sies defined in terms of non-Gypsy–Gypsy binaries or cultural content. While she appears to have the ethnographic material to do this, it is not used to full advantage. For example, while she comments on how official preoccupation with the "problem" of camping Gypsies limits the scope of legislation, policy, service and funding (including her own paid position), and documents a history of Gypsies in houses (often not identified as "Gypsies" by non-Gypsy neighbours or service providers), she ultimately offers little new insight into the housed Gypsy experience. Related to this, her discussion points to how accommodation, locality–mobility, identity and political mobilization–representation played out in Teesside, but she does not explicitly address these issues. Likewise, she does not take the opportunity (also hinted at in some of her discussions), to address how Gypsyness–non-Gypsyness may have intersected with such variables as class, gender, generation or locality and region.

Because this title is part of the *Studies in Applied Anthropology* series, the reader might expect more explicit discussion of methodology, ethics and politics. Buckler does make reference to some of the conflicting identities that she assumed vis-à-vis Gypsies, council officials, academia and family in the context of doing fieldwork "at home," but there could have been more reflection on the significance of these for the research process and product. Buckler's description of leaving her development officer job due to the challenges of combining this kind of employment with academic writing, teaching and mothering may make the study more of a cautionary, than an encouraging tale for those aspiring to applied anthropology.

Sandra Bamford, *Biology Unmoored: Melanesian Reflections on Life and Biotechnology*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006, 230 pages.

Reviewer: *Karen Sykes*
University of Manchester

Sandra Bamford has written an unusual book based on 31 months of research into the livelihoods of the people who call themselves the Kamea. *Kamea* refers to a group of 14,000 Kapua speakers, who reside in the Gulf Region of Papua New Guinea. It is a locale that is markedly the antipode to Bamford's geographical and conceptual world. In that time, she learned how to live in a world that did not privilege biology as a determinative feature of what it means to be human. The Kamea taught Bamford a number of things about how they think differently about "human nature" as it was understood by evolutionary biologists of the last two centuries, and by contrast how they understood the make-up of each person. She summarizes what she has learned about the several assumptions that the Kamea hold in the first chapter of her book. These assumptions define non-biological thinking, which she sees as the mirror of biological thinking. That mirror is then used throughout the rest of the book to reflect upon a number of contemporary debates about biotechnology in Western locales. The result is a fascinating book, aptly titled *Biology Unmoored.*

Biology Unmoored is written to make a point. That point is that some people live quite well with alternative versions of kinship as human nature; ones that are untrammelled by popular Western understandings built of concepts from medical and especially biological science. What these forms of daily existence look like, conceptually, ritually and mundanely, challenges Bamford to name them, which she does in her introduction to the text:

> 1, the capacity to mother or father a child is not given in the nature of things, but depends, instead, on the relationships that one forms with non-human species. 2, in constrast to the guiding precept of evolutionary biology, there is no embodied link that connects the generations; the organic world is understood in nongenealogical terms. 3, males and females, mothers and fathers, create markedly different kinds of social relations. Unlike Euro-American logic, there is no essential equivalence with respect to the kinds of relationships that men and women are seen to engender. 4, bodies do not exist as autonomous entities, but have the capacity to act directly upon one another. Therefore, it is entirely possible for one person to eat for another. [p. 6]

Bamford calls these examples of non-biological thinking by contrast to biological thinking, which is a form of Western academic reasoning that privileges human nature and concomitantly, the argument that human nature should not be violated on moral grounds because it is determinative in the general make-up of each person. This latter concern I will return to below.

I wish to first discuss the structure of Bamford's own argument. *Biology Unmoored* uses a complex three-way comparative method to expose non-biological thinking and biological thinking as they work in popular disputes over the ethics of biotechnology in Euro-American contexts. A couple of misconceptions about what Bamford is up to with such a comparison should be dispelled immediately. Firstly, the reader should not assume that the Kamea live in a world afloat where the flow of life and their movement in its waters is best described as "unmoored." That is not so and it is not Bamford's claim. The Kamea are very clear to anchor their knowledge of who is kin in a series of decisions about how they are related to each other. Bamford does not present the Kamea as ignorant of biology or of paternity or sibling relationships. She shows that Kamea think that human make-up is an effect of social relationships. The relationships between parents create a relationship to the child: they care for the child because they care for each other. The transmission of genetic substances is simply not a focus of their attention and does not matter in how they tether children to parents and parents to each other. Secondly, the reader should not assume that this is an account of Kamea society in the round. While some readers might want

this, I think that this is not an omission but a result of the artfulness of Bamford's highly responsible ethnographic assessments. She can relinquish responsibility for the total story for a more conscientious claim: that deep understanding is built though exposing her ignorance and misunderstandings. Her experience with the Kamea exposed quite a bit about what she had learned honestly, or put differently, what she had never before understood about human relations. She required a specific kind of comparative anthropological craft to communicate what she learned from fieldwork to a reader who had not the privilege to visit the Kamea.

