

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 Diè de l'Adamaoua (Cameroun)* », Nanterre, Société d'ethnologie, 2002, 129 pages.

Recenseur : *Serge Genest*
Université Laval

Les Diè regroupent environ 50 000 personnes vivant principalement dans le périmètre de la préfecture de Teholliré, 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 Diè 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

villageoise) mise en branle par l'annonce de cet événement et, finalement, l'opération proprement dite. L'auteur s'appuie sur la description d'une cérémonie datée de septembre 1991 comme illustration d'un cas-type de rite de circoncision dans cette population. Le lecteur est convié à une présentation ethnographique qui aborde par le menu toutes les activités liées à la circoncision proprement dite.

Le troisième chapitre décrit en détails les différentes étapes de la période de «renaissance», i.e. de réclusion/convalescence qui suit la circoncision. Elle dure le temps nécessaire à la cicatrisation du pénis de tous les initiés.

Le propos de Muller montre que la circoncision constitue un élément central de l'identité dii depuis des temps immémoriaux et qu'elle continuera de le faire dans l'avenir puisque ces rites initiatiques se maintiennent en assimilant divers changements. Ainsi, certaines familles conduisent leur enfant à l'hôpital pour y être circoncis sans que cette façon de faire n'empêche le garçon de s'inscrire au camp d'initiation comme tous les autres. Plusieurs autres transformations ont également cours, par exemple «l'individualisation croissante du processus de la circoncision» (p. 43), amenant des parents à faire circoncire leur enfant à la maison. Dans de tels contextes, le caractère autrefois communautaire de cette pratique a déjà commencé à subir des modifications en profondeur.

Les pages (pp. 107-110) consacrées à la mise en rapport de la circoncision avec la «pseudo-excision», que Muller identifie également comme «tiraillement du clitoris» (p. 108) et leur interprétation qui s'éclaire davantage dans le rapport des Diï avec leurs voisins Gbaya nous fait passer, en fin de parcours, de la description ethnographique centrée sur la circoncision à une interprétation ethnologique plus large des variations sur les thèmes de la circoncision et de l'excision, des rapports entre les sexes et de la circoncision comme «un indicateur de genre qui produit et perpétue la séparation entre les hommes et les femmes» (p. 121).

Les paragraphes de conclusion servent à aborder la question plus générale des transformations qui sont apparues dans les rites de circoncision pratiqués par les Diï. C'est alors l'occasion pour Muller d'insister sur la persistance de cette pratique comme marqueur identitaire malgré les changements qu'elle a connus depuis quelques décennies. Elle contiendrait même, dans ses manifestations actuelles, une résurgence de l'identité dii devant les forces mondiales de dé-localisation.

Pourtant, plusieurs indices des modifications apparues au fil des années et présentées dans cette monographie laissent davantage penser que nous sommes face à une rupture définitive avec des coutumes déjà passées dont l'ethnologue vient nous livrer une dernière photographie. La description ethnographique de l'anthropologue prendrait ainsi l'allure d'un témoignage à valeur historique des derniers sursauts de pratiques communautaires largement modifiées, laissant anticiper leur dissolution comme phénomène social, malgré la persistance de cette pratique.

Une remarque de détail en terminant. L'usage abondant que Muller fait de la transcription phonétique des termes et des expressions de la langue dii aurait mérité une présentation des clés du système phonétique utilisé par l'auteur en début ou en fin de texte.

Susan Greenhalgh, *Under the Medical Gaze: Facts and Fictions of Chronic Pain*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Reviewer: *Sam Migliore*
Kwantlen University College

Under the Medical Gaze is an interesting and thought provoking book. Susan Greenhalgh's personal and intimate account of her experiences with biomedicine and specific members of the medical profession makes an important contribution to medical anthropology, feminist and gender studies, and the relatively new field of autoethnography. It is the type of book that should appeal to academics, the general public and, it is hoped, medical professionals.

Greenhalgh begins with the usual review of literature and discussion of theory. The reader soon discovers, however, that *Under the Medical Gaze* is anything but a traditional academic text. Greenhalgh takes chances and experiments with the narrative. She displays courage, for example, in presenting a narrative that delves deeper into her personal feelings, psyche and medical condition(s), and provides a much more detailed account of her interactions with medical professionals than most academics would feel comfortable discussing publicly. In the process, Greenhalgh succeeds in providing us with an insider's shifting account(s) of the pain, desires and troubling doubts people may experience due to the medical diagnosis (misdiagnosis), prognosis, and treatment of chronic conditions such as fibromyalgia. She also succeeds in demonstrating the potentially negative effects a diagnosis/misdiagnosis can have on a person's self-image and mental health. The book does not provide an account of how the medical professionals themselves viewed their interactions with Greenhalgh but, to her credit, she acknowledges this and attempts to address some of the limitations of the narrative.

In terms of style, the author experiments with the narrative presentation. She distinguishes between Susan Greenhalgh, the anthropologist and author of the text, and S., the patient who diligently recorded the everyday notes that made the text possible. Although I suspect that the distinction between the "I" and the "she" facilitated the actual writing of the book, it left me wondering about the usefulness of discussing autoethnography in terms of a divided "self" (a portion of which, according to the author, no longer exists except for the notes left behind). My personal bias is that autoethnography is one means by which anthropologists can open the