given to definitions, issues, and problems, vary according to region and colonial history, and in terms of the political status of indigenous groups in question. Not surprisingly, in this regard, Canadian Indians would seem to have far less in common with Papua New Guinean customary landowners, than with Aborigines.

Finally, TEK researchers are by no means unanimous in their motivations, ideals, and goals. Some papers were written at a time when it was still acceptable, or at least in theory possible to get away with passing simplistic judgments on other peoples' customs, when an outside observer felt it was warranted. For example, Johannes and Lewis (Chapter 13) argue that Torres Strait Islanders do not understand critical aspects and the limits of their environment. The authors seem disappointed they can find no evidence of a conservation ethic in Islander society. In Chapter 4, Hunn presents arguments in support of sharing indigenous knowledge as an ideal of science, but he ends up sounding mercenary, mainly out to protect the vested interests of the research establishment.

On the other hand, some papers in the Workshop foreshadow complexities and the political volatility of working with IK and TEK, notably Healy's chapter (6) which deals with the relationship of researchers, communities, and consumers. Rose (Chapter 15) raises key questions about the power relationships between knowledge holders and researchers, and the fundamental issue of who benefits from recording TEK.

This book, in a sense like this review, is a snapshot of the times. However tempting, it would be unfair to take issue with the results of a seven-year-old conference, as the reference points for debates about TEK, and TEK politics, are rapidly shifting. For instance, the role of international conservation agencies in relation to TEK came up at the Australia Workshop (no paper was produced), yet no actual conflicts between protected area managers and indigenous landowners were discussed (only the potential for conflict).

Similarly, the contributors to the book have a tendency to put TEK on a pedestal, to compartmentalize and treat it as something in isolation from other cultural systems. Although TEK is bound up with contentious land rights and tenure issues in many places, the book for the most part sidesteps such problems. What government would not prefer to appear progressive in negotiating to preserve TEK rather than deal with land rights? The value of TEK alone to indigenous peoples in their land justice struggles seems debatable, though no doubt it is something that needs to be looked at case-by-case.

Romanticization and fetishization of TEK seem natural, and perhaps necessary given that indigenous knowledge has clearly been undervalued in the past. Yet one wonders whether the conservative perspectives and interpretations concerning TEK in this book really do much to demystify it. It is reasonable to speculate what would happen if a similar conference were to be held today; what would the agenda be? Moreover, who would be there?

Posing these questions reveals several of this volume's weaknesses. Looking back, certain items seem conspicuously absent from the Australian Workshop agenda. Perhaps these omissions are a 'sign of the times,' but they are troubling. Much is made in the preface about 'partnerships,' in the editors words, 'partnerships in tradition and science.' There is even some discussion of what one participant (Con Boekel) calls 'ethics in partnership,' rules of engagement that should govern the working relationship of nonindigenous researchers and indigenous knowledge holders.

Yet the TEK conference was ultimately about the people who weren't there. Despite much tipping of the hat to indigenous collaborators, there are no contributions from indigenous groups or representatives voicing their perspectives, not even a few direct

quotes. Instead we get lectures on things like 'choosing the right informants' (Johannes and Lewis, Chapter 13). It is difficult to escape the feeling that the partnerships uppermost in the minds of many contributors to this book are still the interdisciplinary ones between anthropologists and natural scientists. Also noticeably missing in this volume is treatment in any depth of intellectual property rights issues surrounding TEK. What could have enlivened and enriched this volume, otherwise replete with extremely worthwhile examples and information that might never be very accessible beyond the South Pacific region, is a critical perspective on TEK. Without such a perspective, TEK studies can wind up with some extreme, if not dangerous, distorted, reductionist comparisons of indigenous knowledge and western science, as in the dichotomy of cognitive processes drawn by Wolfe et. al. (1992): IK is intuitive, oral, holistic, subjective, cyclical and inclusive vs. western science, which is analytical, literate, objective, linear, etc.

Today a healthy, more reflexive, critical perspective on TEK is taking shape. Many unrealistic claims and interpretations regarding the significance, uses, and characteristics of TEK--notably its uncritical celebration as wisdom for conservation and sustainable development in the modern world--are being constructively challenged on a broad front, not least by indigenous groups themselves.

