

the “Westoxicated” woman in the 1960s), but the Europeanized dandy, called the *fukuli* (bow-tied) man. Male nationalists projected him as an unauthentic, superficial, empty character. Nonetheless, with his shaved beard and grown hair, the *fukuli*, indeed, was a reminder of the by-now disavowed *amrad* and feminized *amradnuma*; a threat to the honorable masculinity associated with the urban brotherhood. Later the question of the women’s veil pushed aside the anxiety over the *fukuli* man. But the veil was also a marker of the homosocial–homoerotic affectionate world of men and women. Within this perspective, the project of unveiling women became pivotal, not simply in the modernists’ sense, that is, as necessary for women’s emancipation, but for the modernists’ heterosocialization of culture and heteronormalization of eros and sex.

Chapter 6 reviews some Iranian classical literature and modern novellas, showing how the heterosexualization of love provided the opportunity for re-imagining marriage as a romantic rather than a procreative contract. Romantic, heteroerotic love entered into the scene of Iranian modernity as a tragedy in which its ideal happy ending (marriage) was blocked by political and cultural forces: the despotic government, ignorant people, men of religion, and lawlessness of the country. Despite the fact that men advocated romantic marriage, polygamy and divorce at their will remained unproblematic to them. This was contrary to women’s critique of both in their early writings, combined with demands on men to disavow male homosexual practices.

Chapter 7 examines modern educational regimes and their regulatory and emancipatory impulses, while the later effects of these tensions on women’s national claims are the subject of the last chapter. The re-imagination of women as companionate wives reconfigured their procreativity into a new notion of motherhood, fueled by the modernist drive for progress and science, yet trapped in a discourse of scientific domesticity. It enabled women’s quest for education and schools provided a space in which women could claim citizenship. Nonetheless, women’s assertion that they were (and are) compatriots of men were contained by the protectionist prerogative of the masculine over the feminine, real and allegorical. This conceptualization of women constructed a language of parity—in which “woman” was juxtaposed to “man.” Gradually, besides schools, the press and the new judicial courts became new national channels for women’s grievances, a movement that eventually moved the language of parity toward that of much more equality.

Najmabadi’s endeavour to integrate the study of genders and sexualities is a landmark in Iranian (and Muslim) feminist studies. Even though all of her illustrations are printed in black and white, she also deserves praise for offering one of the few efforts to use visual text as primary material for Iranian feminist historiography. The book is useful reading for students and scholars of cultural, Middle Eastern and women’s studies, as well as art history and history. She, perhaps, assumes too much knowledge of Iranian history; certainly, non-specialist readers may have trouble knitting the argu-

ments together. There are also some theoretical weaknesses. Despite her attempt to look with an “Iranian eye,” Najmabadi’s still relies too much at times on a European way of seeing. Her de-closeting of the *amrad*(numa) and challenging the modernists’ (and Islamists’) transcendentalization of Sufi love are courageous, accurate and appreciable. But her materialization of Sufi love—explicitly in the domains of sex and desire—overlooks Sufi political history and de-contextualizes Sufi love from its proper politics of visibility.

Susan McKinnon and Sydel Silverman, eds., *Complexities: Beyond Nature and Nurture*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005, 330 pages.

Reviewer: *Matthew Wolf-Meyer*
University of Minnesota

Complexities is the fruit of an attempt to bring together anthropologists from across the discipline’s subfields to consider anthropology’s fraught relationship with models of human determinism and the public debates (as the title implies) regarding “nature” and “nurture” in human cultures, development and their futures. As the editors make clear in their introduction, the contributors to the volume include the organizers of the Wenner-Gren funded workshops from the mid-1980s to the late 1990s. This set of largely senior researchers is supplemented with material solicited from junior faculty and subdisciplines otherwise under-represented in the collection. All told, there is an impressive array of scholarship included in *Complexities*, which represents watershed essays from some of the contributors, as well as state-of-the-science summaries from others.

I imagine that most readers of *Complexities* will approach the book much as I did, from the unenviable position of only being formally trained in one of anthropology’s subdisciplines, but having interest in how the subdisciplines might articulate. Because of this, some essays fail to properly orient the reader to debates within the respective subdiscipline, with some chapters unnecessarily arcane in their interests, and in a couple cases, arguing against concepts which seem to no longer hold such great sway in the minds of the public or within the academy. It should be noted, however, that there is no attempt to appeal to cultural anthropologists in particular (as might be expected since both editors are cultural anthropologists); rather, each author frames the debates they engage in as they see fit, which, in at least a couple of cases makes the debate seem quite distant from the anthropological mainstream. The more successful essays in the collection are the ones that borrow from a number of the subdisciplines, or which deploy subdisciplinary methodologies on issues germane to more than one of the anthropological subdisciplines. Rather than stress the inadequate contributions (which might be more appealing to adherents to the subdiscipline of the author), I prefer to

focus on some of the contributions to *Complexities* that are exceptional in their ability to engage readers from across the subdisciplines.

