This book is an important addition to northern Athapaskan ethnography. It will be of value both to non-Native scholars and to the Dene themselves. It should be required reading for courses in anthropology and Native studies departments that deal with Native peoples in Canada or in subarctic cultures in general.

Who Shares: Co-operatives and Rural Development
D.W. Attwood and B.S. Baviskar, eds.
Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988. x + 432 pp. $46.50 (cloth)

Reviewer: Marilyn Silverman
York University

In focussing on co-operatives, this volume "use[s] comparative case study analyses to . . . deepen our understanding of this field of development studies" (p. 1). To this end, the volume contains a very readable "Introduction" written by the two editors and 18 case studies which originally were presented at an 1983 symposium in Montreal.

The most striking feature of the volume, and both its strength and its weakness, lies in the sheer diversity of the cases presented. First, the articles cover a wide variety of locales and modes of livelihood. There are studies of co-operatives among pastoralists (in Baluchistan, Botswana, East Africa, Kenya) and among agriculturalists (in north-eastern Brazil, Kenya, Uganda, Egypt/Tunisia, Nigeria and the Philippines). Eight of the case studies are from India; four of these concern the dairy industry. Secondly, the kinds of co-operatives which receive attention vary considerably. The cases range over production, purchasing, processing, marketing, credit and savings co-operatives. Thirdly, the antecedent conditions out of which the co-operatives developed are extremely variable. For example, in some places the co-operatives were generated out of indigenous systems of land tenure, whereas in others they were located in colonial structures such as plantations. As a result, the class bases of the focal co-operatives are highly diverse. The various case studies deal, among other things, with wage labourers, pastoral nomads and small farmers. Fourthly, the co-operatives run the gamut of highly institutionalized organizations to "informal" ones based on prior local groups and networks. Fifthly, the levels of analyses differ. The articles range from those which focus on a single co-operative to one, for example, which assesses co-operative development for all of Africa. Finally, the different perspectives of the authors add a further dimension to this diversity. These range from anthropologists doing local-level political economy to sociologists collecting data by random sample and questionnaire.

In the light of this diversity, the editors are to be credited for achieving a degree of intellectual orderliness by organizing the contributions around three central questions. First, what is, and has been, the relationship between socioeconomic inequality and co-operatives? Secondly, how does the intervention of the state affect co-operatives? Thirdly, how does informal co-operation work and how does it affect the "fit" of more formal, "official," co-operatives?

In the "Introduction" the editors pose these questions and show how the particular case studies shed light on them. At the same time, a reading of the particular

cases shows that many are far more complex than these general questions allow. As such, the volume has the usual weaknesses and strengths of endeavours of this type. On the one hand, the volume necessarily lacks internal coherence, so readers who are interested in more theoretical and/or uniform approaches to development and co-operation will be somewhat disappointed. On the other hand, the diversity of case material and ethnography engenders a necessary respect for the complexity of real economic life and the problems of development. Moreover, several of the articles are excellent. It for these latter reasons that the volume is to be recommended. It will be useful for courses in agrarian systems and rural development and for those readers whose work and interests lie in co-operatives and rural development.

Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other
Bernard McGrane
New York: Columbia University Press, 1989. xi + 150 pp. $32.50 (cloth)

Reviewer: Elvi Whittaker
University of British Columbia

The sparse collection of writing which addresses the gap between anthropology and philosophy is expanded by this work. The author examines the concept of the Other, the notion which, for more than a decade, anthropology has thrust forward as one of its central claims to existence. The evocation of the Other has tripped off so many anthropological tongues for so long that it has reached platitudinous proportions. McGrane's history-of-ideas analysis, however, lends it a scholarly seriousness. He traces the metaphoric history of the Other from the emergence of the Renaissance to the 20th century. Beginning with the 16th century, the reader is introduced to a cosmography where the Other is a heathen—sinful, diabolical and quintessentially non-Christian. From this period McGrane moves to the Enlightenment, when the concept was synonymous with ignorance in the face of rationality, a "savage" separated by the absence of religion from his moral opposite, the civilized, knowing European. To make his point the author evokes the classic confrontation of Crusoe with the Man Friday. In the 19th century, philosophy passed much of its intellectual mandate over to anthropology. At that time the Other resided in some mythic past, safely removed from contemporary civilized man by the ultimate segregation of all, evolutionary time. So anthropology and biology, McGrane suggests, serve as discourses that attempt to unify contemporary humanity with remnants from the innocent and savage past. In short they are "theories of kinship" (p. 78). Finally, in the 20th century where everything is culture-bound, the Other is accounted for by cultural relativity, where difference is "merely" or "only" difference and where, superficially at least, the Other is "not-inferior-but-different" (p. 129).

The giants from whose shoulders the author surveys the anthropological enterprise appear to be Foucault and, to a lesser extent, Wittgenstein, Kuhn and Nietzsche, on the one hand, and Fabian and Todorov, on the other. In the opening pages he declares his debt to Harold Garfinkel, Alan Blum, and to ethnomethodology in general. It is disappointing that their epistemological influence, provocative