Cultural Reflections
Journal of the Graduate students of Anthropology

RAL REFLEC

CULTURAL R

L REFLECTIC

IONS   CULT

Cultural Reflections

Journal of the Graduate Students of Anthropology

MISSION: Cultural Reflections is a peer-reviewed journal organized by anthropology graduate students. We accept anthropologically-relevant submissions from all university and college students on Vancouver Island, on a Call for Papers basis. Cultural Reflections strives to be a participatory publicaiton offering an opportunity for students to participate fully in the peer-review, evaluation and publishing process. The Editors seek scholarly contributions including articles, reviews, and field notes, covering diverse topics and issues from all four anthropology sub-disciplines: archaeology, cultural, physical and linguistic anthropology.

About Cultural Reflections

Cultural Reflections is a peer review journal produced by the graduate students in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Victoria. Cultural Reflections covers diverse topics and issues from all four anthropology sub-disciplines: archaeology, cultural, physical and linguistic anthropology. We invite submissions from all graduate students from various disciplines at the University of Victoria, as well as from undergraduate Anthropology students from Vancouver Island colleges and universities.

Submissions for publication fall into the following categories:
- Papers/Articles: maximum 20 pages, double-spaced, including notes and references.
- Reviews of books, conferences or speakers: maximum 7 pages, double-spaced.
- "Field Notes" consisting of thoughts, experiences, short articles, or diary snippets from field-work experiences: Maximum 7 pages, double spaced.
- Image based work, in single or essay form: Include captions and relevant text.

Editors of the publication are responsible for:
- soliciting submissions
- coordinating peer review process
- returning reviewed papers to the authors and providing editorial feedback
- formatting finalized articles into journal form
- coordinating printing process
- mail out to Canadian Universities and subscribers
- managing Cultural Reflections account
- soliciting funding from University donors

And it's a lot of fun!!

General Articles

Field Notes

Reviews

Introduction

Welcome to the combined sixth/seventh issue of *Cultural Reflections*, a journal put together by the graduate students of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Victoria. Since its inception in the Fall of 1997, *Cultural Reflections* has remained an overwhelmingly successful project, receiving high praise from students, professors and anthropology departments across the country. For those of you familiar with past issues of our journal, we thank you for your continued interest and support, and we are confident that you will be delighted by this year's selections. To all of our new readers, we hope you enjoy your first Cultural Reflections experience, and remember to look for us again next year.

This current issue of *Cultural Reflections* would not have been possible without the dedication of the contributors and editors. Their commitment to the editorial process was outstanding, as each participant had to anonymously review three other articles, a process that served to strengthen and polish the pieces that now appear in this volume. We commend this year's authors for maintaining the high standards that have characterized the previous journals. We would also like to extend a warm thank you to our generous financial sponsors. These are individuals who recognize the importance and value of projects that aim to combine student's academic interests with the practical, professional skills often required in the dissemination of information.

The team that was responsible for this issue of *Cultural Reflections* has benefited tremendously from this opportunity of being involved in the production of a peer-reviewed academic journal. Keeping in line with last year's issue, we decided to solicit articles not only from anthropology students, but from students in other academic departments who believed their work to be of anthropological interest. This issue is truly a testament to the incredible scope and diversity of contemporary anthropology.

We hope you enjoy reading this issue of Cultural Reflections!

The Cultural Reflections Team

Vanessa Dicenzo
Andrea Gemmill
Cynthia Korpan
Anita Maberly
Michelle Rogers

Edith Blades

Whose Home and Native Land?

Abstract

Indigenous peoples claim a particular bond to their ancestral land. This bond is the basis of their claim to these territories and belief in their inalienable right to this land. The deep connection by indigenous peoples to their land can be difficult to understand for some non-native people. This paper reflects on the concept of native homeland by comparing the concept of home among indigenous peoples to the Jewish concept of the land of Israel. In both cases the connection to the land is cultural, spiritual, economic, and environmental. Such parallel commitment to ancestral land leads to a reflexive consideration of the concept of homeland, which may provide insights to peoples of non-native heritage on the depth and importance of indigenous land claims.

Biographical Statement

Edith Blades is a fourth year student at the University of Victoria where she majors in Anthropology with a minor in Religious Studies. She was awarded the Bruce McKelvie Scholarship in 2004 and is co-author of the paper, The Pedagogy of Machina sapiens and the Curriculum of Teacher Education, *which was presented at the 2004 Conference of the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing. She studies the anthropology of religious experiences and cultural changes caused by emergent technologies.*

When I die and am laid out in my coffin, a small pillow of soil from my homeland will be placed under my head. This is a symbolic way of fulfilling an ancient and traditional desire of most Jews to be buried in their homeland, the land of Israel. Although my body will not literally be resting in Israel, the fact that my head will rest on Israeli soil is enough. The concept of homeland is also applicable to the land originally occupied by indigenous[1] communities. In both cases, homeland means an inalienable right to live in an area of the world (International Year of Indigenous Nations 2003). This concept has become an opening for personal reflection, which in turn has furthered my understanding of land claims in process in many regions of the world, and specifically in North America. I have always given mental ascent to the importance of indigenous land claims but the concept never touched me personally or emotionally.

Margolis (2001) suggests a reflexive rather than an analytical approach to gain understanding of another culture. Reflexivity encourages recognizing your own biases by looking "increasingly

inwards when studying 'other' cultures" (Margolis 2000:1). Reflexive anthropology breaks away from what could be seen as the traditional "us and them approach" towards an identification with those of other cultures and traditions (Margolis 2001). As I reflected on my biases, I realized the concept of homeland, as it relates to indigenous peoples' traditional land and land claims, is similar to my understanding of a Jewish homeland. The term homeland specifically encourages in me identification with, rather than a separation from, indigenous peoples who also claim a homeland. This paper explores the similarity and the differences between homeland from a Jewish and indigenous perspective.

Hurt defines homeland as, "places where people have bonded with their landscapes in an uncommon manner" (Hurt 2003:1). For this bonding to have occurred people need to have lived on the land long enough to have adjusted to its environment, to have marked that environment with their cultural stamp, and to have developed their identity with influences from both the cultural landscape and the environment. This bond with the landscape results in a closely-knit ethnic community that is partially segregated, socially and spatially, from other communities (Hurt 2003). This segregation, most common during pre-contact years, serves to maintain the communities' unique forms of cultural life and history. This historical and cultural tie with the land and environment also creates an emotional loyalty to the homeland that includes the desire of the community to defend that space.

The United Nations Chronicle echoes Hurt's view noting that "the bond between Indigenous people and their homeland is spiritual, economic and ancestral" (United Nations Chronicle 1993:1). The spiritual nature of this bond is often embedded in the cultural landscape[2] of the homeland. According to the Chronicle, "Indigenous people often follow a land-based religion believing that when their land is taken away so is the spirit that gives them life" (1993:1). As a result, when an indigenous person is denied access to their homeland they may feel a separation and loss from their traditional spirituality that is based on a belief that religious power and spirit flows from the land.

For indigenous people a homeland contains areas that have particular spiritual significance. As Hurt explains, "The homeland's cultural landscape can be composed of private sites…landmarks or shrines which commemorate events central to the historical narrative of the group" (Hurt 2003:3). These sites are not removable from the land and in most indigenous homelands these sites may even be invisible to those outside the community.

For example Glavin retells a traditional story told to him by Rosalie Johnny, an Elder of the Nemiah Indian Band located in the interior of British Columbia. Johnny relates how a sacred rock protects young women from pain during their menstruation. According to the tradition this rock is there as a result of a girl transforming into a rock. Young women who have begun menstruating take a white cloth and stuff it into a crevice in the rock saying, "Grandmother help me not to get sick anymore" (Glavin 1992:31). The passing down of this cultural knowledge needs to take place at the rock; it is at this site that the ritual is explained by the Grandmother to her granddaughter, thereby retaining the meaning and relevance of this special place. Access to the sacred rock preserves this ritual; without access to this place this traditional practice would likely become a story from the past.

The connection between land and religion is also reflected in the belief

that Mt. Tatlow, which towers over the landscape of the Nemiah homeland, traditionally "watches over the people and takes care of them" (Glavin 1992:7). This sacred mountain is a central figure in the spiritual lives of the people of the Nemiah. Since these sacred sites are essential to the landscape, if anyone of the Nemiah Indian Band moves to another location that person may need to return to their homeland for religious renewal or practices associated with these sites. This need to return is also part of the definition of homeland. Hurt suggests that "group members typically wish to live in the homeland or visit regularly if they live outside the homeland. Since no other place can substitute for the unique social and religious life found within the homeland" (Hurt 2003:4). For many indigenous peoples, notes Cobbs, "the landscape is our church, a cathedral. It is like a sacred building to us" (Cobbs et al. 1996:79).

Closely related to religion is the category of ancestry, which is also part of the bond between indigenous peoples and their land. Most indigenous groups have stories of their ancestry, including stories about how the creator either led them to the land or created them in a particular location. For example, the Haida believe that Raven found Haida ancestors in a clamshell on the beach at Naikum on Haida Gwaii (Native American Creation Stories 2001). In this way, ancestry is intimately part of the land, part of the very identity of a people. An Elder of the Pueblo peoples, living in the South Western United States, explained the bond of ancestry this way: "The story of my people and the story of this place are one single story we are always joined together" (Cobbs et al. 1996:76).

This intimate connection to the land through religion and ancestry includes the way people earn a living from the land, or their cultural economics. Often this economic association is expressed in tribal declarations or treaties. For example, the people of the Nemiah state in their declaration: "We will continue in perpetuity: a) to have and exercise our traditional rights of hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and natural resources, b) to carry on our traditional ranching way of life" (Glavin 1992:4).

Indigenous peoples clearly have their own homelands but these lands, which nourish the people both physically as well as spiritually, are often not recognized by provincial governments nor the Canadian federal government. In an attempt to ensure no further erosion of indigenous traditional territory many indigenous leaders are negotiating land settlements with the provincial governments in their territory. Elders from the Yukon speaking with Julie Cruikshank, a Canadian anthropologist, explain that according to indigenous peoples, "understanding of ownership rarely includes formed boundaries and is expressed in terms of knowledge acquired during a lifetime" (Cruikshank 1998:16). This forming of permanent boundaries is part of the land treaty process which lays out what is and what is not indigenous peoples' homeland. indigenous peoples' knowledge of their homeland gained over their lifetime is intimately tied to their identity and an emotional attachment to their land. This attachment can sometimes lead to confrontation as treaties are negotiated. The provincial and federal governments in Canada should legally recognize that the defense of one's homeland is also part of being a people whose homeland is threatened.

The concept of Israel has many similarities with the concept of homeland among many indigenous peoples. In Judaism, both spirituality and ancestry come from the land. Jaffee

writes that Israel "was permeated by a sense that its land was the central point at which the heavenly world, with its divine beings, came into contact with the world of human activity" (1997:28). This direct contact with the divine happened most commonly in the inner most part of the Temple in Jerusalem, called the Holy of Holies.[3] This central place in the Temple covered a spiritual conduit to the land itself, a place literally where heaven and earth meet. Rabbinic sages argue that "the land retained a holiness in its soil, which distinguished it from any other spot on earth" (Jaffee 1997:117). From Judaism's inception the land of Israel has always been central to the Jewish religion; as Jacobs argues, "Judaism has centered not only on a people but on a land -Eretz Yisrael, "The Land of Israel" (1984:157). The patriarchs of the Jewish religion-Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob-and Matriarchs-Sarah, Rebecca and Leah-are buried in Israel, which is one of the reasons many Jews believe "that the very soil is sacred" (Jacobs 1984:158).

Despite conceptual similarities, the indigenous use of the concept of homeland reflects a stronger bond with the environment than the Jewish concept of homeland. Martin writes, "there is a difference between how Native people and non-Natives feel about cultural resources…I am referring to the connection of the place to my culture" (2001:2). This difference is primarily due to the extent the land has been developed. In Israel the land is marked with ancient tombs, buildings, roads, and sacred rocks. These markings are meaningful to me since they speak of a long relationship my people have had with this land. Indigenous people have all these signs in their homelands too, but they are not as evident to people with a non-native worldview. An Elder from the Nemiah Indian Band could walk a tourist around the landscape and point out the markings of the long and intimate past her people have had with their land, but these markings are mostly of the natural world. In Israel the claim to the land is referenced to sacred sites, many of which are of human construction built by the people who inhabited the homeland or ancient building and burial sites. While these significant places narrate the story of the land, indigenous peoples significant places are typically not marked by human technology; it is the land itself that is significant, not what is constructed by the occupants of a particular homeland.

Chamberlin (2003) relates an incident from Northwest British Columbia that occurred during a meeting between a indigenous community and some government officials. The officials were stating their claim to some of the indigenous' land for the provincial government. The Elders at the meeting were astonished by these relative newcomers' claims and finally one of the Elders put what was bothering them into a question: "If this is your land," he asked, "where are your stories?" (Chamberlin 2003:1). Then the Elder proceeded to tell a story about the land in his own language. Everyone at the meeting understood the message. In a similar way stories connect me to the land of Israel and remind me that perhaps my understanding of homeland is a matter of degree.

From a Jewish perspective the stories I have told my children and will tell my grandchildren are the stories that tell them who we are as well as who we are not. These stories are from the land of Israel but also include stories from Europe and even from Canada. Though I am content to live in Canada I have the need to visit the homeland of my faith, the land that gave birth to my people and their stories. It is this longing for the original roots of a people that helps me to appreciate the great depth and intensity of the connection of indigenous peoples

to their homeland and the desire to preserve their ancestral territories.

Conclusion

I have argued in this paper that a people and their homeland are inseparable; as such removing access to the land of the people who call the land home, results in their economics, identity, and spirituality being weakened. I have also stated that we, who are not from the homeland, may not see the sacred sites, but that does not mean the land is empty. For each indigenous group, their land is full of sacred and significant sites that can be learned and thus identified through thousands of years of oral history. But for indigenous peoples, as with Jews, the entire homeland is sacred and the source of their sacred stories.

This degree of commonality has allowed me to reflect on the idea of a homeland giving me a new perspective and understanding of the idea of a 'land claim'. My people have identified with the land of Israel for only 5000 years, a short span in comparison to the sense of homeland for indigenous peoples in North America. Yet I find the term 'homeland' to be a potent way of understanding one's connection to a place. As non-native I wanted to identify with the struggle of many indigenous groups to retain their traditional territories. I found that reflecting on the word 'homeland' enabled me to understand a little of what it might mean to a indigenous person to have their homeland denied to them or taken away, and this has renewed my understanding of what it must be like for any people to be displaced from an area of the world they call home.

Endnotes

[1] For the purpose of this paper the term "indigenous" will be used to refer to the peoples who first occupied North America.

[2] An indigenous cultural landscape is "a place valued by an Aboriginal group (or groups) because of their long and complex relationship with that land. It expresses their unity with the natural and spiritual environment. It embodies their traditional knowledge of spirits, places, land uses, and ecology. Material remains of the association may be prominent but will often be minimal or absent" (Parks Canada 2005:1).

