

women's control of loan funds. His study thus supports the cautionary warning within the field that the singular micro-credit formula that simply advances loans to raise household income does little to challenge Bangladesh's broader infrastructure, in which women's "positional vulnerability" (p. 74) and cycle of low-paying home-based enterprises are so firmly enmeshed. As the participants in Rahman's study explain, the Grameen Bank has largely sacrificed its social development constitution to maintain a high repayment rate; "it has become a *kistir* bank, a bank for installment collection" (p. 117). Regarding institutions like the Grameen Bank as historically contingent frameworks for rules, beliefs and practices, can thus illuminate how, when gender policies intended to challenge existing relations of power are introduced, outcomes can seem so little changed.

Rahman's study could have benefitted, however, from the addition of a short section situating the Grameen Bank scheme within other microcredit and microfinance approaches. Increasingly, advocates of microlending are adopting a microfinance approach in which equal emphasis is placed on savings activities as well as on the disbursement of loans. Although enforced savings constitutes a part of the Grameen scheme, savings activities, including the brief mention of members achieving individual accessibility to their Group Fund Account (in 1996), are mentioned only in passing. What are the potential advantages of accumulated savings for some women? Similarly, although we learn that some "women borrowers achieve a degree of self-esteem and achieve investment and repayment goals" (p. 96), a natural reaction is to ask for some elaboration on success stories about women who have been able to transform power relations and to create their own spaces. From his critique of the Grameen Bank's neoliberal agenda, specifically, Rahman might have taken a bigger step forward to problematize, not only this development project, but the very concept of development itself.

These minor points aside, Rahman's book makes an important contribution to the field of development studies and especially to the recent promotion of microcredit as an international development policy. Although his study is based on one village example, it has policy implications for similar schemes being established worldwide, and for those throughout Asia and the Pacific, especially. The book raises provocative and important questions. Consequently it could provide the basis of lively debates in both undergraduate and graduate courses in development, as well as for specific discussions on development planning and policy formation.

References Cited

- Goetz, A. M., and R. Sen Gupta
1996 Who Takes the Credit? Gender, Power and Control over Loan Use in Rural Credit Programmes in Bangladesh, *World Development*, 24(1): 45-63.
- Morduch, Jonathan
2000 The Microfinance Schism, *World Development*, 28(4): 617-629.

Ken Coates, *The Marshall Decision and Native Rights*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000, 246 pages, \$24.95 (paper).

Reviewer: Robert Adlam
Mount Allison University

This book begins in its opening chapter with the individual at the centre of this controversy—Donald Marshall, Jr. He is a figure already well known to Canadians as a result of his wrongful conviction and the subsequent judicial inquiry of the 1980's. Here, Marshall is before the Court system again B this time for fishing without a licence, selling eels without a licence and fishing during a closed season. He admits to having caught and sold 463 pounds of eels without a licence and with a prohibited net within closed times. The only issue at trial, then, is whether he possesses a treaty right to catch and sell fish under the treaties of 1760-61 which exempted him from compliance with the regulations.

Joined by Mi'kmaq chiefs, the Union of Nova Scotia Indians and the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq, a legal battle ensues which works its way through the court system ending up finally before the Supreme Court of Canada. In its ruling of September, 1999, the Supreme Court not only finds for Marshall but holds that he has established the existence and infringement of a local Mi'kmaq treaty right to carry on a small scale commercial eel fishery. Amidst the controversy which follows, the Court takes the rather unprecedented step of issuing a statement of clarification [November, 1999]. The statement addresses certain misconceptions about the judgement, principal among these being, that the *Marshall* decision is specifically about eels and not about other natural resources. Further the treaty right referred to in *Marshall* is a *regulated* right. This recognizes the stewardship of the Federal government, the continuing pre-eminence of conservation, and the need to consider the "rights" of other users. Finally, the right to a moderate livelihood is interpreted as being limited to securing "necessaries"—meaning "food, clothing and housing, supplemented by a few amenities" and not to the open-ended accumulation of wealth.

For Coates, making sense of the *Marshall* decision requires a very broad and comprehensive perspective which must take account of the historical as well as contemporary circumstances of First Nations within the Maritime provinces. Accordingly, there are the historical relations which developed between First Nations and newcomers culminating in the treaties of 1760-61 B the agreements immediately relevant to the case at hand (chapter 2). As well, there are the contemporary social, economic and cultural conditions among these First Nations which finds them largely marginalized from the opportunities enjoyed by most non-Aboriginal Maritimers. Indeed, hardest hit appear to be Aboriginal youth who, even in the face of more vibrant First Nation communities and the reinforcement of language and culture, continue to experience a lack of belonging in a world markedly different from that of their ancestors (chapter 3).

