

As Sider describes, inquiries from the Canadian government into solutions to the Indigenous problems, in fact, negatively impacted the health and well-being of the Innu and Inuit peoples. The relocation and settlement of Indigenous hunting families created more social problems to endure. The book discusses how constructed settlements were, in part, built to encourage commercial fishing among the Indigenous community. The authorities built new resettlement villages coined as “concentration villages” in inhospitable places, with the effect of intensifying the hardship for Indigenous peoples. Sider writes: “Nor can it be dismissed as a mistake, for there were expensive consulting studies about where to put the new Native communities, which note that water was not readily available and the hard rock base would make septic systems difficult and expensive” (175). Sider reveals that while white Canadians live comfortably with all amenities, Indigenous peoples live in cramped conditions with no running water and poor sanitary conditions. High unemployment and little, or no, opportunity to practise their traditional subsistence activities have increased the suffering of the inhabitants.

Sider shows that the negotiation for land and the land claims policy prioritises Canadian economic and political agendas over Indigenous peoples’ needs. Government funding of Indigenous organisations incurs debts, which obligates them to support government interests in the negotiations for territorial lands. The book explains that, in this context, the focus on Indigenous culture in negotiation is political rhetoric that camouflages state and corporate economic agendas. Furthermore, the overall shift toward land claim negotiations has cultivated an image of progressive governance in Canada. The political structure for the negotiation process continues to be based on the Canadian model of governance and the dominance over Indigenous peoples in the struggle for land and resources. *Skin for Skin* is a powerful and positive contribution to anthropology, while it examines the traumatic tale of the changing lives of Indigenous peoples subject to oppression and self-destruction. Sider has shown the intensity of the Indigenous struggle within the constraints of British and Canadian colonialism.

References

- Brice-Bennett, Carol
 1976 Inuit Land Use in the East-Central Canadian Arctic. *In* Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project, vol. 1. Milton R. Freeman, ed., 42–44. Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.
- Henriksen, George
 1973 Hunters in the Barrens: The Naskapi on the Edge of the White Man’s World. St. John’s, NL: Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Petitot, Emile
 1883 On the Athabasca District of the Canadian North-West Territory. *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography*, vol. 5. London: Edward Stanford.
- Samson, Colin
 2003 A Way of Life That Does Not Exist: Canada and the Extinguishment of the Innu. St. John’s, NL: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Campbell, Craig, *Agitating Images: Photography against History in Indigenous Siberia*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014, 267 pages.

Reviewer: Christos Lynteris
University of Cambridge

Craig Campbell’s *Agitating Images* is an intellectually stimulating monograph whose analytical efficacy stems from the fact that it operates on multiple, intersecting registers, all of which are connected through the notion of agitation. On a first level, as developed in the book’s first and main chapter (“The Years Are Like Centuries,” 9–152), it is a robust and much-needed historical ethnography of a culture base [*kultbaza*] in Soviet Evenkiia, which provides an excellent genealogy of the processes that would later lead to the formation of the Soviet House of Culture, as studied by Bruce Grant. By focusing as much on the politics as on the aesthetics of sovietisation, the author provides a rich portrait of the Tura culture base that underlines how agitation functioned not simply as a method of indoctrination but also as both an apparatus of disciplining cultural difference and a site for the emergence of “socialist paternalism” (5).

On a second level, the book is an attempt to present and follow a new anthropological approach of archival photographs. Once again, this approach centres on agitation, which the author qualifies as “a historiographical ethos” (xiii). Rather than being coeval with the archive, Campbell argues, photographs trouble and unsettle it. This approach is followed closely in the book’s second chapter (“Dangerous Communications,” 153–210). The author’s extensive experience with analysing and digitising socialist colonial photographic archives in Siberia has allowed him to dwell on a range of visual sources so as to produce a discussion of visual theory grounded on a long-term engagement with, and immersion in, photographic archives. Treating photographs as “agitational agents with the capacity to frustrate the words that we use to construct and contest the past,” the author argues for a visual approach that has the advantage of allowing us to read the Soviet archive against the grain (154). More specifically, asserting the status of the photographic image as “an archive in its own right” as well as a vehicle of dangerous communication, a notion borrowed from the symbolist painter Odilon Redon, Campbell draws us into a compelling and radical re-examination of photographs, which can best be appreciated when the book is read alongside the digital companion of the book (168).¹

On a third level, the book makes use of archival photographs of the Tura culture base as a way of undermining the hegemonic function of historical writing. Hence, in the first chapter, Campbell employs a method of visual fragmentation and close-ups aimed to “counterintuitively liven up the page as a constellation of awakening,” in Walter Benjamin’s sense of the term (14). Rather than illustrating the text, these images are aimed at generating a dialectic between agitation and nervousness. Thus, we see on the left-top side of each page one or two square photographic fragments. These are not, as conventionally expected, framed or focused on immediately recognisable ethnographic subjects or objects. Instead, they include captions that are often disconcertedly (and, hence, productively) unfamiliar, including film smudges and scratches. As they begin to define our visual field of reading page after page,

we would perhaps have liked to know more about the way in which these fragments were generated and allocated in the monograph (were they selected or were they random, as perhaps the author's online "archival degenerator" indicates?).