[3] In Judaism there is only one Temple and it is located in Jerusalem. This singular temple was constructed in its entirety, including location, based on instructions believed to be received directly from God.

References Cited

Chamberlin, J. E.
    1993 If This is Your Land Where Are Your Stories?. Online. Internet. Accessed: 18 March 2004. Available <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20041231.bkchp041231/BNStory/SpecialEvents/>.
Cobbs, J., Flowers, C., Gardner, J. and Loomis, H.
    1996 " Through Indian Eyes". Montreal: Reader's Digest Association.
Cruikshank, J.
    1998 The social Life of Stories: narrative and knowledge in the Yukon Territory. Vancouver:UBC Press
Glavin, T. and the People of the Nemiah Valley.
    1992 Nemiah The Unconquered Country. Vancouver: New Star Books.
Hurt, D.

2003 "Defining American Homelands: A Creek Nation Example". Journal of Cultural Geography 21(1):1-14.

International Year of Indigenous Nations.
1993 "International Year of Indigenous Nations". Online. Internet. Accessed: March 10 2004. Available <http://www.native-net.org/archive/nl/9307/0194.html>.

Jacobs, L.
1984 The Book of Jewish Belief. New Jersey: Behrman House.

Jaffee. M.
1997 Early Judaism. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Margolis, E.
2000 "Reflections on 'Reflexivity'". Online. Internet. Accessed: 6 January 2004. Available <http://faculty.oxy.edu/tobin/anth370_9900/workshop/reflections/eva.html>.

Martin, R.
2001 "Native Connection to Place: Policy and Play". American Indian Quarterly 25(1): 1-6.

Native American Creation Stories
2001 "Native American Creation Stories". Online. Internet. Accessed: 21 June 2005. Available <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Prairie/8962/creation.html>.

Parks Canada
2005 "An Approach to Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes". Online. Internet. Accessed: 21 June. Available <http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/pca-acl/sec4/index_e.asp>.

United Nations Chronicle.
1993 "Preserving the Past, Providing a Future: Land Claims and Self-rule". United Nations Chronicle 30(1): 1-3.

Dwayne Cover

Lost in Translation
English in japan

Abstract

From billboards to vending machines, mass media to education, English is virtually ubiquitous in Japan. However, for many, Japan is still assumed to be a homogenous, monolingual entity. This paper will begin with a look at the historical background of English in Japan and then move on to the contemporary setting. Two theories offering contrasting interpretations of the language contact phenomenon will then be presented: the first views English as a hegemonic force colonizing the mental space of the Japanese population; the second claims English has undergone a complex process of domestication and that it is now 'Japanese English', created by the Japanese for the Japanese.

Biographical Statement

Dwayne is currently a graduate student in the Department of Pacific and Asian Studies at the University of Victoria. He spent the past six years teaching ESL/EFL – two years in Japan and four years in Vancouver. His research interests are in the sociology of language and in second language acquisition.

On a bustling Friday night in downtown Tokyo a young girl steps off the train. She wears Nike shoes, Levi jeans, and a Calvin Klein T-shirt. On her MP3 player the songs flip from Madonna to Eminem to the Backstreet Boys. She stops to buy a Starbuck's coffee and read a movie poster advertising the latest Brad Pitt blockbuster to hit Japan. Checking her watch, she sighs and reluctantly heads into her *juku*[1] class where she will spend the next few gruelling hours working on her most troublesome subject: English.

This scene would not be unusual in Tokyo or any other city in Japan. English has become a pervasive force reaching diverse areas of Japanese society through media, consumer products, and education. Although urban centres are more heavily imbued with English, rural areas receive similar advertising, movies, and television programs. This overwhelming presence has been interpreted in a variety of manners - from ally to antagonist to alien. This paper will focus upon two particular perspectives: the first, put forth by Tsuda Yukio[2], labelling English an externally imposed form of foreign domination; and the sec-

ond, from the work of James Stanlaw, suggesting that much of the English in Japan is created *by* the Japanese *for* the Japanese.

Framed over the historical progression of Japan's relationship with the English language, each of these perspectives appears indicative of a different period. Early contact, from the Meiji Restoration (from1868) to the American Occupation (1945-52), may well be identified with Tsuda's "Hegemony of English" argument (1997). Inequality in trade relations and military power – two factors intricately connected - allowed the English language to gain a strong foothold in Japan However, the more recent climate of language contact reveals a significantly different terrain. Alongside the rapid rise in economic production and prosperity, the Japanese have also enjoyed a shift in their relationship with English. As argued by Stanlaw, English now appears to be imported and regulated within the country rather than imposed externally. Thus the idea of English 'domestication' may offer a more accurate illustration of the complex patterns of language borrowing and employment seen today.

This paper will begin with a brief overview of the history of English in Japan and the present state of language contact within the country. It will then move on to the contrasting arguments of Tsuda and Stanlaw, evaluating both against a historical backdrop in the concluding discussion.

English in Japan
HISTORY OF CONTACT

The English language is not a recent import to Japan. Although one might assume the influx began with the American Occupation following World War II, or even more recently with the expanding global dominance of Anglo-based media, the history of contact reaches back much further.

From the arrival of Commodore Perry in 1853 and the opening of trade relations between Japan and the West, American and British merchants carried English and Anglo-based culture into the country. Foreign goods, including cotton cloth, woollen fabric, sugar, and ironware, were in high demand and various elements of Western culture gained great notoriety - from an "interest in Western languages and Christianity, to Western art, apparels, hair style, and even the eating of beef" (Hane 1992: 107). As a result of the increase in contact and trade, Japanese/English pidgins began to appear around trading ports in Yokohama, Kobe, and Nagasaki (Loveday 1986). English was viewed as a vehicle with which Japan could "catch up to the West" and, in 1871, the language became part of the nationally regulated curriculum at both the primary and middle school levels (Reesor 2002). Japan's first officially recognized post-secondary institutions adopted English as the principle language of instruction. A movement for national language reform - under which the Japanese language would have been completely abolished and replaced by English - also began and was supported by a number of influential figures - most notably Mori Arinori, Japan's first Minister of Education (Kubota 1998; Loveday 1996). Although this radical suggestion was never adopted, the early impact of English upon the country was evident.

Following this initial success, the English language rode a tumultuous wave through periods of fanatical popularity and outright contempt through to the Second World War. By the latter half of the 1880s and into the 1890s, the rising tide of nationalism stemmed the influx of English, but the language maintained a level of importance as Japan's link - economically, politically and scientifically - to much of the outside world. Japanese became the main medium of instruction in the school system, but English remained an essential part of the curricula (Loveday 1996). After the First World War, new forms of tech-

nology (e.g. radio, film, and the gramophone) facilitated another wave of Anglo-based culture into the country: "Urban daily life during this period [the 1920s] was particularly characterized by the enthusiastic following of Western urban trends and fads such as the department store, the ice-cream parlour, the Charleston, and jazz, not to mention fashion" (Loveday 1996:70). However, by the 1930s, a strong anti-Western sentiment dominated and a number of steps were taken to purge the country of all things associated with the West. The English language was a primary focus of this movement and many terms that had been in regular use were replaced by newly coined Japanese equivalents (e.g. 'record' became *onban,* 'ski' became *sekkobu*) (Loveday 1996:74). English language education was severely restricted and in some cases completely removed from public and private institutions.

During the period of American Occupation increased contact with foreigners (primarily U.S. soldiers) and strong influence from American political advisors helped to re-establish the influential position of the language. 'English fever' swept the country with conversation classes filling up and English language textbooks becoming best sellers (Loveday 1996). Many saw English as their primary link to internationalization and democratization - in much the same way it had been envisioned during early contact - and thus the quickest method by which to rebuild the country and regain a foothold in the global economic order. During this period the Japanese politician Ozaki Gakubo resurrected Mori Arinori's call for English to be adopted as a national language (Kubota 1998; McVeigh 2004). Ozaki made the same pitch on two occasions, in 1947 and 1950, but was unsuccessful on both attempts.

Although the official and public acceptance of the language has continually fluctuated, English has been undeniably significant for the Japanese. The long historical progression of this relationship has laid the foundation for the current contact setting.

ENGLISH TODAY

In contemporary Japanese society the English language is virtually ubiquitous. The level of penetration has reached a point where there is now debate as to whether or not it is even possible to carry out an everyday conversation in Japanese without employing a number of English-derived terms. Stanlaw estimates that up to 10% of daily vocabulary for Japanese speakers (3000 to 5000 terms) is composed of English 'loanwords' (2004), while Honna suggests it may be as high as 13% (cited in Tomoda 1999). In addition, 60-70% of new lexical terms added annually to the Japanese dictionary are derived from English (Hogan 2003). In many cases, English vocabulary is adopted alongside an existing Japanese term with the same meaning; however, the English term is galvanized with a "cool" or "modern" connotation that its domestic counterpart does not enjoy (Stanlaw 2004; Seaton 2001). Borrowing has also occurred when there was a gap in the Japanese lexicon - often in areas of new discovery relating to science and technology. Specialized fields such as medicine, engineering, and computer programming heavily reflect this trend with *gairaigo,* or foreign words, being heavily prevalent in technical terminology (Tomoda 1999).

Media sources have been the most dominant force in broadening and strengthening the presence of English in Japan. There are now five national English-language newspapers circulating in the country, along with a large number of local and special interest papers (Stanlaw 2004). Foreign films, predominantly English, have out-grossed domestic productions almost every year for the past two decades (MPPAJ 2005). In 2003 and 2004, English singers accounted for approximately half of the

'Top 100' songs at the most popular Tokyo radio station, and many of the Japanese singers had either their names and/or song titles listed in English (FM Japan Ltd. 2005). The use of English words and phrases within Japanese pop songs is also very common (Stanlaw 2000, 2004). Although imported television programs have not yet seen the same level of success, English-language DVD and home video rentals are becoming increasingly popular.

English also maintains a prominent position in the education system. As mentioned above, English has been a part of the nationally regulated school system for over a century. Although it is not officially mandatory, the vast majority of students at the junior and senior high levels choose English as their language elective to prepare for university entrance exams. Stanlaw estimates almost all junior high students, at least 70% high school, and 100% of first and second year university students are enrolled in English (2004). As of 2001, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) instituted English instruction beginning at the elementary level. It is worth noting that English language education in the Japanese public school system has been frequently criticized for inefficiency and ineffectiveness (Gainey and Andressen 2002; McVeigh 2004; Reesor 2002, 2003); however, the government has recently taken steps to address this situation. In 2002, MEXT released the ambitious *Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities*, which called for 100 super English high schools to be established, along with more study abroad opportunities for students, more foreign (i.e. native English speaking) instructors in Japanese schools, and better training programs for Japanese nationals teaching English (MEXT 2003).

The continued emphasis placed on English in education appears indicative of its importance in the contemporary setting. Political support has also been demonstrated in revived attempts to have English declared an official language in Japan. As recently as 2000, the Prime Minister's Commission on Japan's Goal in the 21st Century floated the idea of elevating English to official status (Miyai 2000). Although the proposed plan would not go as far as Mori Arinori's original recommendation to abolish Japanese more than a century before, it would grant official recognition within the country.

English appears as strong now as in any other period in its history of contact with Japan. For anyone who has spent even a short time in the country, the actual level of English language saturation is immediately evident. The second section of this paper will examine two opposing perspectives on how this phenomenon has been interpreted.

Imperialism vs. Domestication
JAPANESE VICTIMS

The charge of linguistic imperialism has closely followed the global spread of English. Phillipson's benchmark work, entitled *Linguistic Imperialism* (1992), provides a systematic analysis of the ways in which the interests of English-speaking countries have been furthered via "linguicism". Phillipson defines *linguicism* as "ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language" (1992:47). He then provides material examples for this argument to support the claim that language is closely tied to educational and cultural forms of imperialism:

> …commercial products of all kinds, films, television serials (the USA dominates telecommunications and satellite communications worldwide), advertising agencies abroad (the

majority of which are American), youth culture…[and] ensuring the place of the dominant language as a school subject or even as the medium of education…(Phillipson 1992:58).

Although Phillipson was not the first to posit this argument, he did succeed in articulating a more comprehensive theory which other scholars were then able to utilize in specific settings.

Tsuda Yukio, now at the University of Tsukuba, adopted the theory put forth by Phillipson and applied it to the Japanese context. Tsuda is highly critical of English in Japan, which he interprets as a form of foreign imposed domination upon the local population. He coined the term "Eigo-Shihai" - literally, "English domination", but defined by Tsuda as "the Hegemony of English" - to describe the current contact situation (1997). However, Tsuda sees not only linguistic and cultural oppression; he goes even further to suggest that the presence of the English language and Western culture in Japan is engendering a "colonization of the mind" for the Japanese (1997). This is portrayed as a subtle process through which Westernization gradually alters the cultural values and beliefs of the local population, until they surrender the ability to define their own cultural identity. This particular definition, as well as many aspects of the "Hegemony of English", falls quite firmly into the area of study known as *Nihonjinron* - or "theory of Japaneseness" literally translated (Kubota 1998).

Nihonjinron is an ideology which places the Japanese in a unique position, culturally, linguistically, and even biologically, by virtue of their geographic and historical isolation from other peoples. This topic is heavily contested with supporters citing it as evidence of Japanese solidarity and critics

labelling it as ethnocentric racism (Dale 1986; Kubota 1998; McVeigh 2004; Miller 1982). His Hegemony argument definitely identifies Tsuda with the former. He observes the relationship between the English language and the Japanese people with the concept of *Nihonjinron* firmly in mind:

The Japanese are now suffering from the linguistic epidemic, which I call "Eigo-Byo", or "Anglomania". Having a firm belief in the notion of English as an international language, the Japanese are obsessed with learning and using English to the point where they glorify English, its culture and speakers (Tsuda 1997:25).

For Tsuda, "Anglomania" has become most evident through disturbing trends in education and mass media. He points to the commodification of the English language, in the form of popular advertising campaigns for *Eikaiwa*[3], as a particularly insidious combination of the two (Tsuda 1994). If the approach toward English is not quickly altered, Tsuda predicts dire consequences for both the Japanese language and culture:

Since language constitutes the core of cultural identity, the use of English generates a division especially in the personal identity of speakers of English as a second language…Some people throw away mother tongues and use English alone. The question in this case is whether they can or wish to continue to maintain their cultural identity (Tsuda 1997:25).

However, he does offer an alternative to combat the waves of English washing over Japan: "The Ecology of Language Paradigm" (Tsuda 1994).

The Ecology of Language calls for global linguistic equality whereby international activities (i.e. conferences, sporting events, etc.) would always be conducted in the language of the host country, instead of

in English, as is often the case (Tsuda 1994). If all of the representatives were not skilled in that particular language, translators could be utilized to maintain linguistic balance. In addition, cultural mores would be followed in reference to individuals or subjects relating to a particular country - such as Japanese name order (family name, given name) or indigenous country name (e.g. "Japan" would be referred to as "Nihon" or Finland as "Suomi") - regardless of the language being spoken (Tsuda 1994: 58-9). It is important to acknowledge that Tsuda is not expecting the sudden extrication of English from international use, but is offering a process by which a more balanced language environment could be achieved.

