

dence concerning genetic affinities. In the future, however, ancient DNA analyses might yield valuable information.

Americanists are very fortunate that three volumes giving fresh insights into the early prehistory of Northeast Asia have been published recently. Also relevant is Keiji Imamura's recent synthesis of Japanese prehistory (*Prehistoric Japan*), which includes the Kamitakamori site, dated 500 000 years. American archaeologists should now realize that there are no actual or logical barriers to the occupation of eastern Beringia and beyond during most of the Late Pleistocene; i.e., before about 30 000 years ago, when the Upper Paleolithic in the Russian Far East began, and before glacial ice closed the hypothetical ice-free corridor east of the Rocky Mountains, and covered most of the coasts of southern Alaska. American archaeologists should admit that they do not know when people first ventured into Alaska, and open their critical minds to careful consideration of all reported evidence, no matter how early it appears to be.

References Cited

Dikov, N.N.

1997 *Asia at the Juncture with America in Antiquity*, Richard Bland (trans.), Anchorage: National Park Service (originally published in 1993 by Nauka, St. Petersburg).

Imamura, Keiji

1996 *Prehistoric Japan*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
West, Frederick Hadleigh (ed.)

1996 *American Beginnings, the Prehistory and Palaeoecology of Beringia*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

F.G. Bailey, *The Need for Enemies: A Bestiary of Political Forms*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998, xiv + 223 pages.

Reviewer: *Anthony P. Cohen*
University of Edinburgh

"Politicians are like lawyers," says Bailey, "they rate victory higher than truth." That is perhaps the tersest and most lucid summary to date of Bailey's anthropology of politics. To make it, he revisits his 40-year-old field work in Bhubaneswar, Orissa, the work first described in his 1963 book, *Politics and Social Change*. He poses the question of the personal agendas which lie behind political disagreement, differences of view which seem to require explanation because of the extent to which they belie the appearance of collective sentiment and the claim of consensus. In the case presented in this book, the first derives from the Independence struggle; the latter, from the rhetoric of the Orissa Chief Minister. There is nothing very startling about the agendas he reveals: of caste and class; of political careers and anti-colonial experience; of aspiration, commitment and corruption. His data are in the form of extended interviews, the texts of which will be intriguing in themselves to historians of the early post-Independence period.

There is also little in the argument which will surprise readers who are already familiar with Bailey's work. We have masks; we have the axiomatic distinction made between "the political person" and "the whole person"; we have another essay on the theme of political fatalism ("Enantiodromia"), the inexorable movement from principle to compromise: "In the end, reality must win; there is a nemesis" (p. 176). It is elegantly written with more than a hint of world-weariness (and strong reminders of the influence which Manchester left on the author).

But I am not clear what this book adds to Bailey's oeuvre. I am not an Indianist, and therefore cannot judge the significance of these data. As a generalist, I suppose I take the view that a book based on 40-year-old data must either be justified by their rarity, or by the novelty of the argument. I am doubtful about the first, and unconvinced about the second. Nor do I think he demonstrates the proposition about politicians' compulsion to win. Rather, the impression I take from his vivid accounts of politics in Orissa in 1959 is that running things is more difficult than people suppose, for whatever reason. The movement from absolutism to pragmatism could be restated as one from unrealistic simplicity to actual complexity. Politicians disappoint not so much because the complexity paralyzes them, but because they seem to respond to it by reverting to a simplicity which cannot but fail many of the people and their diverse interests. This is a less interesting view of politics: that alongside the corrupt and the visionary, most politicians muddle along trying to do the best they can in the face of overwhelming odds. It is the view to which I am increasingly persuaded.

Eric Schwimmer, *Le Syndrome des Plaines d'Abraham*, Montréal: Les éditions de Boréal Express, 1996, 205 pages.

Reviewer: *Gerald Gold*
York University

From personal and research experience, Schwimmer considers three models of nationalism and sovereignty and relates each of these to the "sectorial nationalism" and cycles of tolerance which characterize the relationship of Canada and Quebec. Beginning with the toleration of 16th-century Holland, and subsequently in New Zealand, Indonesia and in New Guinea, this book adds an original perspective to studies of Quebec nationalism. Schwimmer asserts that sovereignty is the only workable solution to centuries of cyclical tolerance and acceptance of Québécois minority status. A process of "minorization" (forced acceptance of a minority status) is illustrated symbolically by the "syndrome of the Plains of Abraham." In a compelling and sometimes controversial argument he combines a critical, though selective reading of history with field work in the Mauricie region of Quebec. As the outside Dutch observer, Schwimmer comments on the political strategies of (undefined) "English" Canadians and Quebec

nationalists. His analysis focusses on the cycles of toleration which reinforce the assignment of minority status (minorization). His anthropological critique and politicized autobiography adds to social critique in Quebec.

