arguments claiming there is no substantial difference between human and non-human animals present something of a challenge to a discipline that defines itself by way of just such a distinction and that continues to represent culture as its exclusive topical preserve. But, whatever position individual anthropologists might take on the implications of human/non-human animal similarities, most would probably agree that there is still enough to be learned about the species *Homo sapiens* (or the genus Homo or subfamily Homininae) to justify the maintenance of a separate discipline. And if things discovered about human animals can be connected with an expanding knowledge of non-human animals – if, for example, we find that things previously considered arbitrary and inessential artifacts of culture (or specific cultures) are instead found to be rooted in cognitive or behavioural tendencies of other biological species – then all the better.

How humans should treat non-humans, however, is another matter – a moral question ultimately unrelated to empirical knowledge of how much we share with other creatures and equally related to ethnographic findings concerning how animals are treated outside of the West. In this last respect, anthropologists may be disappointed by how few chapters consider treatment of non-human animals in non-Western societies. In fact, there are just two – Chapter 12 by Jet Bakels and Chapter 15 by Erin Riley – and both concern ethno-linguistically defined local populations of Indonesia. From my reading of ethnography and from my own research conducted over a period of 40 years in eastern Indonesia, my impression is that members of a good many small-scale societies draw about the same line between human and animal as would Westerners (or at least those who have received little in the way of a modern biological education). In addition, they appear to base the distinction on the same criteria – notably, lack of language, clothing, fire, apparent tool manufacture, and so on. This is not to claim that hunter-gatherers and subsistence agriculturalists engage in practices as cruel as battery farming or many kinds of animal experimentation. Yet even while so-called animists may grant "souls" or something like human intelligence to non-human animals, this certainly does not prevent them from killing and eating them – sometimes doing so in ways that would seem cruel to Westerners, as the editors acknowledge in the last paragraph of their introduction.

Rather than moral (or cultural) differences explaining cross-cultural variation in the ethical treatment of animals, this more likely reflects the very technological success of modern societies, which has greatly expanded the uses to which humans, for their own benefit, can make of animals. Add global capitalism to the mix and inhumane practices involving animals that might appear distinctive to the West – most of which are connected with a commodification of other species – may be sufficiently accounted for. Also pertaining to rights and mistreatment, one final reflection on the volume may be in order. While there is much to be said for treating non-human animals with greater compassion and even extending to them certain human rights, I searched in vain for any discussion of whether or how far newly empowered animals should be held to the same moral and legal standards as humans. For example, if they attack or kill humans, members of their own species, or members of other non-human species (chimpanzees seem to do all three), should they not be tried and, if found guilty, punished accordingly? One is, of course, reminded of European animal trials (see Evans 1987 [1906]), and I look forward to an "anti-speciesist" answer to this question.

References

Evans, E. P.
1987 [1906]
The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals. London: Faber and Faber.

Haugerud, Angelique, *No Billionaire Left Behind: Satirical Activism in America*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013, 278 pages.

Reviewer: Pamela Stern
Simon Fraser University

In the 1990s, a small group of social justice advocates in Massachusetts came together to protest the neo-liberal assault on the Keynesian state and on the poor, whose safety nets were being dismantled. Choosing satirical street theatre as their mode of protest, the activists managed to infiltrate and upend some anti-tax theatre organised by right-wing politicians. By the end of the decade, the core of the organisation had shifted to New York City, becoming the Billionaires, first for wealthy presidential aspirant Steve Forbes, and then, as Democrats and Republicans settled on their 2000 presidential nominees, the Billionaires for Bush (or Gore). They adopted humorous "Billionaire" pseudonyms such as Iona Bigga Yacht, Phil T. Rich, and Merchant F. Arms and donned thrift store furs and other evening attire meant to evoke the glamour (and the economic disparity) of the Gilded Age. The Billionaires staged protests meant to draw attention to, and political action against, the corrupting influence of money on American democracy.

In *No Billionaire Left Behind*, Angelique Haugerud provides an ethnography of the Billionaires and their interjection as tricksters or court jesters into American political discourse during the first dozen years of the 21st century. Haugerud's study of the Billionaires invites us to consider whether the anti-structure of the joke destabilises systems built by and for the powerful or serves as a safety valve allowing the elite to remain in control. Initially, as the name Billionaires for Bush (or Gore) suggests, the group targeted both political parties, sometimes asserting: "We're buy-partisan. We buy Democrats and we buy Republicans." The Billionaires also staged mock protests against collective bargaining: "What's Outrageous? Union Wages"; health care reform: "Widen the Healthcare Gap"; and public education: "Education is not for Everyone." On tax days (April 15), the Billionaires would dress in their finery and visit post offices, telling last minute filers: "Thank you for paying our taxes."

By the 2004 US presidential election, with some dissension, the group had adopted the position that unseating George W. Bush was crucial and should take precedence over the organisation's broader message about the intertwining of money and political influence. This may have been politically wise; the number of Billionaires chapters had grown from 55 during the 2000 presidential election to nearly 100 in 2004.