Tsuda's argument against the domination of English in Japan finds support with a number of Japanese scholars (Nakamura and Oishi cited in Kubota 1998) and politicians (McVeigh 2004; Miyai 2000), as well as in the general public (Hogan 2003; Tomoda 1999). Many of his claims appear credible when focussing upon the ubiquitous nature of English in the country; however, the presence of the language is only half of the equation. The following section offers an alternative perspective for much of the English that is currently found in Japan.

JAPANESE CONTROL

James Stanlaw suggests that much of the English in the country has undergone a process of language "domestication" - a term applied by Joseph Tobin in his edited work *Re-Made in Japan* (1982). Stanlaw suggests that, "the English used in Japan is not really borrowed, as is commonly thought, but instead is motivated or 'inspired' by certain English speakers or English linguistic forms; it is a created-in-Japan variety for use by Japanese in Japan" (2004:2). He argues against the use of the terms *borrowing*

or *loanword* since both suggest a subordinate relationship with the donor language; the original term is considered to be proper, while the new form is but a *deviation* (Stanlaw 1992). Stanlaw advocates an approach which recognizes that Japanese English terms may be English-inspired, but have a form and meaning that are locally determined. Moreover, the terms are exclusively intended for domestic use and their meaning is often incomprehensible for native English speakers. This process is unquestionably governed domestically, directly refuting the argument that English in Japan is externally imposed.

In support of this argument Stanlaw illustrates the extremely complicated and creative processes through which Japanese English is created. He includes a wealth of examples including truncation (e.g. *paso-kon* for "personal computer" and *apaato* for "apartment"), acronyzation (e.g. *oeru* or O.L. for "office lady" and *jaeru* or J.A.L. for "Japanese Airlines"), and metaphorical transfer (*paapurin* or purpling in reference to "teenage motorcycle gangs who wear purple scarves and cause trouble") (Stanlaw 2004: 16). He also offers some of the made-in-Japan terms which, while in 'plain' English, are not transparent to native English speakers: *saabisu* (service) for "a complimentary product for customers", *baikingu* (Viking) for "a smorgasbord", and *baajin roodo* (virgin road) for "the church aisle the bride walks down" (Stanlaw 2004:40-1). Many others cases are offered in the course of Stanlaw's analysis, however, they are too numerous to cover in the course of this article. It is sufficient to acknowledge that if English were being externally imposed, these complex formations would not occur. More standardized patterns of lexical borrowing and code-switching would dominate. In addition, newly created terms must be accepted and understood by the local population. If this process of domestic ratification did not occur, the terms would not survive.

Stanlaw also examines the wide array of strategies for which English terms

are employed by the Japanese. He acknowledges the most commonly cited instance - to project an association with the West that is interpreted as 'cool' or 'modern' - and also provides a number of other poignant illustrations. He analyzes various situations where English is used in pop songs and contemporary poetry:

> The English words used are often creative and critical Japanese (not American or British) poetic devices which allow songwriters, and even some poets, an access to a wider range of allusions, images, metaphors, and technical possibilities than is available from 'purely' Japanese linguistic sources (Stanlaw 2004:102).

He looks at the use of English by women in Japan as a form of sociolinguistic circumvention - expressing themselves in a manner that would be considered inappropriate, or even impossible, in the Japanese language. There is also an in-depth analysis of the Japanese colour nomenclature system in which English terms are rapidly appearing to mirror, and occasionally to replace, the original Japanese terms. The two parallel forms (e.g. *murasaki* = purple, *paapuru* = purple) have the same translated meaning, but inspire a different sensory feeling for the listener. These examples provide further support for Stanlaw's argument: "[the] use of English is just one more very creative tool in the linguistic repertoire of the Japanese language, used by Japanese people for their own communicative purposes" (2004:276-7).

As mentioned above, Stanlaw's use of the term "domestication" originated from the work of Joseph Tobin. Tobin acted as the primary editor for a collection of articles published as *Re-Made in Japan: Everyday Life and Consumer Taste in a Changing Society*. The authors contributing to the collection, including Millie R. Creighton, William W. Kelly,

and Nancy Rosenberger, presented a wide range of topics in which foreign, predominantly Western, style was given a home-grown Japanese twist for domestic consumption. Some of the areas covered were magazine advertising, fashion, and even the Tango (Tobin 1982). Tobin suggested the dominant theme throughout was "an ongoing creative synthesis of the exotic with the familiar, the foreign with the domestic, the modern with the traditional, the Western with the Japanese" (Tobin 1982:4). He went on to stress that the fusion of styles seen in Japan was unquestionably "about Japanese importation rather than Western exportation" (Tobin 1982:4) – a sentiment echoed in the work of James Stanlaw. This particular pattern of domestication found in such a broad range of topics offers strong support for Stanlaw's findings in the area of language contact.

Discussion

Tsuda's 'Hegemony paradigm' views the English language as an insidious Western export eroding the cultural and linguistic purity of the Japanese. The sheer volume of English within Japan's borders overwhelming the populace and corrupting their mental space. This vastly oversimplifies much of the language contact and language creation occurring in Japan today. It also gives little consideration to the role of the Japanese in negotiating their relationship with English.

The 'Hegemony paradigm' places the domestic population in a passive position unable to resist or adapt to the realities of a fluid linguistic environment. This reading appears more apt for the former relationship between English and Japan, from early contact through to the post-Occupation period. Following the Meiji Restoration, Japan frantically attempted to industrialize with the English language as one of the primary vehicles to this end. Japan suffered in this subordinate position until the rising nationalist zeal attempted to expel the language in the lead up to the Sec-

ond World War. After the war and through the American Occupation, English again surged into the country. Tsuda's 'Hegemony argument' seems appropriate in describing this period. In fact, much of the 'Hegemony argument' resurrects past images of Western Imperialism – a politically and emotionally powerful reference for the Japanese – which may be part of the author's intent. Kubota suggests that many scholars critical of English in Japan work toward generating awareness in the population and inspiring greater linguistic equality rather than toward eradicating English (1998). This is supported by Tsuda's work in the 'Ecology of Language'. With the 'Hegemony paradigm', Tsuda may not be presenting the most accurate depiction of the current language contact environment, but rather attempting to maintain vigilance for cultural and linguistic preservation within Japan.

The primary objective of Stanlaw's domestication work is to convey the active role that the Japanese play in the importation of English. It focuses on the cognizant manner in which English is moulded into a made-in-Japan form that is only recognizable to the Japanese. Although Stanlaw's argument may not be applicable to all of the English found in the country – since many surviving terms do have a historical origin – it does offer a more holistic interpretation of the contemporary contact than that of Tsuda. Furthermore, examples from other fields of study regarding media presentation, fashion, and the arts supports the assertion that the Japanese do exert control over much of the foreign content that enters the country. In a period when many areas of the world appear unable to resist the global expansion of Western culture and the English language, Japan may be one of the best positioned to maintain a level of balance and, in some measure, resistance that others do not enjoy.

Conclusion

This paper began with a look at the history of English in Japan. This then followed onto an explanation of the current state of language contact within the country. It was argued that the overwhelming presence of English has now become an integral and inescapable part of Japanese life. Two alternative theories were then presented providing differing perspectives for evaluating the contact phenomenon. The first was Tsuda's Hegemony of English, which portrayed the language as a neo-colonial form of foreign domination. Stanlaw's language domestication was presented as a counter-argument suggesting the Japanese are, in actuality, exercising much more control over English found within the country. Tsuda's position was identified with the earlier period of contact, while Stanlaw's appeared closer to the current state.

Endnotes

[1] *Juku* are private "cram" schools attended by junior high and high school students seeking extra study time.

[2] The scholar's name, *Tsuda Yukio,* is expressed in its original (Japanese) cultural order with the surname preceding the given name.

[3] *Eikaiwa* are private English language schools offering smaller class sizes (usually 1 to 10 learners) at different times throughout the day to cater to homemakers studying English as a hobby, children and teenagers looking for extra study outside of public school, and businesspeople intending to use English for travel. The largest chain schools are NOVA, GEOS, and AEON, however hundreds of other independent schools are also in business. *Eikaiwa* English has become a billion dollar a year industry in Japan. See Reesor (2003).

References Cited

Dale, Peter N.

    1986 The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness. London and Sydney: Croom Helm Ltd.

Gainey, Peter and Curtis Andressen

    2002 "The Japanese Education System: Globalisation and International Education." Japanese Studies 22(2): 153-167.

Hane, Mikiso.

    1992 Modern Japan: A Historical Survey. 2nd Ed. Boulder: Westview Press.

Hogan, Jackie

    2003 "The Social Significance of English Usage in Japan." Japanese Studies 23(1):43-58.

Kubota, Ryuko

    1998 "Ideologies of English in Japan." World Englishes 17(3): 295-306.

Loveday, Leo J.

    1986 Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Loveday, Leo J.

    1996 Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-Linguistic History. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McVeigh, Brian

    2004 "Foreign Language Education in Japanese Higher Education: The Humanistic Vision or Nationalist Utilitarianism?" Arts And Humanities in Higher Education 3(2):211-227.

Miller, Roy

    1982 Japan's Modern Myth. New York: Weatherhill.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)

    2003 Action Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities". MEXT. Online. Internet. Accessed: 23 Jan. 2005. Available <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>.

Miyai, Yumiko

    2000 "Can National Identity Survive Language Invasion?" The Daily Yomiuri April 1, 2000.

Motion Picture Producers Association of Japan Inc. (MPPAJ)

    2005 "Box Office Profits of Japanese and Foreign Films (1983-2003)". Web-Japan Statistics. Online. Internet. Accessed: 8 Jan. 2005. Available <http://web-japan.org/stat/stats/20LES43.html>.

Phillipson, Robert

    1992 Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reesor, Matthew

    2002 "The Bear and the Honeycomb: A History of Japanese English Language Policy." NUCB Journal of Language, Communication and Culture 4(1): 41-52.

Reesor, Matthew

    2003 "Japanese Attitudes to English: Towards an Explanation of Poor Performance." NUCB Journal of Language, Communication and Culture 5(2):57-65.

Seaton, Philip

    2001 "'Shampoo for Extra Damage': Making Sense of Japanized English." Japanese Forum 13(2): 233-47.

Stanlaw, James

    2000 "'Open Your File, Open Your Mind': Women, English, and changing roles in Japanese pop music." In Timothy Craig, ed. Japan Pop! Inside the World of Japanese Popular Culture. New York: M.E. Sharpe. Pp. 75-100.

Stanlaw, James

    2004 Japanese English: Language and Culture Contact. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Tobin, Joseph (Ed.)

    1992 Re-Made in Japan: Everyday Life and Consumer Taste in a Changing Society. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Tokyo: FM-Japan Ltd.

    2003 "Tokio Hot 100 Charts". J-Wave Website: Tokio Hot 100. Online. Internet. Accessed: 6 Feb. 2005 Available <http://www.j-wave.co.jp/original/tokiohot100>.

Tomoda, Takako.

    1999 "The Impact of Loan-words on Modern Japanese." Japan Forum 11(1): 231-253.

Tsuda, Yukio

    1994 "The Diffusion of English: Its Impact on Culture and Communication." Keio Communication Review 16: 49-61.

    1997 "Hegemony of English vs. Ecology of Language: Building Equality in International Communication." In Larry E. Smith and Michael L. Forman, eds. World Englishes 2000. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Vanessa DiCenzo

Emancipatory Research
Diffusing Power Relations

Abstract

This paper discusses the topic of feminist methodology, with a focus on emancipatory research. The ways in which emancipatory research serves to diffuse the power relations inherent in research projects is addressed. This is accomplished by exploring such issues as 'insider status', questioning objectivity, 'field' construction, reflexivity, multivocality, interpretation and analysis of data, and political activism. Finally, issues to be aware of when conducting emancipatory research are discussed, as well as the positioning of these methodologies within mainstream academia.

Biographical Statement

Vanessa DiCenzo is currently a Master of Arts student within the department of Anthropology at the University of Victoria. Her research interests include alternative birthing methods, reproductive health, feminist theory and method, as well as issues surrounding space and place.

Engaging with feminist theory and ideas has encouraged me to think about writing anthropology in different ways. The focus on narratives (Cruikshank 1997), biographical, and autobiographical accounts (Ronit 2000) by some feminists, as well as a piece of postmodern archaeology (Flannery 1982), has inspired me to employ a new way of writing; a dialogic account regarding emancipatory research.

For the most part, academia tends to focus on, and give credence to, objective, scientific methodologies and ways of presenting material. However, there is much to be learned by partaking in subjective, inclusive, and reflexive research and composition. Narrative forms of writing found within feminist research, including biographical and autobiographical accounts, allow for the attraction of a wider audience, thus increasing the possibilities for social change.

The following paper is a fictional account of a graduate student's encounter with a published feminist anthropologist. The topic of feminist methodology is discussed, with a focus on emancipatory research. The feminist anthropologist reveals how emancipatory research serves to diffuse the power relations inherent in research projects, by discussing issues such as 'insider status', questioning objectivity, 'field' construction, reflexivity,

multivocality, interpretation and analysis of data, and political activism. Finally, issues to be aware of when conducting emancipatory research are discussed, as well as the positioning of these methodologies within mainstream academia.

Emancipatory Research: A Graduate Student's Account

Sometimes graduate school can get you down. Now, it's not that graduate students don't enjoy being in school, or their program, or even the classes that they are taking – it's the stress.

Classes have to be attended, courses and research materials must be read, teaching and marking responsibilities have to be met, and papers must be written; all the while still partaking in the rigors of daily life. Now, we're not all a bunch of complainers; most of us take everything in stride, we did choose to be here after all. It's just that sometimes the stress can get to you, especially at the end of every term, when multiple final papers are due; usually within a week of each other. Most of us handle the stress, because we have to. We might occasionally have to ask for extensions, or stay up all night drinking coffee to finish a paper, but things get done. Personally, I think I've been able to deal with the stress of school, work, and life constructively. Although, at the end of every term I do find myself questioning why exactly I torture myself like this. I could have gone into business, or science, and had a nice comfortable office job. But, I chose anthropology and all the reading and paper writing that goes along with it. I guess sometimes we have to suffer a bit for the things we love.

So, like many graduate students, when it starts getting close to the end of term and I have a lot of work to do, I find myself procrastinating. I think sometimes I just don't want to deal with the work ahead of me, so I find myself cook-

ing, watching movies, 'going for coffee' with friends, and other assorted activities. I know that the papers have to be written, but maybe I feel that I'll be better equipped to deal with it the next day. Of course this only serves to increase my stress, as I end up with less time to accomplish my tasks. I guess I just need that push to get things done.

At the end of one particularly stressful term, I once again found myself procrastinating. Classes had finished. With one paper already written and handed in, and just one more to go, I found myself yearning for the summer break. A time during which I could work a steady job and not have to worry about reading articles, or writing papers, when I got home at the end of the day. I also found myself planning for the Fall semester, when I would promise myself, as I do at the beginning of every semester, that I would make a point of organizing my time more efficiently. That way I would not be in the position of scrambling to get everything done at the end of term. So this particular day, while I was mulling this over and trying to come up with an idea for my last paper of the semester, I found myself at a bar on the outskirts of town.