In their "Reassessing Male Aggression and Dominance: The Evidence from Primatology," Katherine C. MacKinnon and Agustin Fuentes confront the usage in sociobiology, evolutionary psychology and in some quarters of anthropology of cross-species models of aggression to explain human male behaviour. In looking at the reductionist claims made by authors who attribute aggression, promiscuity, and other "negative" male behaviours to roots in primate cousins, MacKinnon and Fuentes also examine the roles that the cultural expectations of Western scientists play in their interpretation of primate behaviour. MacKinnon and Fuentes stress that by comparing the diversity of human behaviours (as evidenced through ethnological studies) with the range of primate behaviours, "the hallmark of primates... is behavioral and adaptive flexibility and variability." They choose, in their conclusion, to stress a biocultural model of human behaviour, stressing both genetic predispositions and cultural norms, but weighting neither unduly; this tack is taken by the other contribution from a biological anthropologist, Kathleen Gibson, in her study of brain plasticity and behavioral versatility across primate species. Although for the widely read primate enthusiast MacKinnon and Fuentes offer little new, they do synthesize a great body of literature into a concise chapter that brings together primatology, contemporary biological anthropology, and elements of both cultural anthropology and (unwittingly) science studies. As such, the chapter is ample evidence that the intersection of human and primate behaviour is fruitful intradisciplinary ground to explore. Other biocultural chapters include contributions from Thomas Leatherman and Alan Goodman on mixed-method approaches to diet and health, and a charming piece from Mary Orgel, Jacqueline Urla and Alan Swedlund on popular interpretations and scientific research into human bodily aesthetics and male attraction to waist ratios. Both, like MacKinnon and Fuentes' contribution, stress the need to integrate biological and cultural models into the understanding of dominant scientific paradigms, their prestige, and the possibility of their unsettling.

Lynn Meskell offers a survey of the role of gender in archaeological research in her chapter, "Denaturalizing Gender in Prehistory," primarily as it is deployed in the New Age "goddess movement" and popular studies of archaeology. Most anthropologists are familiar with the myth of a primordial matriarchy, from which humanity has fallen; taking it upon themselves to dispel our collective androcentrism, the goddess movement attempts to evidence the primordial matriarchal order and deploy it as a foundation for contemporary women's empowerment. Meskell's offense is not at the ends to which this myth is used, but rather the shoddy archaeological work that is relied upon to make claims about the veracity of a primordial matriarchy. Meskell draws on the contemporary archaeological excavations of Çatalhöyük, a site notorious for

its role in the development of the modern matricentric mythology. Under excavation by Ian Hodder, the findings of recent years have challenged the earlier interpretations of a pristine matriarchy brought low by the introduction of men and their technology. In bringing together popular culture and archaeological knowledge, Meskell shows how eager some constituencies are for "scientific" expertise, and how critical it is for anthropologists to question their assumptions and interpretations before offering them up for popular digestion. In challenging popular misconceptions of science, Meskell offers a fine example of how anthropologists can contribute to contemporary debates, in this case about gender, sex and sexuality and their roles in social life. Other contributions from Karen-Sue Taussig, Margaret Lock, Susan McKinnon, and Nina Glick-Schiller respectively offer similar forays into challenging cultural expectations about health, disease, gender norms and the "natural" basis of citizenship. This is a tactic also employed by Mary H. Moran, in her "Barbarism, Old and New: Denaturalizing the Rhetoric of Warfare," which offers a timely repudiation of the "New Barbarism Hypothesis," represented in attempts to reduce modern conflicts to evolutionary misunderstandings and "ancient tribal hatreds." Drawing on her own research among those who appear to suffer from "ancient" animosities in Africa, Moran demonstrates the need for cultural anthropologists to attend to both the emergent and residual components of society. In so doing she offers a glimpse of how well cultural anthropological and historical research can articulate to produce explanations that resist simple reductions. More importantly, she also illustrates how cultural anthropologists can intervene in popular debates.

A concise and compelling introduction to the "new" linguistic anthropology is provided by John J. Gumperz and Jenny Cook-Gumperz. More attuned to the ways in which power and cultural expectations shape and legitimate the use of language, current movements in linguistic anthropology bring it closer to concerns within both archaeology and cultural anthropology. Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz provide a state-of-the-science summary of this current movement and examine how these recent developments help to make sense of the use of standardized and national languages. For those anthropologists already working in this idiom, there is little new here (other than an excellent review of the literature); for anthropologists in the other subdisciplines, "Language Standardization and the Complexities of Communicative Practice" offers a rich glimpse at current concerns in linguistic anthropology and the possibility of applying linguistic models to issues in archaeology, cultural anthropology, and (possibly) biological anthropology. The other contributions from linguistic anthropologists, William Foley and Eve Danziger, tend more closely to the concern with the role of the "natural" in human cultures, as it relates to innate mental structures and to the interpretation of what is "natural." While neither of these contributions evidences the same intradisciplinary concerns of the Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz chapter, they both offer illuminating views of how linguistic anthropologists deal with per-

sistent concerns about the human brain and the understanding of nature and culture in everyday life.