One thing the Australian Workshop did not foresee was how quickly and energetically many indigenous groups would move to regain control of their cultural information (symbolized by TEK). Increasingly, indigenous communities are cornering the discourse on TEK (note the Inuit experiences reported by Kemp and Brooke in *Cultural Survival Quarterly* (1995: 25-27). Remarkably, many groups are now revitalizing and reclaiming, for their own purposes, what, as late as the late 1980s, was still fast becoming an anthropological salvage operation. For better or worse, in many cases, indigenous TEK initiatives are not exactly turning into the kinds of joint ventures, or 'partnerships' envisaged by Workshop participants in 1988.

The low profile IUCN TEK Working Group has a lot to its credit. It was instrumental in producing this valuable book, and seeding a number of other TEK initiatives that are still ongoing. It is hoped that this book will gain the attention of a wider audience, which it deserves. One final thought: for the sake of comparison, it might be profitable to read this edited volume back-to-back with *Cultural Survival Quarterly's* 1991 issue focusing on Intellectual Property Rights, Cunningham (1993), and the *Intellectual Property Rights for Indigenous Peoples Sourcebook* edited by Greaves (1994).

Although this edited volume is mainly geared for like-minded professionals inside and outside universities variously concerned with TEK, the approach and format for the book work well as an introduction for nonspecialists, as well as specialists concentrating on regions other than the South Pacific.

References

Brundtland Commission.

1987 *Our Common Future*. World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Cunningham, A.B.

1993. *Ethics, Ethnobiological Research, and Biodiversity*. World Wide Fund for Nature.

Greaves, Tom.

1994. Intellectual Property Rights for Indigenous Peoples, A Sourcebook. Society for Applied Anthropology.

Kemp, William and L. Brooke.

1995. Towards Information Self-Sufficiency: The Nunavik Inuit Gather Information of Ecology and Land Use. Cultural Survival Quarterly. Winter. pp. 25-28.

Morin-Labatut, G. and S. Akhtar.

1992. Traditional Environmental Knowledge: A Resource to Manage and Share. Development 4: 24-30.

Wolfe, J., C. Bechard, P. Cizek, D. Cole.

1992. Indigenous and Western Knowledge and Resource Management Systems. Rural Reportings, Native Canadian Issues Series, 1. University of Guelph. Ontario.

Ecological Identity: Becoming a Reflective Environmentalist, by Mitchell Thomashow. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1995. 228 pp.

**Reviewed by Caroline Pomeroy, Institute of Marine Sciences,
University of California, Santa Cruz.**

Mitchell Thomashow's *Ecological Identity: Becoming a Reflective Environmentalist* is a thought-provoking, if at times overly personalized and moralistic, work focusing on the relationship between ecological identity and environmental action. Directed toward environmental professionals, teachers of environmental studies, and others who seek to "connect their inner voices with understanding of ecology, community, and citizenship," (p.xiii) *Ecological Identity* is offered as a sorcerous and guide for that process, termed "ecological identity work" (EIW). As Thomashow sees it, those who seek to make this connection face a fundamental tension between their sense of wonder about nature on the one hand, and their perception of threats to its well-being on the other. The challenge is to maintain, develop and share that sense of wonder while also conveying the importance and urgency of acting to address those threats. EIW entails "using the direct experience of nature as a framework for personal decisions, professional choices, political action, and spiritual inquiry" (p.xiii) to meet this challenge, and thereby benefit those who use this approach, society, and nature.

Thomashow presents ecological identity work in both practical and theoretical context. He provides anecdotes drawn from his own 20-year experience and that of his students in a graduate course, "Patterns of Environmentalism," at Antioch New England Graduate School, together with analysis of some of the actors and movements of American environmentalism since the 1800s. In each of six chapters, Thomashow focuses on a

particular aspect of ecological identity, its connection to particular actors, movements, and approaches in environmentalism, and the EIW exercise(s) for exploring and developing this aspect in oneself.

Chapter One, "Voices of Ecological Identity," develops the concept of ecological identity, defined as the ways people construe themselves in relationship to the earth, as manifest in personality, values, actions, and sense of themselves (p.3). Thomashow's purpose is "to show how an ecological worldview can be used to interpret personal experience, and how that interpretation leads to new ways of understanding personal identity." This is ecological identity work. Through the creation and analysis of cluster diagrams, students explore their conceptions of environmentalism. Thomashow highlights the various "epistemological metaphors" (e.g., ecological consciousness, ecopsychology) identified in this analysis, and notes that each incorporates a connection between mind and ecosystem as a source of identity and action. Consideration of these metaphors is used to stimulate "critical reflection and deep introspection" (p.23) through which individuals widen "their circles of identification" to include nature and thereby enable them to internalize concern for its well-being as their own. This process also uncovers some of the tensions between ecological identity and environmental action, most notably that between one's desire for solitude in nature and a sense of responsibility to become involved in political action on its behalf.