I had spent the day in the library looking for sources on the topic of feminist methodology in anthropology, hoping that an idea would come to me. Unfortunately, for every idea I had, I could only find a limited number of sources. Sure the computer told me that there were anywhere from fifteen to forty-three assorted books and articles on a particular topic, but once I actually made my way to the stacks I could find only, on average, a quarter of the sources I had listed. Either the book was missing, that particular journal volume hadn't been ordered, or someone had misplaced the source somewhere in the library. As a result, I left the library frustrated and uninspired. At that point I definitely was not in the mood to tackle any projects related to school. But, I also didn't really feel like calling any friends to see

what they were up to, or going home to my partner, who would tell me that everything would work out in the end, as he always did. Since I wanted to get away from everything, I headed out of the city centre and ended up at the airport bar. I found myself seated on a bar stool drinking a beer and hoping that a viable idea would occur to me at some point during my reprieve.

As I sat alone sulking and hoping for an epiphany, a woman sat down beside me. After the bartender took her order, she looked over and said, "You seem upset". I told her that I was stressed because it was the end of the term and I couldn't seem to decide on a topic for my last paper. She proceeded to ask me what class this paper was for. I responded that it was for a graduate seminar entitled "Feminist Research in Cultural Anthropology". At this point I was getting a little irritated, as I was not in the best of moods and wanted to be left alone. But, when she said, "Well, I consider myself a feminist anthropologist, and I'd be happy to help you come up with some ideas," my ears perked up.

"Well I'm interested in feminist methodology, as I intend to take a feminist approach and stance when I conduct fieldwork of my own" I said.

She asked, "Are there any particular methods that you are interested in?"

To that I replied, "Yes, I'm interested in emancipatory forms of research, because I think the multivocality it allows should be more visible in anthropology".

She said, "There are many reasons why emancipatory research is important, not only to feminism, but to all academic disciplines. It is especially important in anthropology, where some scholars pride themselves on speaking for those who might not be able to speak for themselves."

"Yes, I know it's important, and I've read a few articles on the subject.

But, I can't seem to find enough sources that discuss that importance to facilitate writing a 20 page paper", I responded.

"If you look at the work of authors such as Deborah D'Amico-Samuels (1991), Teresa L. Ebert (1996), Sherry Gorelick (1991), Kathleen Lynch (2000), Bob Pease (2000), as well as others, you will see that there are many reasons why it is important for feminism and anthropology to engage in emancipatory types of research," she said.

She went on to explain that these reasons include the diffusion of power and consciousness-raising (Ebert 1996), among others, but that she felt that diffusion of power was really the most important reason for conducting emancipatory research. Then she explained, in detail, how this power diffusion can be achieved in emancipatory research.

Diffusion of Power

She began with the issue of power in conducting research. She explained, "There is always an inherent power relationship between the researcher and those being researched. One goal of feminist research is to limit the power differentials that exist. In anthropology we try to be objective and stand back and observe which only increases the gulf between researcher and subject. Even engaging in participant observation does not eliminate this power disparity. If anthropologists are going to go 'home' and take it upon themselves to write about certain communities, and why they do the things the do, the role of the anthropologist as objective scientist and power-holder is perpetuated".

"So, emancipatory research is one way to get around the power relationships that exist when conducting research?" I asked.

"In a way. Although we can never totally eliminate the power relations inherent in conducting research, emancipatory techniques are the most efficient ways we have at present of trying to diffuse the

power. Think of it this way… if you are an anthropologist and you live with a group for a year or two, you interview people, you take part in the activities in which they engage, and basically experience the events of daily life with them, and then write a descriptive or explanatory account of this group of people, what purpose does that serve them? What purpose does it serve anyone? But, if anthropologists take part in "open-ended, dialogically reciprocal" (Lather 1986: 269) discussions and co-operative write-ups of data, then we can challenge the "assumptions of mainstream social science practice" (Lynch 2000:82), elicit social change, and alter the ways in which we interpret and analyze data by diffusing the power relations that exist between researcher and researched," she suggested.

"How, exactly, does emancipatory research serve to diffuse the power relations that exist between a researcher and those being researched?" I asked.

"Well, first I think we need to look at the conception of power. Once we possess that knowledge, then we will be able to determine how we can begin diffusing power. Michel Foucault has been widely cited and referred to for his definitions of power. He suggests that power 'must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization' (Foucault 1978: 92). To elaborate, power exists in relationships, is exercised and not simply possessed, and is present at multiple points (Fawcett and Featherstone 2000). Ebert (1996:187) also points out that power is 'marked by chance', 'not historically determined', 'heterogeneous', and 'unstable'. Therefore by provoking resistance, power serves to undo itself (Ebert 1996). That is exactly what occurs when emancipatory research is conducted," she replied.

"So, what you are saying is that how power has been conceptualized has led feminists, and feminist anthropologists more specifically, to develop research methods that serve to unravel those power relations. In essence we have witnessed power 'provoke resistance' and consequently unravel itself in the process."

"Yes," she answered.

"In what ways do you think emancipatory research helps to diffuse the power that exists between the researcher and the researched?" I asked.

"There are many techniques that feminists can use to diffuse the power relations that exist in research. The most prevalent ways visible in the literature include realizing that women do not possess a kind of 'insider status', questioning objectivity, considering how 'the field' is constructed, being reflexive, including multiple voices in all aspects of research, altering the ways that we analyze and interpret data, and engaging in political activism," she suggested.

"What do you mean by these techniques?" I asked.

"Let me explain," she offered.

Then, my new acquaintance went on to describe how feminist anthropologists use these methods in attempts to diffuse power.

Relations and 'Insider Status'

"First, we need to take a look at research relations if we want to determine how feminist anthropologists can work to diffuse power between them and those they research. Staeheli and Lawson (1994:97) argue that exploring relations is "necessary for understanding the substantive processes that structure the social world and so shape the process of feminist fieldwork". In discussing the methods feminists use in attempts to diffuse power, we elucidate the ways researchers put processes in place to alter the social structure, and hence, the process of fieldwork.

One dimension of the relations between researcher and researched is the notion of 'insider' and 'outsider', or 'othering'. For the most part, anthropolo-

gists are thought to be 'outsiders' when they conduct fieldwork. Even instances where we have what some would call 'native anthropologists' (those who study their own communities) there is still the disparity of 'insider/outsider'. This is due to many factors, including differences in education, economic class, or gender, to name a few. But, I'm getting off topic. Where I was heading with this, is the fact that status as an 'insider' or 'outsider' can alter the power relations between the researcher and the researched," she explained.

"But, how does this pertain to emancipatory research?" I asked.

"Well, as early as ten years ago, the idea that women researchers had an 'insider's' view when conducting research with other women was circulating amongst some scholars (Gilbert 1994). This idea is an essentialist view that ignores "the various dimensions of difference that distinguish women and the issues with which they are concerned" (Staeheli and Lawson 1994:97). The realization of this essentialism generated a sense of crisis for some, and feminist researchers began to question their relationships with the people, places, and power structure they study (Staeheli and Lawson 1994).

The move away from essentializing women, and the questioning of relationships existing within research, lead to the imposition of techniques that some feminist anthropologists use to conduct emancipatory research," my acquaintance explained.

Questioning Objectivity

"One of these new techniques was the questioning of objectivity. This was a big move in anthropological research. Some anthropologists like to think of themselves as scientists conducting objective research. By attempting to be objective, researchers are detaching themselves from those being researched. This cre-

ates a position of 'knowing observer' for the researcher who is separated from the individual(s) being researched and subjected to analysis, therefore reinforcing the power of the researcher (Armstead 1995 Gilbert 1994).

Feminists questioned if objectivity was even possible, much less desirable (Gilbert 1994). Some anthropologists, including myself, would argue that a researcher can never be totally objective when conducting fieldwork (Armstead 1995, Bloom 1997, Gilbert 1994). As human beings, we all carry our own worldviews with us, whether they are at a conscious or subconscious level. Our gender, social or economic class, education, ethnicity, or some other aspect of our life may influence us. Due to these aspects that make us different we can never be completely unbiased, and we, as researchers, need to acknowledge this.

Feminists have recognized this and argued against objectivity. It has also been suggested that researchers 'need to see women as the subjects of, not objects of our research' (Gilbert 1994: 93). This obviously has implications for not only how feminist anthropologists conduct their research, but how they interpret, analyze, and present their data (Gilbert 1994). Gilbert (1994:90) has suggested that '[i]nstead of attempting to be a neutral, distant researcher, feminists focused on the mutuality of the research process; intersubjectivity not objectivity and dialogues in place of monologues became the goals.' As a result of this methodological change toward emancipatory types of research, the relationship between the researcher and the researched was made obvious and open to debate (Gilbert 1994). The feminist anthropologist was not assumed to be objective or value-free, nor does she/he keep a distance from those being researched (McDowell 1992:405).

Questioning the objective "nature of social science research and the privileged voice of scientific discourse", as D'Amico-Samuels (1991:78) suggests, has

lead to the use of different methods when conducting feminist research, with the aim of empowering women," she explained.

"Okay, so emancipatory research is obviously one of the methods feminists used to engage in more subjective research. You also talked about how questioning objectivity diffuses power relations. What other aspects of emancipatory research allow for this diffusion?" I inquired.

Constructing "the field"

"Feminists have started to think about how we construct 'the field' (D'Amico-Samuels 1991, Katz 1994, Mascia-Lees et al. 1989, Staeheli and Lawson 1994, Trinh 1986-1987). In most anthropological research it is the researcher who defines 'the field'. They are the ones who get to draw the lines, and define what is and is not part of their field of investigation (Katz 1994). In this way, 'the field' is an ideological concept. Artificial boundaries of time and space are established, and differences within groups are obscured (D'Amico-Samuels 1991). This construction also serves to create a separation between those researching and those being studied, as the research group is thought to be fixed and homogenous, and therefore distinct from the researcher (Katz 1994, Staeheli and Lawson 1994).

Among others, Katz (1994) has urged feminists to blur the boundaries that exist between 'the field' and the academy. She argues that 'the field' is always constituted through sets of power relations. It is academics who create 'fields' to study. We do this through our projects and research accounts (Katz 1994, Mascia-Lees et. al. 1989, Staeheli and Lawson 1994, Trinh 1986-1987)."

"How do we go about 'blurring' these boundaries?" I asked.

"I would suggest that anthropologists be mindful that the academy is part of 'the field'. We never do research in a vacuum. Our life experiences, the way the institutions within which we work are structured, how funding is allocated etc., all influence the construction of 'the field'. We also need to collaborate with those we research when attempting to construct our field of research, which would be a part of my extension of Katz's suggestions," she said.

"That being?" I asked.

"I would also argue that we need to 'blur the boundaries' that are created when fieldwork is conducted. We need to step away from research projects that explore only a certain snippet of time occurring within a specified region. We must keep in mind that events that took place fifty years ago, for example, can and often do affect the way people live their lives today. Also, limiting 'the field' to a small area serves to create a homogenous group. People living around areas we are studying may have an effect on the people and events anthropologists study, and that is something that we also need to acknowledge.

Being aware that it is academics who create 'fields', that space and time boundaries give us a limited vision, and that the creation of 'fields' is always done through power relations, means we need to focus on creating more inclusive 'fields'," she suggested.

"How do we do that?" I asked.

"We can do that by collaborating with the people we wish to research. This includes, but is not limited to, asking what they think is important, how the community is affected by people living in other areas and actions that take place elsewhere, and questioning people who do not live within the community of study. We should also talk to people within and outside of the community about important events that took place in the past, and question them concerning how the present might be shaped by these occurrences. If we must 'create a field', this allows for those being researched to be involved, therefore diffusing power, as well as giving a more in-

clusive view of the community," she explained.

Reflexivity

"Another important way that feminist researchers attempt to diffuse the power relations between themselves and those they study is by maintaining a level of reflexivity. Sandra Harding (1987) argues that a conscious reflexivity places the researcher and the researched on equal footing. This is accomplished by researchers being aware of and disclosing "their own histories, values, and assumptions that they bring into the field" (Nast 1994:59) when conducting research, as well as when interpreting, analyzing, and reporting their results (Bloom 1997). This is very similar to the issues surrounding objectivity that we just discussed. We can never be entirely objective so we need to acknowledge that fact, not only within ourselves when doing research, but also to those we study and those who read our written accounts. Not only does this consciousness serve to decrease the sense that researchers are "neutral, objective observers" (Bloom 1997:112), but it also increases awareness of how knowledge is produced in the researcher/researched relationship, where dynamics of power and positionality are at play. This introspection that researchers take part in can also lead to new research questions and/or new hypotheses (England 1994)."

"This seems very similar to the notion of questioning objectivity that we discussed earlier, as you said. How is reflexivity different?" I asked.

"Well, not only does reflexivity encourage the awareness of the researcher's biases, it also promotes the continuous analysis of the theoretical and methodological standpoints taken by the researcher (Lynch 2000). As relationships are formed and more is learned about the community being studied, a researcher may find that his/her particular theoretical and/or methodological leanings need to be altered, or changed completely. This constant reflection allows for more pertinent questions to be asked, and for the researcher, those being studied, as well as academia, to obtain more constructive and useful information through the research project.

It is also imperative that researchers 'retain an awareness of the importance of other people's definitions and understandings of theirs' (Lynch 2000: 90-91). Encompassing reflexivity allows researchers to include multiple voices in their projects. We will talk about multivocality a little later. In terms of reflexivity, it is important for researchers to take into account, and fully understand, the research group's definitions and conceptualizations. To exclude this knowledge could lead to misunderstandings and misrepresentations. To avoid further misunderstandings, it is crucial that the researcher be confident that members of the community of study understand her/his definitions and understanding of concepts, events etc. Finally, researchers should outline their use of concepts and/or definitions in written accounts to elicit accurate comprehension from the academic community," she said.

Multivocality

"I think that we need to talk about multivocality as well," she suggested.

"I hear a lot about multivocality, and that researchers need to give voice to other points of view. But I question how often anthropologists actually take the interpretations of other people, namely the people they study, into account," I said.

"Recognizing, and incorporating, other worldviews into social science research might not be general practice as of yet, but in feminism, and especially feminist anthropology, I think that it is fairly common," she said.

"How do feminist anthropologists go about including other voices in the research they conduct?" I asked.

"Feminists began by thinking of fieldwork as a dialogical process occurring between the researcher and those being researched (Acker et. al. 1983, England 1994, Gilbert 1994, Gorelick 1991). England (1994) has suggested that there are two main benefits of this type of research: 1) the probability that the research may be transformed by the input of the researched is increased, and 2) the researcher becomes a visible part of the research setting, which leads to analysis of the role of the researcher, resulting in a more reflexive stance. But, we talked about reflexivity already, so let's focus on the transformative value of multivocality.