Culturally diverse Indonesia, united by a common Javanese linguistic core, developed a form of national and postcolonial unity which Schwimmer notes is less inclusive than Québécois identity. (Forced inclusion of Timor and West Irian is not thoroughly explored by Schwimmer who does express reservations on Québécois inclusion of Native peoples.) The building of an Indonesian nation relied on unifying principles, of the “four P’s,” nonetheless, Schwimmer asks, like many critical commentators, what forms the cultural base or “Core” of a Quebec nation?

Somare provided a cultural core to New Guinea by extending the metaphor of the “big man” to a multicultural nation united with Pidgin as a common language. However, as the complex history of Quebec and Canada demonstrates, bilingualism and multiculturalism do not provide a “cultural core” which incorporates Quebec. Schwimmer demonstrates how the political status of Québécois is somewhat similar to that of the Maori of New Zealand in that the latter are culturally distinct, however do not occupy a distinctive territory. In a generalization which I consider to be simplistic, he identifies three alternative national outcomes: adsorption (Indonesia), sectorial independence (New Zealand Maori) and national independence (New Guinea and, in different circumstances, Quebec). The comparison between these “nations” emerges more clearly as their leaders are newly educated elites whose mobility is blocked by a minority who occupy most positions of power and influence (and rely on minority leaders to represent their interests—the colonial *roi nègre*). Schwimmer then compares the cyclical toleration offered the Maori with the status of Québécois and suggests that in both societies a sectorial division of powers has assured continual minorization.

Working from interviews with 15 residents in the Mauricie, a semi-rural area north of the St. Lawrence River, Schwimmer finds that his respondents use family metaphors to describe their relationships with Canada. Other anthropologists and observers such as Tremblay, Verdon and Lemieux have written about similar family metaphors in rural Quebec, although in Schwimmer’s study, the father is Canada, and in his discussion of the Parizeau model of Quebec, the national aspect of territory excludes any notion of federalism by using the metaphor of European Community. Schwimmer also emphasizes that what distinguishes these relationships is that they are about control over territory (although territorial integrity has been emphasized in Quebec government policy since 1960). The tension between the Levesque model of Quebec independence, focussed on a relationship with Canada, and the separate nation envisioned by Parizeau, runs through the last four chapters of this book and can be found in excerpts from interviews.

Schwimmer links the recent history of Quebec to the “nightmare of colonialism” and sees a relationship between

former clerical control in Quebec and caretaker regimes elsewhere. Emphasizing his theory of cycles of tolerance, the recent history of Quebec is described as an oscillation between periods of toleration and those of lent. These become contexts for events such as the Referendum (of 1976), the failure of the Meech Lake Accord and for the responses of leaders like Trudeau, Levesque and Parizeau.

Following the recent work of Sylvie Lacombe, Schwimmer emphasizes that a significant and often bypassed feature of Quebec history is the role of the modest classes and their everyday resistance to minorization by ignoring the presence of dominating others (a vision which Schwimmer attributes to Henri Bourassa). Reading this and other interpretations, a reader might ask whether they apply to the Québécois of 1997. But some, like Schwimmer, see a direct link between the earlier vision of Quebec as a conquered nation and resistance to multiculturalism. He argues that the notion of “distinct society” cannot, for the Québécois, including the people of the Mauricie, be another form of minorization. The various political options open to people of rural Quebec are now viewed by the anthropologist from the perspective of the people of the Mauricie. Following Dumont’s notion of “partial holes,” the notion of sovereignty is shown to be compatible with the world of person, place and nation as seen by people in the Mauricie. Moreover, drawing on the metaphor of popular festivals, Schwimmer recognizes the compatibility of this interpretation, which is shared by Gérard Bouchard, of the duality of elite and popular understandings of separate realms of culture. Schwimmer relates this dualism to Indian myth and observes that popular understanding of nation is not incorporated in Parizeau’s *avant projet de loi* which was an elite concept of nation.

The concluding chapter considers the emerging authenticity of Quebec as a nation. This discussion, reminds me of our research on Quebec in Louisiana where the Levesque government pursued a policy of a national and moral responsibility toward francophone minorities in America. Schwimmer’s research, which preceded the second Quebec referendum, came at a time when Quebec was abandoning its offices in many American and Canadian cities, rejecting the project of a cultural mission for one that was more economic and political. The policy change reflected a movement from collusion with traditional francophone elites to a more pragmatic and diplomatic intergovernmental policy. Nevertheless, emotional ties between Quebec and America remain linked to everyday practice and cultural icons. That conflict between minorization and statecraft remains integral to Quebec policies if not to those of that cultural space called *Francophonie*.