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 co-authored 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-

ogy and ecology. Lewis, writing the anthropological critique, points out that fire burning practices did not fall under the normal anthropological ethno-science examinations. He surmises the reason for this omission is due to the perception of hunter-gatherers as having little or no effect on their environments. Lewis also alludes to the fact that Stewart's difficulties in publishing the text may have come from his theoretical and political orientation, one which led him into direct conflict with Julian Steward as an expert witness in Indian land claim cases. Although this is a contentious statement, Lewis does offer reasoned support for it, and there is no doubt that Stewart's description of Native American's relationship to the environment attributed a greater agency than the theory of either Leslie White or Julian Steward—both of whom Lewis points to as representative of the dominant trend in anthropological theory in the 1950s and 60s in studies of ecology. Lewis asserts that Stewart's theoretical orientation, and the conclusions that he drew from it, were out of step with many of his contemporaries. For this reason alone, and given Stewart's success at the Indian Claims Commission hearings at the expense of Julian Steward and his cohort, his work is worthy of greater examination.

Anderson's ecological critique puts forward an argument similar to Lewis'. Anderson insists that most ecologists base their formulations on premises that counter to the idea that "Indians shaped the ecology of certain plant communities with fire" (p. 41). Further, she contends that if this initial premise is questioned, then much of the theoretical framework of ecologists is completely undermined. Anderson asserts that the implications of Stewart's contribution to the understanding of ecology has been far from realized, and that an appreciation of the role of Indigenous Peoples in shaping the environment will lead to a greater understanding of both the history and ecology of landscapes. This knowledge, in turn, could effect the management of resources today.

The bulk of the text—approximately 300 pages—is a tremendous collection of Indigenous burning practices across the United States. Stewart examines the literature by geographic area, and compiles the known literature for each part of the country. The text proper is encyclopaedic in form, lacking a strong narrative structure. This characteristic makes it a difficult book to read; however, as a resource its massive collection of citations and synthesis of published materials makes it a highly original and useful contribution to the discipline. Quite simply, for those interested in burning practices in general, Indigenous burning practices, and ecology, this book becomes more than a historic text or curiosity. It is an unparalleled collection detailing Indigenous involvement in altering the environment through the use of burning practices. It is worth noting that the text has a unique citation and reference style, which is a bit cumbersome, but manageable; coupled with the extensive index, the text is quite easy to negotiate.

I see two errors in the introduction from the editors. In her discussion of the long-term involvement in ecological practices, Anderson suggests that Indigenous Peoples might have such a depth in history that they are, in fact, natural to the ecological setting. Specifically, she says, "...that Indian manipulations may have occurred long enough in an area to be considered part of the normal environment of a vegetation type" (pp. 51-52). This naturalization of Native Americans does appreciate their agency, but at the same time conflates Indigenous practices with nature rather than society. In so doing, Anderson, no doubt unintentionally, seems to create a dichotomy between "modern humans" and Indigenous disturbances in the landscape. The possibility of such an understanding is enhanced by the fact that Anderson uses language that could be interpreted to fall into the same rhetorical frame that Lewis and Stewart both rail against in their depiction of burning practices. I believe the language within which she casts this interpretation would have been more faithful to Stewart's argument had it referred to Indigenous practices as having an *historic* sociology, with depth in time and breadth in knowledge. Certainly this latter interpretation is more congruous with the themes addressed in the rest of the book.

It is important to document the history of this area of anthropology and of this author. Stewart, as Lewis asserts, generated the most articulate and successful counter position to one of the most important anthropologists of the 20th century, Julian Steward. Knowing more about Omer Stewart is valuable on several levels. His applied anthropology and his appreciation for Indigenous agency, including burning practices, is an under-appreciated part of the history of anthropology. Lewis and Anderson deserve credit for their work in preserving this text, and ensuring its publication.

Jean-Claude Muller : « *Les rites initiatiques des Dìì de l'Adamaoua (Cameroun)* », Nanterre, Société d'ethnologie, 2002, 129 pages.

Recenseur : *Serge Genest*
Université Laval

Les Dìì regroupent environ 50 000 personnes vivant principalement dans le périmètre de la préfecture de Tcholliré, dans la province de l'Adamaoua au Cameroun. Depuis le début des années 1990, Jean-Claude Muller a séjourné à plusieurs reprises dans cette population et a livré le fruit de ses analyses dans diverses publications. Cette courte monographie sur les rites initiatiques des Dìì s'inscrit dans la foulée des nombreux thèmes de réflexion privilégiés par Muller.

Le premier chapitre donne des précisions sur divers aspects des rites de circoncision et montre les liens qui sont tissés entre le pouvoir de la chefferie et ces rites.

La deuxième partie du texte aborde plus spécifiquement les événements qui entourent la préparation des futurs initiés au rite de circoncision, la dynamique sociale (familiale et