

favorise et aménage les liens et les pratiques d'aide et de soin par la création d'entreprises et d'organismes. Pour soutenir les familles et compléter les services publics dans la prise en charge à domicile des personnes dépendantes, différents organismes proposent ainsi leurs services ou sont appelés à le faire par les pouvoirs publics. Certains d'entre eux existent depuis longtemps, d'autres sont plus récents. Ces divers organismes de bénévoles, organismes privés ou d'économie sociale, participent au réaménagement des modalités selon lesquelles notre société pense et gère la question de la dépendance.

Les auteurs examinent d'abord dans quelles conditions les organismes et entreprises ont émergé. A cet égard, ils montrent comment les services bénévoles ont été créés pour l'aide à domicile, et dans quelle mesure ce recours au bénévolat touche à la fois à la question de la liberté dans la relation d'aide et de soin, et à la question des responsabilités collectives face à la dépendance. Examinant quelle place les entreprises privées ont obtenu dans le champ de l'aide et des soins, ils montrent que la création et l'essor de ces organismes et entreprises est lié à des déplacements dans l'aide que peuvent recevoir les personnes dépendantes. On voit ainsi comment, au moment où les entreprises privées à but lucratif connaissent un certain essor, une autre sorte d'entreprise a fait son apparition : les entreprises d'économie sociale, destinées à créer des emplois de réinsertion sociale. La nécessité de replacer la relation d'aide dans son contexte conduit les auteurs à examiner la nature de cette relation dans ces divers cadres que sont les organismes de bénévoles, les entreprises d'économie sociale, et les entreprises privées, où la valeur du service est directement corrélée à la gratuité du service ou au contraire à sa valeur marchande.

Les facteurs invoqués par les pouvoirs publics qui expliquent et justifient les politiques de maintien à domicile sont bien évidemment tous porteurs de la question de la dépendance et de son contraire : l'autonomie. En effet, si les personnes âgées en perte d'autonomie constituent la majorité des personnes touchées par l'aide à domicile (70%), divers autres groupes en sont également bénéficiaires : personnes handicapées, malades chroniques, personnes post-hospitalisées, personnes souffrant de problèmes de santé mentale chroniques ou de troubles cognitifs, mourants, malades atteints du sida, donc des individus vivant des expériences très différentes et nécessitant des services variés.

Eric Gagnon et Francine Saillant examinent également les dimensions et les expressions de la relation qui s'établit entre les différentes catégories d'intervenantes et les personnes auxquelles elles apportent aide et soin, en s'interrogeant sur la place qu'elles occupent en tant qu'intermédiaires entre un espace public et un espace privé, et entre la personne aidée et son milieu. A travers le tableau qu'ils brosent, se lit la place de l'écoute, de la compassion, de l'amour et de l'empathie, comme partie intégrante de la vision humaniste de l'intervention, et se révèlent les deux figures du lien social que concentre le rôle des intervenantes : la figure de

l'ami et la figure du professionnel. Discrétion, confidentialité, respect de l'intimité, mesure de la parole, réserve, sont autant de qualités qui caractérisent les pratiques des intervenantes et qui sont les conditions nécessaires à l'établissement de ce qui est considéré comme une «bonne relation». Les auteurs montrent combien, pour les intervenantes, l'aide et les soins, c'est avant tout un acte de communication, lequel se déploie suivant une certaine temporalité. La question de la temporalité, analysée ici avec une grande finesse, est fondamentale au regard de la relation de confiance qui doit s'instaurer. Certes, la durée des liens amenuise la distance existant au début de la relation. Mais, si le temps écoulé permet aux aidés de s'habituer à cette présence, un contact trop fréquent met en péril la bonne distance qui doit être préservée. Comme on le voit, c'est une relation tout entière fondée sur la bonne mesure.

La référence à la figure de l'ami ouvre sur une nouvelle question, que n'esquivent pas les auteurs, celle des liens de l'intervenante avec le milieu familial. Ainsi, une des dimensions de l'ouvrage consiste à cerner comment cette pratique d'aide s'inscrit à l'intérieur des familles et des communautés des aidés, et à étudier la place spécifique de l'intervenante à la fois par analogie et par différence avec les membres de la famille.

Enfin, s'interrogeant sur la manière dont se joue la gestion de la liberté dans cet espace particulier qu'est la relation d'aide, les auteurs examinent comment et jusqu'où les intervenantes s'y engagent, comment elles affirment leur indépendance et leur liberté en écho à celles que revendiquent les aidés, comment se pose la question des limites et comment s'exerce ou non le contrôle extérieur sur leurs actes.

Pour conclure, l'ouvrage ouvre sur une question de toute première importance : le rôle de l'Etat. Dans la société moderne que les auteurs qualifient de «société de la dépendance» au sens où la dépendance fait problème, les auteurs mettent en évidence les formes fortement institutionnalisées que prend la gestion de cette dépendance, dans la mesure où l'Etat distribue les rôles et les responsabilités à l'intérieur même de la sphère privée.