Bamford has her own anthropological craft under tight control. Her presentation of Kamea views of humanity produces an exciting three way comparative framework. In each chapter her research into Kamea understandings of how they are related to each other as kin is contrasted with the assumptions of evolutionary biology by reference to a vignette about a debate in biotechnology. She introduces each chapter with a notable moral dilemma: sometimes a matter of who is related to whom, and how that is so; in other cases a concern about what makes a good parent and how one can know what is good. In so doing, she shows the pervasiveness of biological thinking in European and North American experience and provides readers, lecturers or students, plenty of material to think with as they prepare their own answers to these questions. She then provocatively contrasts that logic to its radical opposite: non-biological thinking among the Kamea.

Bamford practices ethnographic comparison as a kind of polemic; she destabilizes the assumptions of received wisdom creating doubts in her reader about their own assumptions about what is right and wrong about how humans claim to be each others' relatives. In the process Bamford makes readers wonder if Westerners have wrongly enshrined or sacralized many of the assumptions of biotechnology. With deft tacking between Kamea and Western assumptions about how we are kin, Bamford uses the craft of anthropology to travel in more uncertain waters. The distant shore is a space for anthropologists to invigorate their discipline by asking what it means to be human and thereby take responsibility for what they do not understand.

Todd Sanders, *Beyond Bodies: Rainmaking and Sense Making in Tanzania*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008, 261 pages.

Reviewer: *Andrew Walsh*
University of Western Ontario

It is hard not to compile a running mental list of actions, objects and qualities that the Ihanzu people of Tanzania consider to be gendered in one way or another while reading *Beyond Bodies: Rainmaking and Sense Making in Tanzania.* Caring for livestock is the domain of men, beer production that of women; bows, arrows and firesticks are considered male, grindstones and hearths female; heat and dryness are masculine qualities, coolness and wet feminine, et cetera. What a shame, however, to read this book for nothing but the details. What makes *Beyond Bodies* so commendable is what Sanders does with the rich accounts of daily, seasonal and ritual life from which this list might be compiled. He takes us beyond, as the book's title suggests, the familiar, attractive and ultimately misguided assumption that people like the Ihanzu, who understand themselves as living in a "thoroughly gendered world" (p. 200), must associate everything they deem masculine and feminine with sexed bodies. Sanders "seeks to develop...an alternative set of conceptual tools that will allow us analytically to extricate the body from gender—or rather, gender from the body—while simultaneously maintaining gender's manifest materiality" (p. 27) in the contexts such as the ones he describes.

Key to Sanders argument is the notion of "gender complementarity" (p. 104), a way of thinking about maleness and femaleness that is central to how Ihanzu make sense of the world. For Ihanzu, Sanders writes, "one gender evokes and demands its opposite; one without the other is neither meaningful nor potent" (p. 104). Just as men and women must work and live harmoniously if communities are to thrive, so must male and female forces come together in any number of other contexts to effect the transformations necessary for productivity and prosperity. Not that Ihanzu see all male–female combinations and the transformations they effect as reminiscent of or analogous to the processes of human sexuality and reproduction. Nor, Sanders argues, should analysts do so. "For the Ihanzu, male and female forces, while always relational, can operate within and without human forms...to assume a priori that gender must somehow be about men and women and/or the relationships between them is to disallow such understandings" (pp. 16-17). For Ihanzu, objects, action and qualities associated with male forces are as ineffective without their female complements as a firestick is without a hearth (and vice-versa), a fact that is nowhere more evident than in rainmaking.

Although I highly recommend Sanders' previous work which addresses some of anthropology's latest preoccupations—on the fate of African witchcraft in postcolonial, neo-liberal times (2001), for example, and on the parallel rise of discourses of "transparency" and "conspiracy" in the new world order (2003)—I was very happy to read in this book an unapologetic and exhaustive account of topics that are so obviously more important to Ihanzu than to anthropologists these days. Ethnographically, *Beyond Bodies* is primarily an account of Ihanzu rainmaking—and for good reason. For Ihanzu, as for so many others in the world, rain is a necessary obsession. "Without rain nothing grows. And without growth, people and animals wither and die" (p. 3). No wonder, then, that Ihanzu invest the time, resources and energy they do in thinking about, deliberating over and seeking to direct the seasonal rains that make or break them. In offering such a comprehensive and readable account of these investments, Sanders reminds us of