Chapter Two, aptly entitled "Trees of Environmentalism (Environmentalism Evolving)," focuses on the evolution and diversification of American environmentalism. Thomashow considers Thoreau, Muir and Carson as the roots of the tree according to Thomashow, their various combinations of "practices of the wild," "natural history excursions," and "paths of citizenship" provide role models for integrating knowledge and personal values. The preservation-conservation debate and other controversies that constitute or play a role in environmental issues constitute the branches of the tree. (Thomashow's illustration using McPhee's Encounters with the Archdruid is a useful and refreshing example following the often repeated story of this debate's enactment by Muir and Roosevelt.) The leaves of the tree represent alternative approaches to environmentalism such as ecofeminism, deep ecology, and bioregionalism. As an exercise, the tree of environmentalism enables students to trace the evolution and expansion of American environmentalism. More importantly, it helps them discover the political and philosophical diversity among environmentalists, and the importance of "understanding history, appreciating positions, possibilities, and the historical and social context of environmental choices" (p.48). To complete the exercise, students must locate themselves on the tree, first according to their feelings, then as their professional persona would dictate. This often uncovers tensions they face in reconciling personal values and professional responsibilities.

In Chapter Three, "Ecological Identity and the Commons," Thomashow addresses the connection between individual identity and collective action through discussion of the commons, community, and ecological citizenship. He begins with a critical question: "When does identity lead to responsibility?" Although many who study common pool resources (CPRs) presume that the stronger one's economic, social, or cultural ties to the commons, the more likely one is to cooperate in its management and use, Thomashow does not take this as given. Rather, he explores the tensions between property and the commons, and between individualism and community, that must be addressed to make the connection between individual identity and responsibility for nature (i.e., the commons). He observes that we (in the U.S.) use (private) property to construct our personal identity.

Because we tend not to identify with things that we do not own (e.g., nature), we are unlikely to recognize the larger consequences of that ownership for the commons. Moreover, this disconnection creates the possibility for controversies that are the heart of environmental politics. EIW challenges such narrow interpretations of property and self-identity. But Thomashow reflects a similar narrowness of perspective in his assertion that the crucial problem of environmental politics is to develop approaches to the commons that maintain the sanctity of property rights, and that protect the individual but recognize ecosystem integrity (p.79).

Indeed, it is important to recognize peoples' attitudes, values and beliefs regarding private property and individual identity. But he seems to sidestep the problem; must (or should) we maintain the sanctity of private property rights? Nonetheless, the activity for exploring the commons dilemma is a constructive one: students do a complete inventory of their property, then seek to widen their circles of identification by considering the ecological, social, economic, and political processes that have contributed to their store of material goods. In so doing, they become more aware of the connection between their personal property and individual identity and, more importantly, the implications their acquisition, ownership, and use of various goods have for the commons. Reflection on the connection between their property and the commons establishes a "property/commons feedback network" that relates individual autonomy (in the possession of private goods) and collective responsibility (in one's own good and those connected to the commons), and thereby provides the rationale for personal action on behalf of the commons (although he does not point out the cumulative effect of individual actions, a key part of the commons problem).

Students' work on community network maps complements the property list in this stage of EIW. Students illustrate the structure of their relationships to others and their location within a community (or communities) as a foundation for discussion of what characteristics make for a cohesive, interdependent, and participatory community. This activity is important because it highlights our "pervasive culture of individualism, which seeks to separate the individual from the community" (p.89), and encourages consideration of communities' potential as a loci of political interaction and personal commitment, and the constraints to realizing that potential. In the concluding section of the chapter, Thomashow draws upon the work of Kemmis, Havel and Ostrom to develop a model and rationale for ecological citizenship. Kemmis' emphasis on the importance of public expression and consensus forged from diverse perspectives within communities, Havel's call for decentralization and local action with a moral foundation, and Ostrom's recognition that people can indeed manage the commons together suggest the opportunity and necessity for ecological citizenship.