Au total, Éric Gagnon et Francine Saillant nous proposent ici un ouvrage alliant la sensibilité et la lucidité sur un phénomène social d'une actualité croissante.

Review Essay

Mary Bouquet (ed.), *Academic Anthropology and the Museum: Back to the Future*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001, xiv +240 pages.

Reviewer: Barbara Lawson
Redpath Museum, McGill University

Following decades of marginalization and neglect, museums have become sites of critical interest for many anthropolo-

gists and other social scientists engaged in studies of institutional life, exhibitions, and material culture. Museum anthropology made its debut in the latter half of the 19th century; its period of greatest influence coinciding with the establishment of the university as anthropology's institutional setting in the 1890s. With the fieldwork revolution of the early 20th century, museums declined as places for academic anthropology, reaching an all-time low by mid-century.

Academic Anthropology and the Museum examines the current period of renewal and re-invention, which began gathering momentum almost twenty years ago. Editor Mary Bouquet (Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam) has already gained scholarly attention with theoretical writings on museums and material culture (2000a, b). The need for a sampling of recent museum-related work by anthropologists was apparent to Bouquet who had just set up a course on cultural anthropology and museology at Utrecht University. The editor suggests that her own Netherlands-based experience and the European-focus in most of the articles provide a useful alternative to anthropology's almost exclusive preoccupation with the Anglo-American tradition. Not mentioned by Bouquet, but also significant, is that one of the few works focussing on museum anthropology to emerge immediately before the museum boom, *From Field-case to Show-case* edited by W.R. van Gulik, et al. (1980), was also Netherlands-based. Thus the present volume serves as a useful benchmark for those interested in assessing theoretical, pedagogical and praxiological developments over the past 20 years.

In addition to her own introduction and essay, Bouquet has assembled contributions from 12 anthropologists. Among them, the names of Michael Ames and Jeanne Cannizzo will be familiar to readers of *Anthropologica*. The contributors, mostly associated with European universities, represent varied levels of museum involvement—some having experience as curators or directors and contributors to the development of museological theory, others more theoretically oriented with limited “field” experience. The sites under investigation, such as the Smithsonian, Alert Bay's U'mistà Centre, and northern Australia's Melville and Bathurst islands, comprise a broader geography than the academic affiliations of the contributors. The 12 essays are intended to provide a cross section of the many different types of anthropological work now being undertaken in museums; they are grouped as an introduction and the five sections discussed below.

(1) “Anthropological encounters with the post-colonial museum” addresses the complexity of cultural relations during and after the colonial period and how these are embodied in museum artifacts. Saunders' contribution examines Belgium's Royal Museum for Central Africa (the Koninklijk Museum, Tervuren) and the U'mistà Centre (Alert Bay, British Columbia) and finds these geographically and historically disparate locales similar as representations of pseudo-scientific culture (termed pseudo-Boasian in the case of the U'mistà Centre). Both institutions are found to link centre

and periphery, but in opposite directions. Although the essay is often insightful, this reader was vexed by its frequent lapses into jargon-laden obscurity. Relations of scientific production and centre/periphery oppositions are further explored in Porto's consideration of museum photography as print-colonialism in Portugal and Angola, and Venbrux's look at the pre-museum history of anthropologist Baldwin Spencer's collecting of Tiwi artifacts on Melville and Bathurst islands.

A methodological framework, which sees museums anew from the critical stance of the social scientist, is the basis for both sections (2) “Ethnographic museums and ethnographic museology ‘at home’” and (3) “Science museums as an ethnographic challenge.” A variety of institutions serve as field sites, as activities behind the scenes and in the public space are examined, and as the lay public and museum practitioners are recast as subjects of investigation. In section (2), Segalen examines the historical, institutional, and sociological contexts of France's national museums, with special consideration of the Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires, while Dias compares teaching ethnographic museology in anthropology departments at Lisbon's Instituto Superior de Ciências Do Trabalho e da Empresa (ISCTE) and at the University of Coimbra. At issue are the historically divergent trajectories of anthropological research and museum presentations, which although discussed with regard to France and Portugal, should in no way be taken as a particularly unique state of affairs. Segalen's case study is somewhat surprising in its tendency to polarize recent efforts by anthropologists and museum practitioners: the former apparently uniquely suited to recapture public attention and fulfil a new social role by illuminating contemporary concerns, while the latter group remains hopelessly bound to displaying the contents of fusty reserves regardless of any other considerations. In this regard, Dias' call for a renewed dialogue between anthropology and museums is far more sensible.