If fieldwork is undertaken as a dialogical process between the researcher and the researched, then the researcher has the opportunity to explore and clarify the issue(s) being investigated (Acker et. al. 1983, Armstead 1995, Cancian 1992). When research is conducted as a collaborative process, the knowledge of subjects is valued (Armstead 1995). I think that Maguire (1987:45-46) summarizes the goals and benefits of a multivocal research project when she suggests that both researchers and community members, "know some things; neither of us knows everything. Working together we will both know more; and we will both learn more about how to know". When viewpoints aside from those of the researcher are taken into account not only does the researcher allow herself/himself to be educated in an alternative way and transform the research project, but ownership of that knowledge then rests not only with the researcher, but with those researched (Gorelick 1991, Lynch 2000). Lynch (2000:81-82) suggests that the "fact that the subjects are co-creators of the knowledge means that they can exercise control over definitions and interpretations of their life world. They are also in a position to be introduced to research practice through their ongoing involve-

ment in the research process". This serves to diffuse power by giving subjects some control over the research and what is reported, as well as instilling knowledge of the research process," she illustrated.

"What about writing-up the research with the people anthropologists study?" I asked.

"Yes, that is something that some anthropologists practice. It doesn't happen all that often unfortunately," she answered. "Some feminists have gone so far as co-authoring written accounts of research with the individuals that were the focus of their study (Gilbert 1994, Mbilinyi 1989). Mbilinyi (1989) credited the women she studied with co-authorship when she published the results of her research. However, this is not as easy as it sounds. Mbilinyi (1989) was working on life histories with a very small group of women. But, what happens when an anthropologist conducts research within a community with a population of 100 people? Time would rarely allow for an anthropologist to collaborate with that number of people, nor would space when attempting to publish results. With the input of 100 people, or even 20 people, it would be impossible to write an article short enough to submit to a scholarly journal, or a book concise enough that people would want to read."

"If co-authorship is impractical much of the time, are there other ways that feminist anthropologists have attempted to acknowledge the multiple voices that exist within any research project?" I asked.

"Some anthropologists have presented any conflicts arising from data interpretation in their final texts (Borland 1991, Gilbert 1994, Mbilinyi 1989). Most anthropologists don't have the time or space to include the interpretations of every person they interacted with while conducting their research. Focusing on conflicting ideas between researcher and researched that arise once the interpretation and analysis of data is complete is one solution that allows for multiple voices to be heard. This makes readers of written texts aware that

there are different interpretations of events or interactions that are just as valid as the researchers," she stated.

"Don't some feminists give editorial power to their research community?" I asked.

"Yes, that does sometimes happen," she said. "Some feminists have given copies of their written accounts to their community of study, and given them power to remove parts of the text that they were uncomfortable with (Geiger 1986). Some feminists have also given research groups editorial power with regards to the researcher's interpretations and analysis (Staeheli and Lawson 1994). This is another form of co-operation between researcher and researched that helps to distribute control over what is produced, therefore diffusing power," she said. "Those are the only forms of multivocality that I can think of at the moment. You can see that it does help immensely when the researcher's goal is to diffuse power".

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

"Another issue that arises when discussing the power relations inherent in the research process, and the attempt to diffuse that power, is the analysis and interpretation of data (Gilbert 1994). Many anthropologists still conduct research projects where they spend various amounts of time in 'the field', whatever that is for them, and then return home. They sit in their office at their computer, and, once transcriptions are completed, analyze their data, using various methods, and then interpret what the information could mean. Granted most of these anthropologists will have spent prolonged periods of time within their community of study, but how do they know definitively that they are interpreting the data 'correctly'? The people studied might have different ideas about the events or conversations that the researcher may write about. Also, and

more importantly in discussions regarding power, this system serves to perpetuate the power inequities that inherently exist between the researcher and the researched.

When discussing a research project that Acker et al. (1983) had undertaken, the researchers themselves suggested that the act of compiling data, summarizing another person's life (or part of it), and then placing it within the context you have created as the researcher, is objectification" she explained.

"So, then what do we do? How can we find our way out of this system of objectification?" I asked.

"One answer that feminist anthropologists have fashioned is to engage with the people you are studying with regards to analysis (Staeheli and Lawson 1994). Researchers need to look at the categories and concepts that shape the projects they are conducting and include the people they are studying in a "critical, self-reflexive analysis" (Staeheli and Lawson 1994:100). Depending on time constraints, this may be done during research, such as during interviews, or after the data is collected. Anthropologists might be able to spend time following data collection discussing the analysis and interpretation of the data with the people in the community, or transcripts and field notes could be sent electronically to subjects for their input, depending on the available technology. Nevertheless, the point is to include the people being studied in the process of analysis and interpretation of the data. If there are any discrepancies between what the anthropologist feels she/he deserved and what the study subjects feel to be the case, these differences in view should be acknowledged in any written accounts," she answered.

Political Activism

"Finally, political activism is another popular method used by feminists to attempt to diffuse the power existing in research relationships. Part of the move toward eman-

cipatory research is an approach to political change (Gilbert 1994, Kobayashi 1994, Lather 1986, Staeheli and Lawson 1994). Feminist research is concerned with the many different types of inequalities that exist within our world, and the ways in which these inequalities can be lessened and finally eradicated," she stated.

"How does political action fit in with collaborative forms of research?" I asked.

"Well," she started, "taking part in more democratic or collaborative research serves to connect those being studied to the academic world, therefore beginning the process of social transformation (Staeheli and Lawson 1994). When we aim to transform not only the equalities apparent between researchers and researched, but also the inequalities that exist within the communities we research, or between these communities and the rest of the world, that is engaging in political action with the goal of diffusing power."

"Also," she went on, "giving back to your community of study is one way of trying to lessen the inequalities that exist between the researcher and the researched (Gilbert 1994), that is also a form of political action. Some anthropologists might choose to send their book royalties to their community of study, or to set up a foundation in the community's name. Whatever they do, they bring attention to the plights of that community on some level, thereby, helping to empower the members of the community of study".

Conclusions
Issues to Consider

"There are some other issues that need to be considered. Emancipatory research is the best method we presently have to diffuse power relations, but that doesn't mean it's perfect," she cautioned.

"What are these issues that we

need to take into account?" I asked.

"There are two main factors that I can think of at the moment," she said. "First, we need to remember that "even feminist researchers have the power to exploit respondents" (Bloom 1997:117). Our intentions may be genuine, but we need to make sure that we don't fall into the trap of using our research subjects for our own means," she warned.

"That's true," I said. "What is your other concern?" I asked.

"We need to make sure that we are not appropriating the voices of our research communities. If we are going to include the voices of those we research, we need to specify that they are in fact the opinions, understandings etc. of the research subjects. Allowing for any type of confusion regarding ownership simply reinforces the 'patterns of domination' (England 1994:81) that we are trying to impede," she argued.

"That's understandable," I said.

Positioning Emancipatory Research within Mainstream Academia

"So, how do we go about positioning emancipatory research within mainstream anthropology?" I asked.

"Well, that's not an easy question to answer," she sighed. "I'm not sure anybody has the answer. I do think that if feminist anthropologists keep on conducting this type of research, presenting their findings at conferences, and publishing their accounts in prominent journals, then eventually it will catch on. By doing these things, hopefully the colleagues of these feminist anthropologists will see the benefits of emancipatory research, and begin engaging with it themselves. I'm not really sure what else to tell you. Like I said, I don't have a concrete answer to that question," she admitted.

"Oh, that's fine. I just wanted to know what you're ideas were on the subject," I said.

By this point it was getting pretty

late in the evening. I know I was getting tired, and I think my acquaintance was as well. I explained to her that I should go grab a bus before service stops for the night, and get home to bed so I could start working on my paper the next day.

"Yes, I should probably go see if they have started boarding my plane," she said.

"Well, thanks for all your help tonight. I have a lot of ideas for my paper now," I said.

"You're very welcome," she said.

"It was nice meeting you. Have a good night," I said.

"Thanks, you too," she said.

At that point I left the pub to head to the bus stop, and my new acquaintance left heading in the opposite direction. Once I was on the bus I realized that I didn't even get her name. I haven't seen her again since that night. I don't know who she is, and I guess I never will.

References Cited

Acker, J., Kate Barry, and J. Esseveld
    1983 "Objectivity and truth. Problems in doing feminist research." Women's Studies International Forum 6:423-435.

Armstead, Cathleen
    1995 "Writing Contradictions: Feminist Research and Feminist Writing." Women's Studies International Forum 18(5/6):627-636.

Bloom, Leslie Rebecca
    1997 "Locked in Uneasy Sisterhood: Reflections on Feminist Methodology and Research Relations," Anthropology and Education Quarterly 28(1):111-22.

Borland, K.
    1991 "'That's not what I said': Interpretive conflict in oral narrative research." In S.B. Gluck and D. Patai, eds. Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History. New York: Routledge. Pp. 63-75.

Cancian, F.
    1992 "Feminist science: Methodologies that challenge inequality." Gender and Society 6:623-642.

Cruikshank, Julie
    1997 "Negotiatng with Narrative: Establishing Cultural Identity at the Yukon International Storytelling Festival." American Anthropologist 99(1):56-69.

D'Amico-Samuels, Deborah
    1991 "Undoing Fieldwork: Personal, Political, Theoretical and Methodological Implications," in Faye V. Harrison, ed. Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology for Liberation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Black Anthropologists. Pp. 68-87.

Ebert, Teresa L.
    1996   Ludic Feminism and After: ostmodernism, Desire, and Labor in Late Capitalism. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

England, Kim V.L.
    1994 "Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research." Professional Geographer 46(1):80-89.

Fawcett, Barbara and Brid Featherstone
    2000 "Setting the scene: an appraisal of notions of postmodernism, postmodernity, and Anthropologist 99(1):56-69.

Fawcett, Barbara and Brid Featherstone
    2000 "Setting the scene: an appraisal of notions of postmodernism, postmodernity, and postmodern feminism." In Barbara Fawcett, Brid Featherstone, Jan Fook, and Amy Rossiter, eds. Practice and Research in Social Work: Postmodern Feminist Perspectives. London: Routledge. Pp. 5-23.

Flannery, Kent V.
    1982 "The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archaeology of the 1980's." American Anthropologist 84(2):265-278.

Foucault, Michel
    1978 The History of Sexuality. New York: Pantheon Books.

Geiger, Susan N.G.
    1986 "Women's Life Histories: Method and Content." Signs 11(2):334-351.

Gilbert, Melissa R.

1994 "The Politics of Location: Doing Feminist Research at 'Home'." Professional Geographer 46(1):90-96.

Gorelick, Sherry
1991 "Contradictions of Feminist ethodology." Gender and Society 5(4):459-477.

Harding, Sandra
1987 "Introduction: Is there a feminist method?" In Sandra Harding, ed. Feminism and M e t h o d o l o g y . Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. 1-14.

Katz, Cindi
1994 "Playing the Field: Questions of Fieldwork in Geography." Professional Geographer 46(1):67-72.

Kobayashi, Audrey
1994 "Coloring the Field: Gender, 'Race,' and the Politics of fieldwork." Professional Geographer 46 (1):73-80.

Lather, Patti
1986 "Research as Praxis." Harvard Educational Review 56(3):257-277.

Lynch, Kathleen
2000 "The Role of Emancipatory Research in the Academy." In Anne Byrne and Ronit Lentin, eds. (Re)searching Women: Feminist Research Methodologies in the Social Sciences in Ireland. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration. Pp. 73-104.

Maguire, P.
1987 Doing participatory research: A feminist approach. Amherst, M.A.: The Center for International Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

Mascia-Lees F.E., P. Sharpe, and C.B. Cohen
1989 "The postmodernist turn in anthropology: Cautions from a feminist perspective." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 15:7-33.

McDowell, Linda
1992 "Doing gender: feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series 17(4):399-416.

Mbilinyi, M
1989 "'I'd have been a man': Politics and the labor process in producing personal narratives." In Personal Narratives Group, eds., Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. 204-27.

Nast, Heidi J.
1994 "Women in the Field: Critical Feminist Methodologies and Theoretical Perspectives." Professional Geographer 46(1):54-66.

Pease, Bob
2000 "Researching profeminist men's narratives" participatory methodologies in a postmodern frame." In Barbara Fawcett, Brid Featherstone, Jan Fook, and Amy Rossiter, eds. Practice and Research in Social Work: Postmodern Feminist Perspectives. London: Routledge. Pp. 136-158.

Ronit, Lentin
2000 "Constructing the Self in Narrative: Feminist Research as Auto/Biography." In Anne Byrne and Ronit Lentin, eds. (Re)Searching Women: Feminist Research Methodologies in the Social Sciences in Ireland. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration. Pp. 247-64.

Staeheli, Lynn A., and Victoria A. Lawson
1994 "A Discussion of 'Women in the Field': The Politics of Feminist Fieldwork.." Professional Geographer 46(1):97-102.

Trinh, T.M.
1986-7 "Difference: 'A special Third World Women Issue'." Discourse 8:11-38.

Leah Getchell

Queer Science, Queer Archaeology:
Moving Beyond the Feminist Critique

Abstract

Feminism still remains a 'dirty' word in some academic disciplines today, particularly in the hard sciences. It is argued however that a feminist critique of Western scientific thought has shed much light on the omissions of the androcentric discipline. Feminist theory has influenced how archaeologists have both theorized about and practiced archaeology over the last two decades. What this article argues however is that the feminist epistemological standpoint, while important, situates itself in an extremist standpoint as the scientific objectivists do. In order to find an even more holistic and appropriate way to explore and think about our human past, a queer science and archaeology should be undertaken. Not only does queer theory provide a more holistic way to critique lived experiences today and in the past, it moves beyond the feminist focus and provides a more compelling evaluation of historical and modern institutions of power and knowledge production.

Biographical Statement

Leah is in the second year of the anthropology masters program at the University of Victoria and her area of interest is that of social anthropology. My thesis work examines female table-top role-playing gamers and role-playing games as a possible site for resistance or perpetuation of gender stereotypes. Along side her research on gender issues my other areas of anthropological fascination include social and archaeological theory, participatory action research, youth sub-cultures, and play.

Despite the movements in feminist theory over the last two decades it can be argued that *feminism* is still a 'dirty' utterance, particularly when it is associated with the word science. Feminist critiques of science have provided cross-disciplinary insights into the androcentric history and *nature* of Western scientific thought, and the discipline of archaeology is no exception. Since the mid 1980s the presence and acknowledgment of the archaeology of gender has fostered a wide audience of supporters from field archaeologists like Elizabeth Prine, who searches for third genders in a Middle Missouri village, to Alison Wylie who theorizes about the presence and use of a feminist science and its contributions to archaeological theory and method. Although I agree with the critical nature that feminist researchers postulate, I suggest the feminist critique actually situates itself in an extreme fashion the same way objectivist science theories situate themselves as being *the* creators of *truthful* knowledge production— thus positioning feminist theory in an

extremist light. I will argue that clearly some elements of feminist theory and critique are essential both in science and in the way we think about and practice archaeology, however I will suggest we need to move beyond the dichotomous bi-gendered theoretical framework of objectivist processualism and extreme relativist postprocessualism.

Queer theory not only provides an opportunity to move beyond the male/female dichotomy but also away from the heteronormative standpoint that still permeates scientific knowledge and archaeological theory and practice today. It provides us with a more holistic and critical lens from which we can address issues of power and knowledge, both in present day academic/scientific practice and in our interpretations of the past.

