

Insufficient or inadequate statistical data are used to support the central argument. Table 4 (pp. 156-157) displays percentages of time spent in various activities but not the primary data. No attempt is made to calculate the significance, if any, between differences in time spent among the diverse activities by men on the one hand and by women on the other, or among the differences by any one sex for any two activities. Perhaps the sample size (of 2007 "time points" for adults of both sexes--note 14, Ch. 5, p. 227) was insufficient, and if so, the author should have stated that. Table 3 shows income per garden in the community of Itanaramí in 1982, but how these were measured is not given in the table or in the text. Table 2 on p. 98 shows the "aggregate Guaraní market basket" of 17 households; it displays percentages of expenditures on diverse food, clothing, production, luxury, and other items, but not the actual figures per household, and information on how the data were collected is not given in the table or the text. It is impossible to discern from these data, for example, whether there is stratification of income in Itanaramí. Table 5 on p. 161 shows a "sample of an adolescent's wage expenditures" as though it reflected in general on how the earnings from wage labor are spent, and therefore says very little.

I am not arguing that Reed's main findings are wrong--the problem is there is no scientific way to evaluate whether they are wrong or right from this work alone. It is entirely plausible that Chiripá agroforestry does involve subsistence agriculture and sustained extractivism (of *yerba* leaves). The problem concerns the presentation of methods and evidence for these findings. Reed's work has the validity of long-term participation observation, but not the reliability of canonical and transparent procedures in data presentation and analysis. Reed's book is nevertheless a welcome contribution to the ethnography of the Chiripá who have been largely ignored in the English language literature of lowland South America. His critique of dependency theory and his case for cultural persistence of the Chiripá people, despite involvement in a market economy, are well argued in the introduction. His descriptions of the principal sacred and secular rituals, ceremonial speech, religious leadership, and kinship organization seem solid and convincing in a comparative context. His basic mastery of the Chiripá language is also evident throughout the text. The book makes an important contribution, therefore, to South American ethnography; and it is a significant work with regard to defining a "complex frontier society" that maintains a "distinct ethnic identity" (p. 10). It will be important reading for specialists in the field of ethnicity studies. But it is not a definitive and not a prophetic account of Chiripá agroforestry. Perhaps Reed's next book will be.

## **Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government, by Nicholas Thomas. Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 1994. xi, 238 pp.**

**Reviewed by Gregory Eliyu Guldin, Pacific Lutheran University**

Colonialism and colonial ways of thinking persist stubbornly in our late twentieth century world. Thomas' book is a good antidote to all the *au courant* talk of postcolonialism, when he reminds us that neocolonial domination in international and interethnic relations is undeniable and ranges in scope from nasty jokes and pervasive inequalities...[to] frequent military assaults against Third World states to enforce First World Domination. The focus then is on understanding colonialism in our neocolonial world.

The argument is based on the assumption that colonialism is not best understood primarily as a political or economic relationship. Instead, it should also, "equally importantly and deeply" be seen as a cultural process. "Colonial cultures are not simply ideologies

that mask, mystify, or rationalize forms of oppression...they are also expressive and constitutive of colonial relations in themselves.” Here Thomas is at one with the postmodern emphasis on discourse and meaning. More importantly, however, his blending of the economic, political, and discursive is a good holistic approach to the phenomenon. “Colonial culture thus includes not only official reports and texts related directly to the process of governing colonies and extracting wealth, but also a variety of travelers’ accounts, representations produced by other colonial actors such as missionaries and collectors of ethnographic specimens, and fictional, artistic, photographic, cinematic and decorative appropriations” (16).

Thomas’ stance amidst all the debate about “colonial discourse,” “the Other,” and Orientalism is that too often colonialisms are discussed as if they were universal totalities, that one pattern fits all. Not true, says Thomas, “only localized theories and historically specific accounts can provide much insight into the varied articulations of colonizing and counter-colonial representations and practices.” Most writing on colonialism he critiques for confusing Asian, African, and Amerindian; modern and premodern; metropolitan, settler, indigenous, and diasporic subjects; and assimilationist and segregationist colonizing projects. By doing so, he claims to be extending the work of Edward Said, Johannes Fabian, and Bernard Smith.

Not that there’s also room to find fault with these predecessors. In criticizing Said, Thomas points out that not all accounts of colonized cultures are negative; they can be sympathetic or idealized. Furthermore, while “Orientalism” may well characterize Euro-American views of Arabs in the twentieth century, it is not so true of the nineteenth century, nor of areas further afield such as East Asia and the Pacific. Similarly Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Abdul Jan Mohamed are all excoriated in turn for being colonial discourse universalists. Now Thomas’ interest in located subjectivities draws inspiration from Pierre Bourdieu, *Colonialisms*, not colonialism.

