potential to redress the lack of government and museum support that it documents. It neither preserves and promotes Canadian crafts, nor demonstrates the scholarly value of material culture collections. Finally, although nationalism is a constant theme of the craft writers Flood cites, her analysis does not refer to the critical discourse on nationalism that would have explained the central role it played in the Canadian craft movement, as well as the failure of the Canadian government to support these efforts to foster national culture. Nevertheless, the book has great value as a research resource. Flood excels in the compilation of a body of otherwise obscure data. Her coverage of the histories of craft organizations, agricultural fairs and craft instruction, as well as her account of government apathy towards museums and national culture, are original and comprehensive. The questions posed and the data presented are invaluable contributions to museum scholarship. Let us hope that this work will stimulate further inquiry into related questions that are of major significance not only to the craft and museum communities, but also to the Canadian nation as a whole.

Anna Grimshaw, *The Ethnographer's Eye: Ways of Seeing in Modern Anthropology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, xiii + 222 pages (paper).

Reviewer: *William Rodman*
McMaster University

This is a book as much about ways of knowing as ways of seeing. It is a volume appropriate to the first years of the new millennium, because it carries forward in innovative new directions some of the themes and theoretical advances that emerged during the crisis in representation in the late 1980s and 1990s. In the long wake of Clifford and Marcus's *Writing Culture*, mainstream anthropology remains largely a discipline dominated by words. Anna Grimshaw, a leading British visual anthropologist, seeks a shift in focus from emphasis on the construction of the anthropological text, toward perceptions of the ethnographer's eye and a new way of seeing in contemporary anthropology. She seeks to move anthropology beyond writing culture, toward seeing culture.

The overarching theme of Grimshaw's book is "how visual techniques and technologies have rendered problematic all aspects of anthropology" (p. 89). Her starting point is anthropology's ambivalence concerning vision as a primary source of knowledge. On the one hand, anthropology is ocularcentric: it privileges vision as a means of knowing the world. Fieldwork, for example, is premised on the idea of "seeing" things for ourselves—"I-Witnessing," in Geertz's well-known play on words. Yet anthropologists also tend to be iconophobic, distrustful of images, ever-aware of the possibilities that the truth of images may be illusory, or, at best, partial.

The author relates the history of visual anthropology to broader histories—of cinema, of theory in anthropology. Considering the short length of her book, Grimshaw performs well the difficult task of capturing the grand flow and sweep of anthropology during the last century, from romantic and humanist engagement with the world in the first decades of the 20th century, to consolidation and retreat into specialization in the postwar era, to re-engagement with the world in the new age of participatory, collaborative anthropology. She presents visual anthropology as an unsettling reminder of some of the most difficult and complex questions that lie at the heart of much current anthropological practice. How does what we see give rise to what we think we know? How do our visions of the world inform our claims to ethnographic authority? What are the limits of truth in still photography and film?

Grimshaw has organized her book in an artful way. She conceives of the form of her book as an attempt to strike a balance between two cinematic techniques, montage and mise-en-scene. Montage is a technique based on the idea of radical juxtaposition, a new whole produced from edited fragments. She uses the metaphor of mise-en-scene, or "staging," as a scholarly and substantive balance to creative, intuitive, heady montage. Mise-en-scene implies context, composition, situated knowledge, thick description, and totality of design. In the four chapters in part 1 of her book (the "montage" section), she discusses a film-maker and an anthropologist in the context of each other's work and times: Lumiere and Haddon, Griffith and Rivers, Flaherty and Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown and Grierson. From these unlikely pairings come some extraordinary insights, such as her provocative but well-argued claim that W.H.R. Rivers' genealogical diagrams owe more to Cubist paintings than to representations of family trees. She also shows how the ideas and techniques of film pioneers Auguste and Louis Lumiere influenced the use of film in the first great fieldwork expedition, Haddon's 1898 expedition to the Torres Straits. Then she goes on to make the highly original argument that D.W. Griffith, the innovative director of *Birth of a Nation*, changed the direction of anthropology, as well as cinema. Griffith "shattered the camera's static pose" (p. 25), and, by so doing, freed Rivers and, later, Malinowski to create a kind of research in which the vantage point of ethnographer's eye is located at the center of the action, in the complex, ever-changing drama of village life. The waxing and waning of romanticism in anthropology is of particular interest of Grimshaw. She clearly prefers the work of scholars and filmmakers she perceives as animated by the romantic impulse (the director Robert Flaherty and Malinowski, and in the postwar era, Jean Rouch) to those—such as Radcliffe-Brown and the documentary filmmaker John Grierson—whose work derives from an enlightenment vision of the world. She values revelation, "the transformation of commonplace understandings" (p. 45), over illumination, which emerges from the enlightenment project and appeals to the intellect more than the senses and emotions.