Before one can begin to understand and critique feminist epistemology, and its analysis of modern Western science, the role that science has played within the discipline of archaeology must first be reviewed to give the reader a more solid platform with which to follow my argument.

It has been agreed that science can be seen in both a positive and negative light. Science has brought us modern advancements such as aviation, the Internet and astonishing medical technology. On the other hand, the role of science in medicine has recently brought up moral and ethical issues like embryonic stem cell testing—which one could argue allows scientists to play God all in the *good* name of *Science*. These new moral and ethical issues are now bringing up the fine question—what is *Science*?

Auguste Comte suggests that science is an institution of authority and power such as the Roman Catholic Church was only a century ago (Johnson 1999). With this I will agree, however the question of what is *science* needs to be directly addressed in terms of its history within the discipline of archaeology. It was these sorts of questions archaeologists were

asking in the early 1960s: What is Science? What are the different forms of Science? And which form, if any, should archaeology strive to appropriate?

Moving way from the Culture History approach, New Archaeologists, who later called themselves processualists, solidified their paradigm shift with the slogan "we must be more scientific" (Johnson 1999:34). After the Second World War, science-based technological advancements and procedures started penetrating academia and archaeologists hung up their Stetson hats and trowels for crisply starched white lab jackets and became immersed in laboratory life. Archaeologists were moving away from creating and organizing intricate and complicated pottery typologies to being more concerned with pollen diagrams, carbon-14 dating, dendrochronology dating, and other more measurable *scientific* methods. However it was argued that although archaeologists were using *scientific* methods this did not imply that it was a distinctive and useful way of finding out about the past. David Clark is quoted as saying the uses of scientific techniques "no more make archaeology into a science than a wooden leg turns a man into a tree" (Clarke 1978: 465 qtd. in Johnson 1999: 36). Nevertheless, New Archaeologists argued that the natural sciences and the arising technological advances afforded archaeologists the ability to bridge the gap between the past and the present and was the solution to the conundrum of inference (Johnson 1999).

Before I argue more about the validity of science within archaeology, let me first explain how I am defining science in this particular context. Johnson (1999) provides a succinct explanation of the different forms of science archaeologists concerned themselves with, and outlines the most pervasive form—positivism. Positivistic science is said to be conducted using the following beliefs;

1. The notion that we should separate theory from method.

2. The separation of the context of the discovery of an idea from the context of its evaluation.

3. A generalizing explanation is the only valid form of explanation.

4. Un-testable statements are outside the domain of science.

5. Scientific thought should be independent of value judgments and political actions, (Johnson 1999:38-39).

To a critical academic and social theorist, several of these statements are likely to give goose bumps and send one running to the liquor cabinet. These beliefs are the foundation of positivist science and, as we will see later, are critiqued by not only feminists, but by other members of academia as well. An example provided by Johnson of how archaeologists attempted to use this model to explain the past looks something like this;

1. Hypothesis: early states involve differential access to resources, in other words, elites have greater access to basic goods.

2. Test: dig a cemetery from an early state society and chemically analyze the bones.

3. Deduction: the elite ate more meat, so we deduce that they did indeed have greater access to nutrition.

4. Generalization: early states do have such differential access, subject to further testing, other examples from other cultures at the same phase of social development, etc. (Johnson 1999: 41).

It is obvious how New Archaeologists and later processualists attempted to situate their work, and the archaeological discipline in general, within a scientific framework.

There were people during this time and long after that did not agree with this strict and generalizing use of science and Johnson (1999) outlines some of the critiques. Firstly, science is based on testing and observation of results and it is still argued today this is a difficult task with studying the past. This is a strong and ongoing debate and thus I will leave it in its simplest form here. The second argument against positivist science is that, as in chemistry or biology, science is based on predictions and it is argued that human behavior cannot prescribe to this blind predictability as our behavior is said to be purposive or intentional (Johnson 1999). Thus in order to understand human actions and ultimately cultures of the past, it is implied that we must try to understand and recreate people's thoughts or their intentionality behind the production of specific pottery types or irrigation plans. It is argued that archaeology should be concerned less with dating and typologies and more with the thoughts and intentions that create the material record—this task is something that even *science* is incapable of accomplishing (Johnson 1999).

Kuhn and Feyerabend (Johnson 1999) take the critique of science one step further in a direction that aligns with the feminist critique. They suggest that positivism is, in fact, not a theory but a myth. More clearly they suggest that positivism is an ideal model of scientific philosophy and as such, sheds a dim and murky light onto what it is that scientists actually do. Johnson (1999) clearly points out that to ask archaeology to follow such a philosophy would be asking them to create their own fantasy world.

So the question remains, if science is merely a myth, what are scientists getting up to in their laboratories? Khun and Feyerabend suggest there are no authentic observable realities that are consuming the funding dollars and minds of scientists, but rather what they observe as fact and truth is socially, historically, and politically influenced and situated. Feyerabend follows Comte's ideas that science itself is a large and excessively powerful institution that masks its self-serving interests behind their objectivist placard. "Positivism in Feyerabend's view masks 'institutional intimidation' by

pretending to be neutral, hinders the development of science, and encourages scientism and the 'cult of the expert'" (Johnson 1999:45). Feyerabend makes an acute observation with his remark on the 'cult of the expert' and I will return to this point as it fits nicely into my later discussion of the feminist epistemological standpoint on science.

What Kuhn, Comte and Feyerabend are arguing is a case of 'social constructivism'. This is the idea that science, and every other element of human life, is socially constructed. Further there can be no real objectivity in science, archaeology or any other discipline, because what we know or proclaim to discover from facts, theories and methods will always be laden with the influences of the social world within which we work. Lewis Binford suggests in his 2001 article "Where do Research Questions Come From?" that "the recognition and discussion by archaeologists of 'where do problems come from' is probably most characteristic of the contemporary era. Such a problem does not appear to have been acknowledged during the era of traditional archaeology" (670). Binford continues his discussion with careful attention paid to the claims of the contemporary era, or that of a social constructivist standpoint, as merely the business of the humanities with no position in the science of archaeology.

As a *traditionalist* and a member of the old academic elite it is understandable this standpoint of social constructivism would make Binford uneasy as he has dedicated his career to objectivist inquiry. Questioning anybody's epistemological paradigm, one on which they have built their life's work no matter what the area of study, will always become a power struggle—one which I will argue is essential when examining the andocentric nature of scientific thought itself.

The debate over the nature of scientific thought and practice within archaeology has been ongoing since the early 1970s when many archaeologists, like Ian Hodder, began questioning notions of objectivity, inference, and analogy when examining past remains. Alison Wylie is another influential participant in this theoretical debate. In her article, *The Reaction Against Analogy* (Wylie 1985), she describes Kluckhohn's wariness in the processual era of archaeology as the "lingering effects of overreaction to the excesses of evolutionary speculation" (Wylie 1985: 69) and the disciplines wariness of the more abstract queries of anthropological thought. Kluckhohn was ahead of his time when he stated, not only is it impossible to eliminate all interpretive, theoretical inferences beyond the data—the very identification of a body of empirical phenomena as 'archaeological' presupposes a vast network of such inferences—but also that this restrictive policy is profoundly counterproductive (Wylie 1985:69).

This statement and others like it challenge the notion of objectivity not only in the natural sciences, but in what Binford would call the 'Archaeology of Science' as well. Questions arise over the nature of the material record and how what we call 'data' can be considered data in the scientific sense if methods of analysis rely on inference and analogy and, as Wylie argues, are laden with the social experiences of the researcher. The trouble with objectivist archaeology, if we can concede for a moment that objectivity is an attainable goal, is what Johnson described above. We are dealing with a dead human past, so the possibility for one to stand back and make objectivist statements about a culture that is no longer present or patterns of human behavior that we can no longer see is a non-reality within a scientific framework. Wylie continues to support this by saying that any *fact* that is put forth comes only from our contemporary understanding and experience of the way different cultures around the globe work. In essence, any conclusion, assumption, or objective fact derived

from either the archaeological record or in any other scientific realm, is purely a construction of the powerful institution of science itself which supports the goals of the few at the expense of the many.

It is appropriate to reflect back on what Feyerabend said earlier about the scientific institution being a 'cult of the expert'. I will now place a feminist lens on this discussion of science to explore and discuss the androcentric nature of science and subsequently archaeology itself. This will open the door to explain why the search for gender in archaeology is so important to the discipline.

Gender and Archaeology

Viable human populations necessarily include two biological sexes, sufficient numbers of both, and their interactions. The archaeological literature shows a past peopled mainly by men (e.g. 'Early man', 'craftsmen', 'big men') and with little consideration for the interaction between genders. As is it is represented, the human race simply does not have a viable prehistoric population. (Hurcombe 1995: 87 qtd. in Hurcombe 1997:15).

This quote by Linda Hurcombe is a succinct summary of why issues of gender must be addressed within the archaeological record. I have argued above that processual archaeology (i.e. thinking of archaeology as a kind of science) has concerned itself with larger issues like the importance of ranking and hierarchies in cultural change, and largely has a biological reductionist and environmentally determinist approach. It lacks an understanding of the significance of both the symbolic realm and individual agency (Scott 1997). Since then, questions have been raised about the "proper study of mankind" (Scott 1997:1) and here we see

the move away from the strict positivist approach of processualism to the more interpretive and multi-vocal approach of post-processualsim—the introduction of feminist thinking, critique and concern for looking at how we have been interpreting our human past. As the quote from Hurcombe suggests, archaeological interpretation has largely been one sided and thus does not create a picture of a viable life-sustaining prehistory and she suggests, with the current picture of the past which archaeology has painted for us, it is a miracle humans have made it as far as we have. Lucy (1997) aptly points out how the androcentric interpretations of the past represent a gap in the scholarship rather than inherent holes in the archaeological data itself. Lucy's work with Anglo-Saxon burials in Yorkshire demonstrates the ineffective interpretation of burials based solely on evidence of sexual dimorphism that lead to shallow and likely inaccurate interpretations of past Anglo-Saxon life. Instead, her research demonstrates that as an alternative for only using grave goods to ascribe sex to burials, the examination of two other equally significant assemblages (jewelry or no grave goods at all) need to be examined. Thus, the examination of Anglo-Saxon furnished or non-furnished inhumation burials can shed more light on the realities of social organization and gender relations. This is more scholarly in a sense because it does not solely rely on sexual stereotypes that explain nothing as they are formulated not on reality, but on our contemporary biases and misconceptions. Lucy concludes her study by stating, "[U]ltimately, the unquestioned authority of the sexual stereotype must be challenged" (Lucy 1997:164). By including questions of gender in our archaeological research, we are able to add more holistic interpretations of the past.

Margaret Conkey and Joan Gero have, both together and independently, had a significant impact within the archaeological discipline, bringing gender

to the forefront of study. Conkey was a member of the American Anthropological Association Committee on the status of women from 1974 (chair in 1975-1976) and due to this she was drawn into the organization of a panel for the 1977 AAA meetings on gender research in the various sub fields of anthropology. Joan Gero has also done important work on her own and published a number of groundbreaking articles on these issues and was actively involved in promoting research on the political dynamics, including the gender dynamics within the discipline (Gero 1983, 1985, 1991). Together they organized a conference in South Carolina that was one of the first archaeological events to focus on the issue of gender. This was in response to the famous 1989 Chacmool conference at the University of Calgary, where the title of the conference was "The Archaeology of Gender". It drew over one hundred contributions and was the first conference of its kind (Wylie 1992). It marked the beginning of a new era within archaeology and the wheels are still spinning over a decade later.

In their informative 1997 article, "Program to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology", Conkey & Gero concurrently argue with Lucy that the primary purpose for undertaking a gendered archaeology is to both identify and assert the presence and activity of women at prehistoric sites. Such a practice forces conscious attention to startling assumptions about gender, where traditional assessments of the division of labor were extremely biased.

They continue to argue that the concepts of both gender and sex are constructed, that is to say not rooted in biology, procreation, or are inherently dichotomous. This point clearly supports one of the first arguments made in this paper with reference to the social constructivist notions of science, and that all constructionist critiques start from the assumption that our analytical categories are

deeply embedded in historical, sociocultural, ideological and material contexts. The materiality of the archaeological record brings about an important issue on how to analyze the dialectic between human life as socially constructed and the very materiality of human life. In sum "the idea of gender as a social construction mandates that archaeologists interrogate their starting assumptions when setting out to do an archaeology of gender" (Conkey & Gero 1997: 418). Clearly we can see the importance of including the search for gender—multiple ways of experiencing life in the past—into our field methodology and theoretical positioning. It provides us with a more holistic view of the past, one that includes women as active participants within the social and cultural realms of prehistoric reality, and consequently allows us to engage in a more successful scholarship. This position also opens up the doors for multiple interpretations bringing us perhaps that much closer to a more robust *scientific* understanding of our past.

A Feminist Critique of Science

As I mentioned in the opening statement, the word feminism in the 21st century is still at times considered a *dirty* word especially when it is associated with science. I have experienced this first hand, particularly when talking to male colleagues in the natural sciences, such as math and physics. When I mentioned I was writing a paper on feminist science, or using a feminist lens to critique science, I received several blank stares or a skeptically cocked eyebrow. Perhaps this is a result of the skepticism that is raised when the words feminist and science are used in the same sentence. What I would have explained however, if I had felt the social climate was receptive, is that feminism in the sense that I will use it here is not only about equal rights between both sexes, but that the feminist critique offers a critical lens with which we (and it

does not always mean woman, as men can take a feminist approach, too) can take a bird's eye view of how power structures have been organized. This could range from the formation of academic institutions, the political economy, religious institutions, or the discipline of science. A feminist critique allows the user to question the status quo, the taken-for-granteds, and question issues of power and knowledge.

Why then were my male colleagues so dismissive when I mentioned my current pursuit? I would suggest it is the misconception among both men and women about what the word feminism, in the academic sense of the word means. I will heretofore use Alison Wylie's definition of feminism as applied to the sciences. She suggests that feminist interventions with science "exemplify a critical engagement of claims to objectivity that refuses reductive constructivism as firmly as it rejects unreflective objectivism. This is a strategic ambivalence that holds enormous promise and is typical of much feminist thinking in and about scientific practice" (Wylie 1997: 80). She goes on to say the hallmark of the postpositivist philosophy of science " is a commitment to ground philosophical analysis in a detailed understanding of scientific practice (historical or contemporary), an exercise that has forced attention to the diversity and multidimensionality of the sciences" (Wylie 1997: 87). This statement is a difficult one as it requires us to maintain faith that science has a distinctive, unifying rationality that can be reconstructed across any discipline we have historically or culturally identified as 'scientific' (Wylie 1997). What has come from these conclusions is that no existing science studies have the resources to make sense of science from a strictly philosophical, sociological or historical point of view. Andrew Pickering makes the point that "[S]cientific practice…is situated and evolves right on the boundary, at the point of intersection,

of the material, social, [and] conceptual…worlds [and it] cuts very deeply across disciplinary boundaries" (Pickering 1992 qtd. in Wylie 1997: 87). The necessary task at hand is to develop a truly interdisciplinary approach that will take us away from the more dichotomous thinking of the traditional sciences.

