

What are some of the highlights of the book? Harries-Jones helps to place advocacy in the context of the emergence of recent social movements (e.g., environmentalism, feminist and pro-human rights) that are extra-parliamentary but not revolutionary or class-based. Such movements are concerned with empowerment and consciousness raising, and advocacy is an essential mechanism for making the public aware of alternative values.

One cannot but admire the courage, tenacity and ingenuosness of the Chilean social scientists who established over 30 centres of research and advocacy related to issues of poverty, gender and indigenous peoples during the repressive Pinochet regime. These endeavours, as described by Landstreet and his colleagues, were outside of academia and were sometimes under the precarious protection of the church.

Howard Adelman effectively describes the players (politicians, public servants, N.G.O's and media) and the highly fluid circumstances of advocacy for refugee rights. Elspeth Heyworth makes a very compelling argument for more equitable relationships between community groups and local universities, as Stan Marshall advocates industrial research conceived from the labour, rather than the management, point of view.

The chapters by Metta Spencer, Gareth Morgan and Steward Crysdale all provide useful insight regarding the relationship of traditional social science to advocacy. Included are overviews of the history of social science advocacy in Canada and suggestions for more compatible perspectives.

Finally, the other articles by Tim Rees and Carol Taylor, Don Dippo, Ronnie Leah and John Cleveland all make competent and interesting observations about their respective domains of race relations, employment training, trade unions and feminist issues and feminism *per se*.

I am very sympathetic to the issues of advocacy that were raised by Harries-Jones and his colleagues. However, I had one particular problem with this book. It was not easy to read. Surely we should learn to communicate more effectively if we are going to serve as social scientist/advocates. Frequently, I found this book somewhat turgid and overly academic. I sometimes found my mind wandering and then had to reconcentrate to retrieve the presumably relevant points.

In spite of this somewhat uncharitable comment on my part I do consider that the book makes significant contributions to the analysis (rather than the conduct) of advocacy. I would use it as source material for graduate and undergraduate classes in applied anthropology. With a lot of concentrated, disciplined reading, those interested in the analysis (and to some extent, the practice) of advocacy can gain much from the book. Furthermore, the Canadian content of the book has a lot to recommend it, especially since the issues can be made generalizable to other national contexts.

The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses

David Howes, ed.

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. xiv + 336 pp. \$45.00 (cloth), \$19.95 (paper)

Reviewer: Michael G. Kenny

Simon Fraser University

The purpose of the collection under review is to construct the foundations for an "anthropology of the senses" and to shift emphasis away from vision—the sense taken to

be at the heart of Western philosophical and psychological concern—so as to include the other sensory modalities of hearing, smell, taste and touch within the rubric of anthropological inquiry. The editorial intent is therefore both programmatic and methodological. We should attempt to understand cultures not as “world views” (a term which contains an implicit visualist prejudice), but as meaningful embodied ways of organizing the sensorium *as a whole*. The various ethnographic essays in the book show how this might be done and it concludes with a set of notes and queries meant as practical directives for future research.

The spirit of Marshall McLuhan hovers in the background. By emphasizing historical changes in perception wrought by changes in communicative media, McLuhan is seen as having opened up the general issue of the way in which culture, broadly considered, structures the sensorium and situates individuals in relation to the social and natural worlds. For example, what difference does it make to use visual as opposed to auditory metaphors when speaking of knowing or understanding (“I see,” as opposed to “I hear”)? Is “seeing” a more individualistic and private mode of apprehension than “hearing”? What does favouring one or the other tell us about culturally specific ways of apprehending and determining the relationship between self and experience? The fundamental point here is that different societies organize the sensorium differently by emphasizing one sensory modality at the expense of others and conceiving of the relation between perception and cognition in different ways.

Such questions lead on to empirical investigations of how the sensorium (“the entire sensory apparatus as an organizational complex”) is actually structured in particular cases. The question now becomes one not merely of the relative emphasis given to a particular sensory mode, but of holistic analysis of the sensorium as a system of meaning: a system of synesthetic relationships between sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch as manifest in ethnographic contexts amenable to symbolic analysis (structuralist, Turnerian, etc.). We therefore learn of New Guinea drums which mimic the complex language of birds, of a forest world which speaks to the living in the voices of the dead. Likewise we learn of the message-bearing capacity of incense in Morocco, of the significance of flavours on the Indonesian island of Sumba, of the East-African safari tourist’s “gaze,” of the transmarginal nature of smells and of many other things.

As “sourcebook,” the present work brings together material which the editor believes to be foundational to the field of sensory anthropology; it grew out of seminars in this area and has a strong pedagogical bent. It is meant for use in class and contains essays which suggest how primary ethnographic resources might be quarried for relevant material. At its most abstract level the book represents a critique of decontextualized perceptual psychology and of the Cartesianism taken to be implicit in a Western visual orientation (percipient clearly divorced from the perceived, mind from body). The message here is that “perception, like cognition, must be studied in its ‘natural setting’” (p. 275). However, in setting up Cartesianism and psychophysics as straw men, the book contains something of an ethnocentrism of its own in that it diverts attention from the complexities of the “Western” sensorium itself (what of the bouquet of wines, what of the class associations of frying onions, what of the significance of bells and incense in the Catholic mass, what of phenomenology and formal aesthetic theory?). But that is a relatively minor point. On the whole this is a very interesting and useful effort, well calculated to get us to think differently about the perceptual order than we might otherwise have done.