Haugerud began her ethnographic study of the group in 2004 and, thus, had to rely on the oral history accounts of a

small number of key informants for information about earlier periods. In their recounting of the Billionaires' history, members tended to focus on protest events rather than on the day-to-day practices of the organisation. Further, participants tended to remember their activities as being successful if they managed to garner media attention, but, as Haugerud notes, it is extremely difficult to assess the direct effects of protest actions. Do they attract new participants, alter policies, or harden the hearts of the opposition?

Haugerud's direct observations, presented in Chapter 5, reveal that the Billionaires' attempts at humour were sometimes lost on their spectators. Some spectators who did "get it" recognised the Billionaires' playful satire as a privilege that a member of the working poor described as "for people who got money" rather than a form of protest available to people struggling to pay rent (147). The Billionaires understand themselves as advocates for the poor but, for the most part, are not poor themselves. Haugerud reports that most are middle or upper middle class. As well, most are white, well educated, and well-versed in progressive politics. Their ranks include public relations professionals, authors, lawyers, artists, graduate students, and more than a few university professors. Chapter 5 also includes details about how the organisation's leaders in New York City exerted control over the form and content of Billionaires' events around the country. The first-hand ethnographic material is fascinating, and I found myself wanting more of the kind of analysis and careful ethnography that Haugerud provides here.

As we know, George W. Bush was re-elected in 2004. However, did the Billionaires succeed in altering American political discourse or expose the contradictions between the policies and the rhetoric of politicians? For a tiny group – during the 2004 presidential election, the largest and most active chapter, New York City, had around 150 members – the Billionaires appear to have garnered relatively outsized press attention, including stories in the *Washington Post* and a short feature in the Sunday magazine of the *New York Times*. Nonetheless, as Haugerud notes in Chapter 6, media coverage of the Billionaires rarely included an explanation of the group's political aims. Instead, news reports tended to focus on the Billionaires' light hearted play and pleasant appearance, which the journalists contrasted to existing frames of "angry liberals," scruffy social justice protestors, or window-smashing anarchists. Ironically, it seems, the Billionaires possess the cultural capital to engage in protest without offending middle-class aesthetic sensibilities or making observers (including journalists) truly uncomfortable.

In the aftermath of George W. Bush's re-election, many of the Billionaires packed away their top hats and tiaras, occasionally re-emerging as Billionaires for Bailouts or Billionaires for Coal, and even produced a video spoof of Barack Obama's Yes, We Can campaign slogan entitled "No You Can't." In her final analysis, Haugerud suggests that the real point of the Billionaires' satire is fun; it lightens the mood and restores hope among Progressives fighting what seems to be a lost cause. American politics in 2016 are no less beholden to corporate and financial elites than at the birth of the Billionaires. As this year's US presidential election approaches, it is reasonable to imagine that the Billionaires will once again don their finery to parade against plutocracy.

Manning, Paul, *Love Stories: Language, Private Love, and Public Romance in Georgia*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015, 157 pages.

Reviewer: Anna Kruglova
National Research University
Higher School of Economics, Moscow

In a way that reminds one of classic ethnographies, *Love Stories* is a book tightly woven around a paradoxical, and now discontinued, social practice. *Sts'orproba* was a way of teenage romance in a small and remote community of mountain-dwelling Khevsurs in Georgia 100 years ago. In sts'orproba's consummative moment, the *sts'orperi* lovers "lied down" for the night of talk and some carefully restricted physical intimacy. Sts'orproba, however, was understood as a sociable, and not sexual, relationship between affable peers because it was only approved between co-residential, or otherwise socially proximal, young people whose union in marriage was impossible in this exogamous society. Opposite to both sex and marriage, sts'orproba continues to fascinate with the question: What was love in Georgia?

Although of interest to scholars of post-socialism, the Caucasus, and linguistics, the book is that much sought-after, brief, jargonless, and vividly written ethnographic introduction to anthropological "intersections" that brings together a variety of classical anthropological topics, all in about 140 pages. Choosing a wonderful crosshair case of sts'orproba, Manning has built a tale around the cultural construction of desire, age, and kinship; native ethnography; gift giving; semiotic ideology; language and gender politics; religion and folklore; colonial and post-colonial encounters; cultural change; aesthetics of modernity; conundrums of nationalism; and, finally, contemporary Internet worlds. At times, *Love Stories* reads as a detective novel where Manning carefully reconstructs the kinship, gender, and sexual practices of "secretive Khevsurs" from ethnographic and folkloric sources, which include a native ethnography by a couple whose public openness becomes possible only after their exile from the Khevsur community.

Another organisational setup of the book is a romantic novel that develops chapter by chapter and stage by stage, following the progress of a teenage sts'orproba relationship through the lens of a classical ethnographic depiction. In a chapter entitled "The Ambassador," we are taken to see a matchmaking teenage girl secretly bringing lovers together, lulling a suspicious mother, persuading the girl who shows female-appropriate modesty, and the boy, whose worth as a warrior could be questioned if he showed interest in girls. In "Spending the Night Together," Manning explains what could and could not be done while "lying down" together and for what reason. Apart from being a part of sts'orproba, "lying down" could be performed in several genres and for corresponding purposes, which range from sexuality to social obligation to mere necessity of finding a place to sleep. Exploring the themes of transgression and personal autonomy, he demonstrates how much the meaning of "lying down" depended on the genre of talk associated with it and how the genre depended on whether the purpose of lying down was social or erotic.