It is this strict dichotomous thinking that I will address as being the core issue of both the traditional scientific framework and the feminist critique. Although, as Wylie (1997) suggests, breaking down these dichotomies has been the purpose of the feminist critique of science, I will argue that even though much work has been done by feminist thinkers, the feminist approach places itself at the top of the 'how to know' pyramid, doing what the traditionalists did with their philosophical approach to the production of knowledge.

Conkey & Gero (1997) suggest one of the goals of a feminist critique of science is to question strict dichotomies within scientific knowledge in order to acknowledge and explore other ways of knowing and experiencing life that is betwixt and between such opposing notions. Additionally as stated above, it offers a basis for a critical evaluation of authority, symbols, the canon(s) of science, and the arrangements by which science is produced—thus the very nature of scientific inquiry. Conkey & Gero also suggest that feminist critiques of science question who can be a *knower*, as well as the relationships of power between the community of expert *knowers* and the knowledge they cooperatively produce. Ultimately, they are asking questions about the moralization of objectivity.

When one takes a look at the suggested task at hand, which is to deconstruct what Western society has come to know as *science,* it is no doubt an undertaking that would require perhaps an impossible combination of intellectual brawn and pragmatic magic. Conkey & Gero suggest that it is the long-standing

feminist critique of science that has opened the eyes of many archaeologists to the current state of affairs within the discipline. Those who have accepted the feminist critique are those who have joined Conkey and Gero in their efforts to incorporate issues of gender in their theories and methods. They outline four main sections within the feminist critique of science, which have proven to be particularly influential in questioning archaeological practices—I will outline them briefly.

Feminists and other critical thinkers have recognized that politics and the substantive products of knowledge generation are essentially inseparable. They have long been suspicious of science as a bastion of male privilege—a point in which a counter argument would be difficult to substantiate—and that science betrays a pervasive disinterest in the concerns of women. Additionally sciences, particularly the social and medical sciences, not only reproduce but also legitimize precisely the ideology of gender inequity that feminists question. I will add here what I hope will provide a good example of just how androcentric science is by looking at scientific language used to describe the human fertilization process. In Emily Martin's intriguing and telling 1991 article, "The Egg and the Sperm: How science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles", she succinctly outlines the very gender biased language that modern day science uses. In an effort not to lose the potency of her argument, I will quote her in full:

> How is it that positive images are denied to the bodies of women? A look at language—in this case, scientific language—provides the first clue. Take the egg and the sperm. It is remarkable how "femininely" the egg behaves and how "masculinely" the sperm.

The egg is seen as large and passive. It does not *move* or *journey*, but passively " is transported," "is swept," or even "drifts" along the fallopian tube. In utter contrast, sperm are small, "streamlined," and invariably active. They "deliver" their genes to the egg, "activate the developmental program of the egg," and have a "velocity" that is often remarked upon. Their tails are "strong" and efficiently powered. Together with the forces of ejaculation, they can "propel the semen into the deepest recesses of the vagina." For this they need "energy," "fuel," so that with a "whiplashlike motion and strong lurches" they can "burrow through the egg coat" and "penetrate" it, (Martin 1991:489).

This provides an excellent example of the kind of male dominated language, thought and knowledge present in not only modern, but arguably in historical science as well. I suggest this kind of androcentric language is present within the sciences as there has been a noticeable absence of women contributing and writing within the discipline. It is also argued that the statistical absence of women in the sciences not only affects the androcentric bias in the discourse, but has also produced overtly masculine understandings and research conclusions (Conkey & Gero 1997).

In terms of how this has influenced possible notions and research in archaeology, Gero (1993) presents evidence from Paleo-Indian sites that have largely been interpreted with a male bias. This consequently has permitted a dominant paradigm which focuses on hunting as the primary and definitional activity of early Paleo-Indian groups and does not

examine elements in which women played a role in the survival process of their tribes. This is a clear statement of how interpretations of the past can be blindly colored by the exclusion of other gender possibilities, namely women, in the archaeological record. This kind of omission can be seen across the board in the sciences. If we do not insist that issues of gender be a primary focus of our archaeological inquiry, then we are not only being poor researchers—as we are not exploring all the possibilities—we are excluding fifty percent of the population and their role in prehistoric life. Clearly the men could not have done it all on their own.

Queer Theory—Moving Beyond the Feminist Critique

As reviewed above feminist theory is one that attempts to breakdown the status quo of existing power structures, like those within the discipline of archaeology and in science as well. When wearing a feminist lens to critique power structures within archaeology one will realize the discipline has largely overlooked the presence of women in the archaeological record, leaving us with a very unrealistic representation of our historic and prehistoric past.

Looking for gender, that is to say men *and* women in the archaeological record, has subsequently encouraged efforts to look for other less 'traditional' elements in the material record such as past sexualities and the presence and involvement of children. These are all valuable and worthy goals that post processualists have undertaken, and I will continue to support these efforts as I agree with the above scholars who suggest that a critical lens, a *feminist* lens, "is a useful and legitimate interpretive and classificatory device" (Lesick 1997:39).

What I would like to examine further is the idea that feminism and the feminist critique has situated itself, per-

haps unknowingly, in a dichotomous and hyper-relativist standpoint parallel to the uber-positivist processualist standpoint. As I mentioned earlier, the word feminism is still considered a *dirty* word, which still requires further examination within the discipline of archaeology. As Lesick (1997) suggests, it has taken archaeology far too long to acknowledge that a feminist critique aims at more then simply addressing the Western battle of the sexes.

Alison Wylie (1992) puts forth some salient questions that support my idea that a feminist standpoint, albeit unintentionally, sets itself up in a direct and almost pious opposition to the extreme objectivist standpoint they wish to avoid. Wylie suggests the current research on gender is clearly motivated and shaped in part by an explicitly feminist commitment and that in so doing it can be, and still is I suggest, dismissed as an extreme anti-objectivist standpoint. In positioning themselves in this way feminists exemplify the sort of partisan approach to inquiry and scholarship that Binford (2001) identified as conceptual posturing. More concisely, if political obligations as I have acknowledged above are inseparable from our theory and inquiry, does this not irrevocably compromise the commitments to objectivity and value neutrality that stand as the hallmark of science? If this is the case, what credibility can be given to such an inquiry that claims its results are just as limited and biased as those they are meant to displace? In addition, if an explicitly partisan feminist standpoint suggests that it is providing a more *objectivist* view, as it is operating outside the dominant androcentric framework of inquiry, does this not suggest that any view which uses a critical lens can bring new ways of understanding the past, and therefore suggests that any number of standpoints might do the same? Trigger (1998) advises that any standpoint that claims its position is *the* appropriate and correct one, as much of the undertones of feminist literature suggests, it only suc-

ceeds in becoming another extreme standpoint. The real foundation of its critical theory is side stepped by many and it is seen as having little credibility archaeologically or scientifically. This is what has continued to happen with the feminist critique and its efforts to bring gender issues to the surface of the archeological investigation, and is perhaps one of the reasons many scholars in the discipline have been slow to 'catch on'.

In response to Wylie's 1992 article, Little (1994) provides an intriguing response, one that fuelled my own interest in exploring an alternative to the relativist standpoint that follows feminist theory, which still alienates many contemporary scholars across the disciplines.

Little directs her argument back to the musings of seventeenth-century philosopher and historian Francis Bacon and his view that science is the domination of man (explicitly) over nature. This is an appropriate interpretation of the historical framework within which science has developed over the centuries. However, Keller (1985) interprets Bacon's vision of masculine science as ambiguous but reflective of the epistemological efforts of the time. Keller suggests that in order to move past the dichotomy of the male/female bias of the scientific framework, a hermetic standpoint is more useful. I suggest this could be useful in deconstructing the rigid relativist standpoint much of the feminist literature takes. She also suggests that gender ideology was a crucial mediation between the birth of modern science and our contemporary political and economic transformations. The mechanical and hermetic were opposing epistemologies based on philosophies rather than empiricism. "The former separated matter from spirit and both hand and mind from heart. The latter suffused matter with spirit and believed understanding required heart as well as hand and mind" (Little 1994:541). The hermetic vision, that is not to say the physical joining of male and female but of the male and female elements in harmony, was dismissed as the scientific revolution responded to and supported the polarization of gender required by industrial capitalism. Thus, the idea of a harmonious union of both female and male elements was lost to the archives until now. What I hope to demonstrate is that by moving away from explicit male/female dichotomies and adopting a *queer* epistemology we may be able to push the limits of our theoretical thinking. By suggesting the adoption of a hermetic or queer view of the world, and subsequently a queer view of science, the notably dangerous division created by an extreme feminist standpoint epistemology can be avoided.

It is necessary at this point to define what I mean by *queer science*. The term *queer* is again a very politically, socially, and historically loaded term. However the epistemological standpoint behind *queer theory* allows for a more inclusive theoretical paradigm then the feminist male/female dichotomy—as it includes anyone who does not fit within the *normative* framework. Therefore I position my argument of queer science not specifically around the word *queer* but around the standpoint of *queer theory* as a standpoint which aims to be inclusive to *all* genders and sexualities and can offer both science and archaeology a more holistic theoretical approach altogether.

In Goldman's (1996) article, "Who is that *Queer* Queer? Exploring Norms around Sexuality, Race and Class in Queer Theory", she identifies that queer theory, and the term queer itself, has many conflicting interpretations. Some people take queer theory to represent another nebulous abstract form of academic discourse understood only through the signifier *queer*: a complex term which itself allows for many albeit contradictory, interpretations. Therefore, depending on one's position and knowledge, the term *queer theory* can mean several different things: a theoretical per-

spective from which to challenge the norm; another term for lesbian and gay studies, or more radically another way that queer academics waste their time and tax-payers money (Goldman 1996). Clearly, this is an encumbered term, and I will agree that it may even be more of a contested term then the word feminism; however, queer theory seeks to break down the rigid 'bi-gender' structure and I argue it provides researchers with a useful theoretical tool, as it gets away from the oppositional stance which a lot of feminist and objectivist debates create.

Goldman continues defining how a queer theory standpoint allows inclusivity, flexibility, and is a "rejection of a minoritarian logic of toleration or simple interest-representation. Instead, queer politics represents an expansive impulse of inclusion; specifically, it requires a resistance to regimes of the normal" (Goldman 1996:170). Relaying heavily on postmodernist theorists like Foucault and Derrida, queer theory aims to revolutionize power structures by changing the way discourses around sexuality and gender are structured as attempts to disrupt the hegemony of the heteropatriarchy (Goldman 1996). Using queer theory as a basis for a critique of science, it can be seen as a useful tool above and beyond how a strictly feminist—based on a strict bi-gender approach—is used. It allows for an even more inclusive approach to addressing issues of power and knowledge.

Moving Beyond the Feminist Critique

In Thomas Dowson's 2000 article, "Why queer archaeology: An introduction", he outlines why queer theory is an effective standpoint for archaeologists to use when interpreting the past. He argues the past is interpreted in a strictly heterosexual manner that subsequently excludes several other ways of being. Notions of the family are never challenged and the Western and heterosexual ideas of family have

been transposed as being not only the normative way of today, but in the past as well. As noted earlier bringing ones own social, historical and political mores and biases into the realm of research is something that is largely indisputable in the current academic literature. What queer theory provides, which no other theoretical perspective has achieved to this point, is an even more holistic method of critiquing not only lived experiences in the past but current and historical institutions of power and knowledge production.

Dealing with issues of *normativity* has had a long-standing and entrenched position within archaeological thinking. Although the progressive postprocessual trends have introduced a much-needed critical and self-reflective approach to archaeology, they have largely kept their theory and analysis snug within the bounds of the normative. Dowson argues that a new kind of archaeology is thus required. This will not be an easy task, and will force us not only to learn how to better reconstruct the past, but it will teach us new ways of approaching the past altogether. This mandate will not go uncontested and Dowson argues that even the most liberal archaeologists have had a hard time actively supporting a queer inquiry of the past. Although postprocessualism has brought some integral and necessary reflexivity to how archaeologists can interpret the past, we cannot stop there. The discipline of archaeology must continue to push the bar higher and rise to the theoretical and methodological challenge of a more inclusive way of thinking about and researching our human past (Dowson 2000).

Dowson continues his argument for more archaeological engagement with queer theory by suggesting, "queer theory actively and explicitly challenges the heteronormativity of scientific practice" (Dowson 2000:163). This remark brings us back to my argument that instead of a feminist science, we must adopt a *queer*

science and thus a queer archaeology. Not only has the scientific institution been constructed through an androcentric lens, it has also been built on a hetero-androcentric notion. So where a feminist critique brings up essential questions of gender bias in scientific writing, discourse, and practice, a queer perspective takes this one step further by addressing the heteronormative framework from which science is created. By adopting a queer standpoint, archaeologists and critical thinkers are opening up space for an even more inclusive and critical analysis. This includes discussions concerning contemporary institutions that claim to produce *truthful* and *normal* ways of knowing and being. It will allow the active engagement of queer theory as a way of continuing to improve work carried out as interpreters of the past. This will not only improve archaeological theory and method but will strengthen our commitment to addressing the very foundation of Western *scientific* knowledge itself.

References Cited

Binford, Lewis.
    2001 "Where Do Research Questions Come From?" American Antiquity 66(4):669-678.
Conkey, M and Joan Gero.
    1997 "Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology." Annual Review of Anthropology 26:411-37.
Dowson, T.
    2000 "Why Queer Archaeology-An Introduction." World Archaeology 32(2):161-165.
Gero, Joan M.
    1983 The Socio-Politics of Archaeology. David, M. Lacy and Michael L. Blakey (eds). Amherst: Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts.
    1985 "Socio-Politics and the Women-At-Home Ideology." American Antiquity (50)2:342-350.
Gero, Joan M. and Margaret Conkey
    1991 Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goldman, Ruth.
    1996 "Who is That *Queer* Queer? Exploring Norms around Sexuality, Race, and Class in Queer Theory". In Queer Studies: A Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Anthology. Brett Beemyn and Mickey Eliason, eds. New York University Press: New York. Pp.169-183.
Hurcombe, Linda.
    1997 "A viable past in the pictorial present: Invisible People and Processes". In Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott eds. Leicester University Press: London and New York. Pp.15-25.
Johnson, J.
    1999 Archaeological Theory: An Introduction. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
Lesick, Kurtis.
    1997 "Re-engendering gender: some theoretical and methodological concerns on a burgeoning archaeological pursuit". In Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott eds. Leicester University Press: London and New York. Pp.31-41.
Little, Barbara J.
    1994 "Consider the Hermaphroditic Mind: Comment on "The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender." American Antiquity 59(3):539-544.
Lucy, S.J.
    1997 "Sex and gender in Anglo-Saxon burials". In Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott eds. Leicester University Press: London and New York. Pp.150-168.
Martin, Emily.
    1991 "The egg and the sperm: How science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles" Signs. 16(3):485-501.
Scott, Eleanor.
    1997 "Introduction: On the incompleteness of archaeological narratives". In Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott eds. Leicester University Press: London

and New York. Pp.1-12.