This somewhat Boasian emphasis on localizing and historicizing is meant to ward off the demons of essentialism, spirits which have possessed much of the colonialist “discourse” in anthropology, history, and literary studies of late. Although implicated in the earlier construction of racist cultural hierarchies, anthropology is saved by its ethnographic emphasis on the here and now, whereas travel receives a good dose of damnation as part and parcel of a process of domination and transformation. Foucault is invoked here as well to help us centrally situate government and power inequalities in our understanding of language, knowledge, and narrative. Thomas also auto-localizes by placing himself and his work in the Australian-Pacific relationship and its particular dimension of cultural politics and colonialism.

Thomas attempts to avoid going to the other extreme and does not call for detailed colonial histories. He shows the balance he is after in a number of case studies, all drawn from the British Empire, to illustrate the value of a historicized, ethnographic approach. His discussion of colonial projects and discourses from the late nineteenth century through the twentieth is meant to show varying colonizing projects with different models of settlement, and with differential rates of successful colonial representation and presentation.

Towards the book’s end, Thomas attempts to domesticate our understanding of colonialism’s culture by finding it among us First Worlders at the present time. *Dances with Wolves*, the movie, is analyzed for its projection of contemporary colonialist views of indigenous peoples. This critique of representations of primitivism in Australia and North America is needed and useful.

Overall, *Colonialism’s Culture* is somewhat dense to read, what with Babha, Foucault and some other intellectual heavyweights. But the book was accessible to nearly half the undergraduates in my class on *The Development of Underdevelopment*, so I trust the readers of this journal will accomplish no less! Thomas has some important things to say about contemporary international and interethnic relations and by the time one reaches the

concluding chapter on the “Post-Colonial,” the author has succeeded in convincing the reader of the need to conceive of the multiplicities of colonialism.

**Review of *Sanumá Memories: Yanomami Ethnography in a Time of Crisis*. Alcida Rita Ramos. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995. xx, 346 pp. (paper).**

**Review by Raymond Hames, Anthropology Department, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.**

As I have done considerable research among the Yanomamö,<sup>1</sup> it was with anticipation that I received notice of Alcida Ramos' publication of *Sanumá Memories*. This work is a useful contribution to the large and still expanding research on the Yanomamö, an Amazonian people who have become a classic case study for anthropology and the social sciences. They are probably the most widely read about tribal people in the world, largely a consequence of Napoleon Chagnon's immensely popular ethnography *Yanomamö: The Fierce People* (first published in 1968 and the most recent edition in 1992).

The Yanomamö have become a focal point for theoretical debates concerning the causes of warfare among tribal people, the promise of evolutionary biological theory in the behavioral sciences, and most recently, and lamentably, they are internationally known as victims of grave human rights violations. Ramos' *Sanumá Memories* was first published in Portuguese in 1990 as an update of her 1972 doctoral dissertation (The Social System of the Sanumá of Northern Brazil, University of Wisconsin) supplemented by several return visits to the Sanumá (as recently as 1992) yielding additional chapters. A number of the chapters have been published as journal articles in both Portuguese and English.

Based on the work of Ernesto Migliazza, the Yanomamö are divided into four ethnolinguistic groups: the Sanumá or Sanema with 3,200 speakers in about 100 villages, three-quarters of which are in Venezuela; the Yanomamö with 11,700 speakers in 171 villages, with about 80 percent in Venezuela; Yanomam with 5,300 speakers in 64 villages, nearly all of which are in Brazil; and the Ninam (or Yanam), with perhaps as many as 850 speakers equally divided in Brazil and Venezuela. The work under review here is the most systematic account of we have on Sanumá social organization. Other major works on the Sanumá by Kent Taylor and Marcus Colchester focus on ethnobiology, ecology, and economics.

Chapter One consists of a standard ethnographic overview focusing on the distribu-

---

1. Readers may be interested in the use of the terms Yanomamö and Yanomami. Following N. Chagnon's convention, I use the term Yanomamö to refer to the Yanomama in general while Ramos uses Yanomami. The difference has to do with how to represent the terminal vowel -- either by “ö” or “i” -- which is a high, central unrounded vowel that has no equivalent in English. For English speakers it is pronounced similarly to the “e” in “me” or the first vowel in “peter”. According to the International Phonetic Alphabet, this phoneme is represented by an “i” with a short bar through its center. It was first used in the rendering of Yanomami by Jacques Lizot who has worked for several decades among many of the same Yanomama groups as Chagnon. Unfortunately, typesetters do not have the proper symbol and instead they resort to “i”. Typesetters do have the symbol “ö” which is a much closer sound representation than “i”.