The *Marshall* decision is a legal case in a long line of other such cases, from *St. Catherine's Milling and Lumber Company* (1888) through *Syliboy* (1928), *White and Bob* (1965), *Calder* (1973), *Guerin* (1985), *Simon* (1985), and *Sparrow* (1990) to *Van der Peet, N.T.C. Smokehouse, Gladstone* (1996) and *Delgamuukw* (1997). Together these cases form not only a body of law on issues of resource, treaty and Aboriginal rights but have come to symbolize a hope for greater opportunity (chapter 4). Apart from *Simon* (1985), though, none of these cases are specific to the Maritimes. *Thomas Peter Paul* (1997, 1998) involving the harvesting of bird's eye maple with the intention of selling it for profit, really represented one of the first. Here at issue is whether First Nations have a treaty right to harvest trees for commercial purposes. Although Thomas Peter Paul loses on appeal, what it does bring about is serious negotiation on the part of the government of New Brunswick and the allocation of 5% of the total permissible timber harvest for the province to First Nations collectively (chapter 5).

In the wake of the *Marshall* decision, Aboriginal fishers rush to exercise their right to fish, resulting in confrontations both on and off the water. Burnt Church, an Aboriginal community on the shores of Miramichi Bay in northern New Brunswick, quickly becomes one of the flash points of this controversy. At one point, in the early morning hours of October 3, 1999, non-Aboriginal fishers destroy some 3,000 Aboriginal lobster traps. Caught in the middle, Herb Dhaliwal, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, calls for calm and works to establish short-term agreements with Aboriginal fishers while insisting that violence will not be tolerated. In the end, the fury ignited by the *Marshall* decision subsides to be replaced by an "orderly, conservation-oriented Aboriginal fishery, without interference by commercial fishers" (chapter 6). Throughout the early months of 2000, while most bands enter into fishery agreements with the Federal government, only Burnt Church refuses (chapter 7). It serves as a reminder of just how complex and contentious the issues raised by *Marshall* have become for Maritimers (chapter 8).

Written in a journalistic style, much like the source material from which it is drawn [almost exclusively from newspaper accounts of the events], Coates provides little evidence of any direct contact with the individuals caught up in the events covered by this book. There are no interviews, for example, or descriptions of the actual events themselves. This is unfortunate since during the writing of the book, Coates is well positioned to do so, being situated at the St. John campus of the University of New Brunswick. A further failing of the book are the numerous typos and glaring errors such as the "persecution arqued . . . a significal" (p. 41). Others include: Restigouche which becomes "Lestigouche" and is repeated several times, "sadly" in place of "stated," "take" when "talk" is required, and several instances of "persecution" in place of "prosecution." All speak to the relative haste with which the book was prepared and edited.

There is, Coates writes, "a fundamental bias in the debate surrounding the Marshall case, it is the predominance of non-Aboriginal perspectives . . . First Nations perspectives and insight are generally not well canvassed (xii)." Given the approach taken by Coates, there remains a question as to whether he has remedied this situation. Indeed, there lingers a sense of lost opportunity in failing to seek out and give greater "voice" to both Mi'kmaq and Maliseet perspectives.

Gillian Cowlshaw, *Rednecks, Eggheads and Blackfellas: A Study of Racial Power and Intimacy in Australia*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999, ISBN: 0-472-08648-0.

Reviewer: Elizabeth Furniss
University of Calgary

"Rednecks, Eggheads and Blackfellas" is a study of the complex relationships that developed over an 80-year period between the Rembarrnga, an Aboriginal group in Australia's remote Northern Territory, and the white pastoralists, anthropologists, and government officials who in successive waves sought to impose forms of cultural domination and forcibly transform Aborigines' lives. Writing against a conservative Australian anthropological tradition that emphasizes studies of "traditional," bounded Aboriginal culture (p. 4), Cowlshaw instead highlights the ways in which Aboriginal lives were fundamentally intertwined with both those of regional settlers and of government agents seeking to enforce destructive state policies. Unwilling to simply denounce these relationships as "racist," Cowlshaw instead seeks to trace the "everyday manifestations of cultural hegemony" and to emphasize the "ambiguities, contradictions, and forms of compromise" that defined "race relations" on the outback frontier (p. 4).

Cowlshaw draws upon both documentary sources and ethnographic fieldwork carried out in the Northern Territory since the 1970s. Through a focus on the lives of individual Aborigines and a liberal use of interview material, Cowlshaw conveys a strong sense of the diverse ways in which different Aboriginal people have been affected by, have understood, and have sought to cope with practical, concrete forms of cultural domination. At the same time, Cowlshaw never loses sight of the overarching structural conditions—the fundamentally "racialized" system of social relations of unequal power—that sets the context for outback Aboriginal-white relations. Her facility for moving between a rich description of individual life histories and localized events and a critical examination of the broader structural and ideological contexts of Aboriginal-settler-state relations is one of the greatest strengths of this fine and challenging ethnography.

Cowlshaw begins with a review of early representations of the Northern Territory, assessing how images of "primitive" Aboriginality and ideas of progress and modernity coalesced into a discourse justifying white settlement and Aboriginal dispossession. Following Foucault, she explores