Section (3) employs ethnographic methodological and theoretical developments to determine how scientific knowledge is both represented and constituted in museum settings. The chapter by González, Nader and Ou provides an excellent historical overview of the anthropological literature treating the conflicting epistemologies that emerge when artifacts are interpreted and cultures are represented in exhibitions. The contexts they examine are the *Enola Gay* and *Science in American Life* exhibits at the Smithsonian Institution and the ensuing controversies which challenge the notion that scientific and curatorial experts are purveyors of objective reality. Their discussion of “scientific” hegemony over public spaces is particularly compelling when considered in relation to the subject of cultural representation in academic anthropology. Macdonald's behind the scenes fieldwork at London's Science Museum is nicely counterpoised with the front stage orientation of the previous chapters and also provides a good bridge to discussions which follow. With

close to two decades of museum-related anthropological critique, it is indeed refreshing to have some insights acknowledging the complexity of museum culture, the fallacy of assessing exhibits as the work of one or two individuals, and a recognition of the critical and informed reflexivity engaged in by many members of the museum community.

Behind the scenes activities are further explored in section (4) "Anthropologists as cultural producers," which examines the convergence of museological theory and practice with accounts of anthropological forays into the depths of museum territory. Shelton explores the realm of critical museology in which issues and non-conventional exhibition genres deconstruct the work of museums. The focus is on Britain and specifically the Brighton Museum, which reworked its ethnographic displays in exemplary fashion during the mid-1990s with a variety of new interpretive strategies, cultural engagements and creative interventions. Jean Cannizzo compares processes of cultural production in academic research, radio programming and museum exhibitions with a case study of the development of *David Livingstone and the Victorian Encounter with Africa*, an exhibition which was generated and displayed by the National Portrait Gallery (London) and the Royal Scottish Academy (Edinburgh). She realistically describes constraints and negotiations required for an academically-trained anthropologist to collaborate with specialists inside the cultural milieu. As with Macdonald's contribution, Cannizzo's account of contingency, detail and complexity in the process of cultural production is most welcome. This section closes with Bouquet on the subject of exhibition-making and the process of translating concept into design, rendering museum collections visible and accessible to the public. Her fieldwork site is the Institute and Museum of Anthropology at the University of Oslo, where she is able to observe the shift in organizational arrangements that have reconfigured that institution since the 1990s. It is important to mention here that new managerial regimes, dependence on contracting personnel for projects, shifts in the balance of power between curators and other staff members resulting from changes in emphasis from collections to exhibition have likely affected all museum sites under scrutiny in the present volume over the past decade. Bouquet's ethnography of exhibit-making reveals different levels of human agency in what appears to the uninitiated simply as an arrangement of objects, images and words. The volume's final section (5) "Looking ahead" consists of a single essay by Michael Ames, a prominent figure in museum anthropology's recent history. Ames directed UBC's Museum of Anthropology for nearly a quarter century, and his commentary on possible museum scenarios in the year 2015 is well-informed and a fitting ending for this stimulating volume.

As Bouquet notes in her introduction, the relationship now developing between university anthropology and museums poses numerous challenges for academic teaching and research. Perceptions of ethnographic museums as being iso-

lated from everyday life, serving as repositories for exotic objects or mausoleums of material culture and as potentially glorifying colonial exploitation continue to plague anthropological inquiry. Recent criticisms, such as those articulated by Haas (1996), express concern over museum anthropology's ability to divest itself of this perceptual and material baggage. With intensified scrutiny by the academic world and also from numerous cultural communities, the task of cultural representation within contemporary museums has also become increasingly complex. Artifact-related dialogues frequently give way to fundamental concerns about control, both internal and external, and conflicting epistemologies compete for the attention of a shape-shifting audience. *Academic Anthropology and the Museum* focusses on anthropologists, but the consideration given to relations between academic and museum worlds will be useful to any scholar with current affiliations or aspirations to engage with museum culture. In terms of the volume's original intent, as a work responding to the needs of those teaching and studying anthro-museology, it is an impressive accomplishment.

References

- Bouquet, Mary
 2000a Thinking and Doing Otherwise: Anthropological Theory in Exhibitionary Practice, *Ethnos*, 65(2): 217-236.
 2000b Figures of Relations: Reconnecting Kinship Studies and Museum Collections, *Cultures of Relatedness*, J. Carsten (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 167-190.
- Haas, Jonathan
 1996 Power, Objects, and a Voice for Anthropology, *Current Anthropology*, 37 (supplement): S1-S22 (includes C.A. comment).

Veena Das, Arthur Kleinman, Margaret Lock, Mamphele Ramphele, Pamela Reynolds (eds.), *Remaking a World: Violence, Social Suffering, and Recovery*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Reviewer: *Sima Aprahamian*
Concordia University

Remaking a World: Violence, Social Suffering, and Recovery edited by Veena Das et al. is the third (and last) volume on social suffering, violence and recovery compiled by the members of the Committee on Culture, Health, and Human Development of the Social Science Research Council (New York). Whereas the first two volumes *Social Suffering* and *Violence and Subjectivity* examined the effects of problems related to force, political, economic, institutional power on individuals and communities, this last volume explores how people build their lives after collective trauma or after being marginalized through structured violence.