As one can quickly tell by a survey of the titles of chapters in the collection, “nature” and its contestation is a dominant strategy of the collected authors, commonsense for a collection subtitled “Beyond Nature & Nurture.” Unfortunately, “nurture” fails to receive similar scrutiny, and “culture” is more often used as an explanatory device than deeply interrogated for its logics. Moving beyond its stated themes, there are spectres other than the nature–nurture debate that haunt this text, and it is worth focussing on these to expose the lingering effects that dominant anthropological ontologies have on contemporary anthropology across the subdisciplines. René Descartes or Cartesianism appear in a handful of the essays, sometimes named, other times used as a ghostly point of critique. Mind–body dualism might offer another rallying point for anthropologists across the subdisciplines, as where it appears in *Complexities*, it is often argued against. That being said, very little of the philosophical literature that struggles against Cartesianism is engaged with; instead, the contributors rely on their empirical data to overcome mind–body predicaments. In so doing, the contributors fail to take seriously how ideological (and counterfactual) most of the debates they are entering into are, and how the popular predispositions that are being worked against will hold despite logical or empirical evidence to support them.

Complexities shows that the subdisciplines can work together, and that there are debates that still unite anthropologists regardless of training. The nature–nurture debate is only the tip of the iceberg in this respect, and one can hope that anthropologists will engage with other public debates. Given the proper political motivations, *Complexities* provides a model for how pan-disciplinary journals like *American Anthropologist* and *Current Anthropology* could be refigured for engagement with these debates; *Complexities* reads like a primer in pan-disciplinary praxis. There are more and less successful contributions, but the project itself is a refreshing one, and demonstrates that anthropology need not be side-lined (or marginalize itself) in current politics, both within the academy and at large.

Film Review / Revue de film

Charlotta Copcutt, Anna Weitz, and Anna Klara Åhrén, *Can't Do It in Europe*. Distributed by First Run Icarus Films, 2005.

Reviewer: *Julia Harrison*
Trent University

Advertising literature for the film *Can't Do It in Europe* suggests that it “portrays this new phenomenon of “reality tourism,” whereby American or European travellers seek out real-life experiences as exciting tourist “adventures.” The real

life that is sought out in this documentary is the silver mines in Potosi, Bolivia. According to the Lonely Planet Guide, quoted in the film, in these mines you can, “witness working conditions that should have gone out in the Middle Ages.” The camera follows tourists and tour guides as they prepare for the trip down a Potosi mine—a process which involves both dressing in protective boots, clothing and hard hats, and purchasing coca leaves, dynamite or soft drinks for the miners. It then goes down into the mine, and finally follows the exit of relieved tourists to the surface, and their ceremonial explosion of a piece of dynamite—an episode which makes them all look rather appropriately naïve. The film builds its narratives through interviews by the off-camera filmmakers with tourists, miners, former miners, local tour guides, tour company owners and city development officers about various dimensions of this touristic experience.

Tourists’ attitudes to the Potosi mine excursion vary from being disinterested and dismissive, to nervously self conscious at their desire to partake of the experience, to those who truly enjoyed going down the mine, to those joyously enamoured by the fact that they survived the trip, impatient to run off and “grab a couple of *cervezas*”; to those who express horror and disgust at the working conditions of the miners. One tourist says that he expects “to learn a lot,” but what exactly he might learn is unclear. Another says upon his exit from the mine that it is, “the Third World at its greatest”—again causing one to ponder. Exactly how does this experience make that world “great”? The film’s title, which is uttered by a tourist at the end of the film, would seem to capture the essence of what is relevant here: this experience provides the fuel for an impressive tale to demonstrate the exotic character and “awesomeness” of one’s travels upon one’s return home. As such, it has the potential to garner significant social capital. Its “extreme” characteristics startle even the savvy (maybe slightly bored) individual whose has travelled a lot, as one tourist in the film characterizes those who seek out this experience.

Is this “realist tourism”? One tourist enjoyed the fact that those in the mine were “real people,” as if somehow all the others encountered in Bolivia (and elsewhere in the Third World, one presumes) were somehow not. Are they “real” because their labours can be imagined to situate them somehow in a time and place, comfortably not coeval with the “modern,” maybe even the postmodern, world of the tourist? The sweat, labour and heavy toll this work takes on the bodies and health of the miners is real, but for the tourists it remains only an abstract experience, even if for a fleeting visit their bodies endured the filthy, cramped and claustrophobic mine environment. Theirs was largely passive experience. Some it appeared “played” at the backbreaking labour of pushing the ore carts up to the mine opening. The tourist experience in the Potosi mines, staged or not, is entirely contrived, highlighting that “realist tourism” remains something that exists only in the tourist mind.

In a manner reminiscent of the locals in Dennis O’Rourke’s 1988 landmark film *Cannibal Tours* (which follows a group of