In Chapter Four, "Political Identity and Ecological Citizenship," attention shifts from ecological to political identity, and how it can be enacted through ecological citizenship (i.e., environmental activism). The exercise for this purpose is the political autobiography through which students explore the flow(s) of power, how they approach power, and how they resolve the conflicts inherent in environmental issues. As part of this exercise, students address questions regarding the ethics of environmental activism and ecological citizenship. They consider their perceptions of human capabilities and behavior, how these relate to the various perspectives on the ability of liberal democratic institutions, and their broader views related to coercion versus democracy and administrative efficiency versus democratic process in addressing environmental problems.

Chapter Five, "Ecological Identity and Healing," turns to the (often underestimated) psychospiritual impacts of the tensions that underlie environmental work and the psychological turmoil of global environmental change (p.148). These tensions are the source of anger and despair for many people, and have motivated many to seek out spiritual guidance for their efforts to enact an ecological worldview. Thomashow notes that the "great wisdom traditions" (it is not entirely clear what traditions in particular he is referring to; perhaps all religions, interpreted broadly) can offer guidance, as they address many questions and issues common to environmental work (e.g., living simply). Thus the work of the environmental practitioner, in promoting an ecological worldview and action consistent with it, "conveys a tone of moral judgment" (p.149). This can lead to cycles of blame and guilt, which can be paralyzing or, more beneficially, the catalyst for personal responsibility and action to heal the environment. To work through this challenge, Thomashow offers the "eco-confessional" in which he and his students discuss ecological wrongs they have committed. The goal of this activity is to encourage "reflective practice" (over and above that promoted thus far) as a mechanism for ongoing ecological healing of the self. This personal healing is a precursor to collective healing, and contributes to both "sustainable psyches and sustainable societies."

The last chapter, "Educating for Ecological Identity," lays out an EIW-based framework for teaching environmental studies and for promoting ecological literacy. The framework consists of three principles of educational design and nine "interpretive modalities." Neither the principles (highlight the importance of learners' experiences; establish open, cooperative learning spaces; provide conceptual vision) nor the modalities are particularly unusual (with the possible exception of the collaborative text). They do, however, remind us of the immense possibilities, beyond lectures and basic discussion, for teaching and learning. More valuable, perhaps, would have been a summary of the activities described in the text, which are both innovative and appropriate tools for teaching environmental studies, and other related courses as well at many levels. Thomashow then presents the culminating activity of EIW: the sense-of-place map. In this exercise, students express in writing, artwork, or other media the links between their own ecological identity and their life-cycle development. The particular value in this exercise is its reinforcement of the idea that sense of place is "literally the roots of ecological identity" (p.192), and its reflection on the range and variety of regions with which we might identify. Unfortunately, the exercise is not adequately described, nor are specific examples offered.

Thomashow closes the book with an Epilogue: "Ecological Identity as a Way of Saying Grace," in which the personalization and moralistic tone overwhelm. He asks how he can construct an ethical and moral foundation for his actions if he also accepts the temporality of interpretive meaning. For him, the answer lies in ecology's revelation of "patterns with lasting insight," and these patterns' consistency with the great wisdom traditions that have long provided spiritual guidance to people. Ecological identity work, then, as it comprises these cognitive and intuitive, practical and spiritual elements, is "a way of saying grace."

Although some may find the personalization and reflection of the epilogue consistent with the themes of the book, others will find it unnecessary, and somewhat overwhelming, if not arrogant. Two aspects of the book reinforce this conclusion. First, throughout the book, but especially in Chapter Five and the Epilogue, Thomashow suggests that an ecological worldview is the right worldview, and that those who promote that worldview are somehow morally superior to everyone else. He seems to suggest that those who work

to convey this view are spiritual guides (or saviors) to the rest of us. One begins to feel as though they are to be martyrs as they struggle to do this work. Second, although Thomashow makes clear the limitation of his focus to the tradition of American environmentalism, and notes the possible difficulties of transferring the activities of EIW across cultures (p.180), he seems to avoid intercultural diversity (within the U.S. and more broadly) as it influences peoples beliefs, values, attitudes, and actions. Similarly, apart from ecological identity and identity with place, he largely ignores the multiplicity of identities people possess, and the fact that these identities take on greater or lesser salience in different situations.

These criticisms considered, Ecological Identity is appropriate for environmentalists seeking to strengthen their own ecological identity and to heal and fortify their psyches for the challenging work of environmental activism. And for the instructor of environmental studies, the activities he presents have great potential for use in the classroom, from gradeschool through graduate school.