Part 2 of *The Ethnographer's Eye*—the "mise-en-scene" section—opens with an integrative chapter entitled "Cinema and Anthropology in the Postwar World." Here, she relates the rise of documentary film-making to the consolidation of academic anthropology in the postwar era. Grimshaw then devotes three chapters to individual anthropologists who also are important filmmakers: Jean Rouch, David and Judith MacDougall, Melissa Llewelyn-Davies. These case-studies are self-contained essays, but they also extend Grimshaw's main arguments concerning vision and the nature of anthropological knowledge. This section of the book is notable not only for her discussions of the careers of anthropological filmmakers, but also for her insights into particular films of anthropological importance. She exposes, for example, the hidden layers of subjectivity in Rouch's *Les Maitres Fou*, and the beginnings of politicized, participatory cinema in the MacDougalls' *Turkana Trilogy*. The final chapter concerns the emergence of anthropological television, in which Melissa Llewelyn-Davies played a key role. Grimshaw regards Llewelyn-Davies' films on Maasai women as important because "they present to the viewer the world of women as they experience and describe it to a woman anthropologist" (p. 155). Her television films also are important because they reach a mass audience and achieve the goal of presenting ethnographic materials to a mass audience without popularizing or oversimplifying her case studies.

I have two criticisms of Grimshaw's fine book. First, she uses cinematic principles (montage, mise-en-scene) in the presentation of her ideas, and asks the reader to "engage in the book with a cinematic sensibility" (p. xi). She asks this, but provides no illustrations—no non-textual, purely visual points of reference in her book. Illustrations would have enhanced her book and advanced her argument. To cite one specific example, Grimshaw points to the "strikingly visual quality of Malinowski's texts" and calls him "the most *painterly*" of all the classic ethnographers (p. 45, italics in original). Yet she provides neither examples of what she finds visual in Malinowski's work, or illustrations that might lend support to her contention that he is "painterly." In fact, parts of some of Malinowski's books could be construed as both painterly and visual (the opening chapters of *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* are a good example) but Grimshaw does not provide evidence of this: she merely asserts the link between the visual and the textual in Malinowski's work.

My second criticism concerns the way Grimshaw ends her book. The book ends, surprisingly, not with conclusions, but with nothing more than a two-page epilogue. Here, there is no summing up or binding together of the threads of her argument. Instead, in her epilogue, she asserts that *The Ethnographer's Eye* is "a manifesto. It seeks to establish a new agenda for visual anthropology" (p. 172). Does Grimshaw claim too much for her work? Perhaps. There is no doubt that she is a scholar of major importance in the new visual anthropology, but she speaks for herself, and not on behalf of some group, except perhaps readers willing to convert to her point of view. The elements of the book that might be counted as a manifesto are not developed in a systematic manner. Grimshaw's book is less a coherent manifesto than a work of elegant and accessible scholarship: her insights into the past and present of ethnographic cinema are stunning, and she articulates a vision concerning the role of vision in the future of anthropology. As the title of her book implies, she is best regarded as a seer.

Omer C. Stewart, *Forgotten Fires: Native Americans and the Transient Wilderness* (edited and with introductions by Henry T. Lewis and M. Kat Anderson), Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002, xi + 364 pages (cloth).

Reviewer: *Marc Pinkoski*
University of Victoria

Forgotten Fires: Native Americans and the Transient Wilderness, Omer Stewart's posthumously published opus on Indian fire burning practices, is a curious and fascinating book. Given the rise of uncontrollable brush fires throughout the world, the book contains a breadth of study on a timely topic that is unparalleled in either anthropology or environmental studies. The quite remarkable facts of the book, however, are that the bulk of it was written almost five decades ago, and that Stewart's demonstration of the humanity of Native Americans, through the technology and knowledge of fire burning practices, is a prescient depiction of Indian agency that many more recent accounts still do not recognize.

The book is divided into four sections. The first is a coauthored introduction written jointly by the editors, Henry Lewis and M. Kat Anderson. This introduction details the history of the book, and why it was originally rejected for publication. It also outlines a cogent argument for the continued relevancy of the material, dated though it may be, by presenting the text as a historic document. The primary function of the introduction is to situate the book within the anthropological and ecological literature as a forerunner to challenges of the perception that Native Americans were benign agents in their landscape, and emphasise that they were, and continue to be, makers of and participants in the environment. The editors offer as a final contribution of the book the necessity for management officials to reconsider the role of burning practices in the recent and long-term history of the North American landscape. They argue that Native American agency in controlling, caring for, and managing lands through various forms of traditional ecological knowledge has a deeply rooted history in the ecology of the continent.

The next two sections round out the editors' introduction to the text by offering a critique of the original monograph and situating it in a contemporary context of both anthropol-