In any event, these unnumbered and uncaptioned photographs create an unnerving, silent visual rhythm that soon becomes part of a compelling reading experience. What is interesting here is the relation between text and photograph, for the latter are never discussed or explained but stand as nodes of "anti-illustration, an intrusion into the historiographical calm of the text" (xx). Does this technique manage to agitate the reader in the sense planned by the author, or does it rather defamiliarise him or her in the formalist sense of the term? This is a question that, if raised and explored in dialogue with the author's overall "historiographical perspectivism," may allow us to suggest that the risk present in the book's approach lies with the theoretical affinities it seeks to draw. Rather than exploring the idea and debates around agitation in its Marxist context, in an effort to test or tease out the possibility of rendering them anthropologically unsettling, the author resorts to a cultural theory approach. He thus grounds agitation within a discourse of theoretically more familiar notions, such as "troubling" and "queering." While this brings agitation up to date, it could also be argued that it somehow dilutes the critical potential of the otherwise enticing thesis for an agitating use of photography, making the overall argument all too easily assimilable into the current social theoretical doxa. In spite of this theoretical limitation, the monograph is a very important step toward a critical anthropological engagement with archival photographs and their power to unsettle text-centred readings of history and of the state. Most important, it introduces crucial questions regarding the use of photographs in anthropological texts, employing a method that paves the way to an engaged and radical new way of writing visual culture.

Note

- 1 See <http://metafactory.ca/agitimage/index.html>, accessed May 10, 2015.

Corbey, Raymond and Annette Lanjouw, eds, *The Politics of Species: Reshaping Our Relationships with Other Animals*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, xiv + 295 pages.

*Reviewer: Gregory Forth
University of Alberta*

Comprising 20 chapters and an introduction, this multi-disciplinary collection is edited by philosopher and anthropologist Raymond Corbey and Annette Lanjouw, a conservationist and primatologist who is also vice-president for Strategic Initiatives and the Great Ape Program at the Arcus Foundation. As well as supporting the publication, the foundation also sponsored the 2013 conference held in New York from which these papers derive.

Drawing on research in the social sciences, biology, primatology, law, medicine, and philosophy, all chapters critically

discuss the human/(non-human) animal opposition, particularly as it has developed in the West. As the book's title virtually announces, the main focus is speciesism, a moral and political position that sees other natural species as essentially different from humans and accordingly supports their differential treatment. Against this position, contributors explore a variety of issues to advance a philosophical view that questions the existence of any radical difference between humans and animals, thereby challenging notions of human exceptionalism. The concept of speciesism, of course, is modelled on racism and sexism, and, as one would expect, critics advocate a parallel extension of legal rights currently enjoyed only by a single species (*Homo sapiens*) to non-human animals.

At the same time, the authors are not entirely agreed on how far this can or should be taken. One contributor (Joan Dunayer, Chapter 2) argues that human rights should be accorded to all animals possessing any sort of nervous system. (Another suggests a restriction to creatures possessing a central nervous system.) Insofar as these rights might include a right to life, such extension would, of course, seriously restrict the dietary practices of everyone excepting vegans. However, other writers argue for a more modest extension – for example, only to mammals or vertebrates. For the most part, granting rights to non-human animals is argued on the basis of research showing that animals, or particular species, differ less from humans than was previously thought – and sometimes far less. As one might expect, many chapters provide demonstrations of such resemblance concerning non-human primates, elephants, and cetaceans. And the cases are made with reference to issues such as intelligence, possession of a theory of mind, experience of physical pain and mental anguish (including grief and depression), moral agency, and even linguistic ability.

While mammals, and especially large mammals that closely resemble humans in overall structure and facial form and expression, are the main focus of several chapters, the book also includes an intriguing account (Eben Kirksey, Chapter 13) of the capabilities of the ant species *Ectatomma ruidum*, and another chapter (Molly Mullin, Chapter 17) deals with domestic fowl. The extensionist strategy advocated explicitly or implicitly in most of the chapters, moreover, is found wanting, not just by Dunayer but also by philosopher Lori Gruen (Chapter 18), who argues instead for an approach called "entangled empathy," where differences should not make a difference and where one should instead strive to grasp the other animal's own perspective. Somewhat in contrast, in her very personal account of raising chickens, Mullin makes the point that there is no contradiction between caring for animals in a compassionate and ethical way and treating them differently from people, including exploiting them as food and therefore necessarily killing them. In a not entirely different vein, physician Hope Ferdowsian and lawyer Chong Choe (Chapter 19) suggest that ethical practices providing greater protection to non-human animals, particularly in the context of such morally challenging issues as medical and other scientific experimentation, might be modelled on existing policies for the protection of especially vulnerable humans in the same context as, for example, children, the mentally deficient, and people who are economically disadvantaged.

There is much in this book that should interest anthropologists. One might ask how it could be otherwise, given that