Trigger, Bruce G.

1991 "Archaeology and Epistemology: Dialoguing across the Darwinian Chasm." American Journal of Archaeology. 10:21-34.

Wylie, Alison.

1985 "Reaction Against Analogy." Advances in archaeological method and theory 8:63-111.

1992 "The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender." American Antiquity 57(1):15-35.

1997 "The Engendering of Archaeology: Refiguring Feminist Science Studies."The History of Science Society 12:80-99.

Sangeeta Parmar

Pharmaceutical Companies:
Attempting to Change Ethnomedicine by Supplanting Doctors

Abstract

Pharmaceutical companies are an important resource in medicine. However the relationships cultivated by these companies, with physicians and patients, have negative consequences on the delivery of adequate medical care. This paper draws attention to some of the potential problems and tactics used by pharmaceutical companies to form relationships with physicians and patients. Furthermore it makes suggestions on how to buffer negative interference by pharmaceutical companies. This article aims to raise awareness of the need to protect our ethnomedicine.

Bibliographical Statement

Sangeeta Parmar is an undergraduate student at the University of Victoria, pursuing a double major in Biology and Anthropology. In addition to these fields, she has a special interest in Medicine. Her personal health and health care experiences had allowed her to look critically at medicine and the need for refining and protecting our ethnomedicine. She hopes that in the future, medicine will become more people-orientated than profit motivated.

Pharmaceutical companies in North America are increasingly promoting drug solutions for the treatment of health problems. These companies influence both patients and doctors through various tactics that often disguise their profit motive from the public eye. The negative consequences of their interference in the delivery of adequate medical care can, in part, be prevented by drawing attention to the relationship these companies foster with physicians through gift giving, paying large wages, and continuing education, and with patients through direct to consumer advertising. Within the field of Medical Anthropology some are attempting to draw attention to these problematic relationships and to suggest solutions. Recommendations have included increasing doctors' awareness about their relationship with pharmaceutical companies, strengthening the doctor-patient relation-

ship, and increasing the accountability of companies for unethical behavior.

Each society has its own beliefs about sickness, which include ideas about how we stay healthy, how we contract certain illnesses, and what we need to do to get better. These beliefs and ideas, which determine when and why we seek medical help and from whom, comprise our ethnomedicine, or culture of medicine (Quinlan 2004). Pharmaceutical companies are attempting to transform ethnomedicine into a profit-focused industry by targeting doctors and patients. These companies are undermining the authority of doctors by using their credibility as script writers and loyal healers to promote their products to patients. In addition, pharmaceutical companies are also targeting patients through direct to consumer advertising. Through these tactics, pharmaceutical companies are increasingly gaining power over treatment options, altering the relationship between physicians and patients and ultimately changing the beliefs and ideas comprising our ethnomedicine.

The pharmaceutical industry's aim of improving profits is leading to various social consequences, including increased drug prices, and the misuse, or overuse, of medications in ways that have potentially adverse affects on patients (Blumenthal 2004).

In 2002, the industry spent approximately 12-15 billion dollars on marketing to doctors in the United States alone (Blumenthal 2004). Some of the tactics used by the pharmaceutical companies include dispensing of gifts, ghostwriting of articles for academic physicians, payments of large consulting fees and the funding of lavish trips and entertainment for those who support the industry's products (Blumenthal 2004). In addition, companies compete to target medical residents in order to build loyalty with future doctors and to create prescribing practices that are difficult to change until a company invests heavily in the development and marketing of a newer product (Oldani 2004). Furthermore, influential faculty members are continuously targeted either to gain their support for particular products or to neutralize their opinions if they are opposed to the products (Oldani 2004).

Drug companies pay large sums to entice reputable physicians to publish research about their drugs without disclosing any conflicts of interest. For example, a Brown University professor of psychiatry published research supporting the products of a pharmaceutical company, from which he earned $556,000 of his $842,000 yearly income, without disclosing information about his relationship with the company (Oldani 2004). In addition, drug company representatives, trained in sales strategies, not only provide medical residents with free meals, promotional items, school supplies, and travel expenses to attend meetings, but are also allowed to teach residents (Blumenthal 2004). It has been shown that medical schools with strict policies restricting student contact with drug representatives during physician training produce residents who are more critical of the information they receive from representatives (Detsky et al. 2001).

Currently, a common way pharmaceutical companies interact with physicians is through continuing medical education. It is estimated that pharmaceutical companies provide about $900 million of the one billion spent annually on continuing medical education in the United States (Blumenthal 2004). Some physicians, including Marcia Angell, former editor-in-chief of *The New England Journal of Medicine*, are sceptical of the educational value of the information provided by pharmaceutical companies (Lexchin 2001). In Angell's words, "to rely on the drug companies for unbiased evaluations of their products makes about as much sense as relying on beer companies to teach us about alcoholism" (Lexchin 2001). Furthermore, companies continue to target not only individual physicians, but also the whole

organization, by providing financial support to the American Medical Association (Blumenthal 2004). One of the ways to increase awareness of the potential problems that may be caused by pharmaceutical companies is to educate and correct misconceptions that doctors and the medical association may have about their interactions with pharmaceutical companies. A substantial amount of theoretical and empirical literature, including the documented concerns of physicians about their colleagues, suggests that many physicians may be mistaken in believing that their interactions with drug companies have only educational and patient improvement value (Blumenthal 2004). According to Studdert et al. (2004:1898) "when a gift or gesture of any size is bestowed, it imposes on the recipient a sense of indebtedness. The obligation to directly reciprocate, whether or not the recipient is conscious of it, tends to influence behavior." Furthermore, research conducted within the social sciences indicates that humans are prone to a self serving bias (Blumenthal 2004). Therefore, it would be surprising if most doctors were not influenced by the tactics employed by pharmaceutical companies, regardless of their training. In a study done by Wazana (2000), physicians who interacted with drug companies were more likely to request the inclusion of drugs from the pharmaceutical companies they interacted with on hospital or health maintenance organization formularies, and more likely to prescribe these products versus generic brands.

Not only are doctors influenced by pharmaceutical companies through gift giving and the provision of continuing education, but they are also being undermined by direct-to-consumer advertising, which shifts power away from doctors as patients go into clinics requesting specific drugs. Patient demand creates a further incentive for increased interaction between doctors and pharma-ceutical companies as doctors must obtain relevant products. In addition, patients, like doctors, must research products through the resources provided by pharmaceutical companies (Oldani 2004).

The work of anthropologists has added significant insight into the problem of pharmaceutical companies manipulating the interests and intentions of both the medical profession and consumers through coercive sales strategies such as playing on the positive association between taking pills and happiness. For example, Michael Oldani (2004) has drawn attention to the feedback loop that exists between doctors, patients, and the pharmaceutical companies aiming to increase industry profits through drug demand and dependency. The marketing of drugs, directly to patients, raises the question of whether drug companies are not only manufacturing drugs but also manufacturing sicknesses (Vancouver Sun 2004). For example, in an article in the Vancouver Sun one pharmaceutical company's list of symptoms for Social Anxiety Disorder includes, "butterflies in the stomach" when at a staff party, giving a speech or meeting strangers (Vancouver Sun 2004:c9). These common symptoms could be attributed to nervousness rather than a condition needing treatment, yet pharmaceutical companies encourage consumers to see their doctors and request specific drug solutions for their supposed problems. Over half of the requests made by patients for specific drugs are inappropriate for the treatment of their complaints (Donelan et al. 2003). However, as more patients are encouraged to self diagnose and to make drug requests, many believe that specific drugs are the best cure and will doctor shop seeking the desired prescription, thereby decreasing the probability of developing a trusting relationship with one doctor. Further, patient satisfaction is regularly used as a benchmark for quality of care. Therefore, some physicians may acquiesce to such requests, provided the patient does not suffer any harmful effects (Donelan et al. 2003).

However, this changes the dynamic of the doctor patient relationship because the doctor is consulted for script writing services rather than for his or her opinion about treatment options.

Doctors often perceive the specific drug demands of patients as challenges to their authority and expertise, and the time required to thoroughly discuss the patient's request is often considered inefficiently used and better spent discussing valid treatment options, including suitable drug possibilities. To minimize the negative effects of direct-to-consumer advertising, physicians must invest time to strengthen their relationships with patients. Doctors could encourage their patients to critically think about drug advertising while researching their patients concerns and discussing all treatment options. This relationship would increase patient confidence and trust in the medical advice provided and would create a mutually respectful relationship, ultimately buffering the effects of outside influences, such as pharmaceutical companies, targeting this relationship.

Currently there are minimal guidelines setting boundaries for the behaviour of pharmaceutical companies. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) was designed to help enforce safeguards but has fallen short in many respects. Further development of the authority of the FDA and enforcement of stricter guidelines would help minimize and limit the negative effects of pharmaceutical companies. Fraud and abuse by pharmaceutical companies did lead the United States federal government to implement legislation designed to allow federal prosecutors to investigate the extent of illegal activity on the part of pharmaceutical companies, chemical industries, laboratories, and various urologists (Studdert et al. 2004). The application of this legislation led to the pharmaceutical industry setting marketing guidelines for itself in 2002 (Studdert et al. 2004). Although the legislation is a strong deterrent, the degree of adherence to and self–enforcement of the imposed guidelines is questionable. Furthermore, as studies are being conducted which analyze the various tactics used by pharmaceutical companies, guidelines set by the industry for itself are becoming increasingly controversial. For instance, gift giving continues despite evidence that even small gifts create a sense of indebtedness leading to inappropriate prescribing behaviour (Studdert et al. 2004). Pharmaceutical companies circumvent the guidelines set out for regulating their interactions with physicians and for marketing their products through developing relationships with and influencing the FDA, congress, and those selected as neutral intermediaries. This is best exemplified by the lack of investigation on part of the FDA before the approval of Rofecoxib, also known as Vioxx (Topol 2004). Without adequate trials or evidence supporting the benefits or indicating the side effects, the drug was used by 80 million people with sales topping two and a half billion before its withdrawal on September 30, 2004 due to various negative and potentially fatal side effects arising from its use (Topol 2004). This situation brings into question the FDA's role in public health, since it has only been given the authority to act in requesting reviews and trials by the companies prior to drug marketing. The FDA has not been held accountable for their role in approving Vioxx for use. If the FDA is held responsible, perhaps a similar catastrophe could be averted. There are also increasing numbers of lobbyists targeting members of congress, which is leading to the lack of scrutiny on drug circulation. Further development and enforcement of legislation and guidelines, perhaps through the FDA demanding appropriate behaviour of pharmaceutical companies, would be a giant stride in deterring pharmaceutical companies from marketing unsafe products. Furthermore, by limiting the role pharmaceutical companies have in suggest-

ing treatment options their negative influence on the delivery of health care would be decreased. It is an indisputable fact that pharmaceutical companies are important in research and drug development; however, it is also essential to control and manage their interactions and influences. Through their marketing tactics, pharmaceutical companies are altering our ethnomedicine by influencing our perceptions of how to stay healthy, how to prevent illnesses, how to get better, and when, why, and from whom we seek medical advice. Pharmaceutical companies target doctors through gift giving, paying large wages, and continuing education in the hopes of gaining the doctor's confidence in their products. They indirectly influence doctors by gaining the confidence of consumers who, demanding specific drugs, ultimately question the authority of the doctor by relying on the information provided by the pharmaceutical companies. By targeting consumers, pharmaceutical companies also weaken the relationship between physicians and their patients which, in turn, increases the impact of negative external influences on treatment choices.

Conclusion

By creating awareness about the tactics pharmaceutical companies use to achieve their goal of increasing profits, it is possible to limit their influence on physicians who would then be more vigilant about protecting themselves and their patients from exploitative relationships. A large step towards minimizing the influence of pharmaceutical companies on the doctor-patient relationship would be for doctors to sever all giftgiving ties (Oldani 2004). To quote David Blumenthal's article, the professional organization of medicine must reflect the values of the profession, "so too, in the end, must the interactions between drug companies and physicians" (Blumenthal 2004:1889).

References Cited

Blumenthal, David
  2004 "Doctors and Drug Companies." The New England Journal of Medicine 351(18):1885-1890.
Detsky, A., Brill-Edwards, P., McCormick, B. and Tomlinson, G.
  2001 "Effect of Restricting Contact Between Pharmaceutical Company Representatives and Internal Medicine Residents on Posttraining Attitudes and Behavior." Journal of American MedicineAssociation 286(16):1994-1999.
Donelan, K., Lee, K., Lo, B., Murray, E. and Pollack, L.
  2003 "Direct-to-Consumer Advertising: Physicians' Views of Its Effects on Quality of Care and the Doctor-Patient Relationship." The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice 16:513-524.
Lexchin, J
  2001 "Interactions Between Doctors and Pharmaceutical Sales Represpentatives." Editorial. Canadian Journal of Pharmacology 8(2).
Oldani, Michael
  2004 "Thick Prescriptions: Toward an Interpretation of Pharmaceutical Sales Practices." Medical Anthropology Quarterly 18(3):325-356.
Quinlan, Marsha
  2004 "From the Bush: The Front Line of Health Care in a Caribbean Village. Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology." George Spindler, Editor. Pp. 2-3.
Studdert, D., Michelle Mello, and Troyen Brennan
  2004 "Financial Conflicts of Interest in Physician' Relationships with the Pharmaceutical Industry - Self-Regulation in the Shadow of Federal Prosecution." The New England Journal of Medicine 351(18):1891-1900.
Topol, Eric
  2004 "Failing the Public Health-Rofecoxib, Merck, and the FDA." The New England Journal of Medicine 351(17):1707-1709.
Vancouver Sun, The
  2004 "Another Epidemic." Oct. 30:C9.
Wazana, Ashley
  2000 "Physicians and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Is a Gift Ever Just a Gift?" Journal of the American Medical Association 283(3):373-380.

Michelle Rogers

Twentieth Century Travels:
Tales of a Canadian *Judoka*

Abstract
In 1960, Doug Rogers, my father, travelled to Japan in search of an 'authentic' training experience in the martial art of judo. In this paper, a shortened version of the first chapter of my Master's thesis, I am interested in the act and the idea of travel: not only Rogers' experiences of travelling to Japan, but also how his experiences intersect with the evolution of travel practises in the West between the late 18th century and the middle of the 20th century, and the manner in which 'travel' has been reviewed and reported in anthropology.

During the middle part of the 20th century the exchange and reproduction of cultural forms and ideologies between Japan and North America intensified as a result of the Second World War (1939-1945) and the American Occupation of Japan (1945-1952). This increased 'culture contact' between Japan and North America nurtured an environment of mutual curiosity – inspiring dreams about an exotic 'other', and even en-couraging some to travel overseas.

As a young boy living in St. Catharines, Ontario, Doug Rogers (b. 1941), my father, became interested in Japan and the martial arts. Captivated by "all things Japanese," as he says, Rogers would actively seek out 'Japanese culture' in Canada, whether reading comic books which emphasised the mystical powers of 'super jujitsu', eating family dinners with

chopsticks or taking judo lessons at the local YMCA. His fascination with Japan and the sport of judo ultimately resulted in his travelling to Tokyo, Japan in 1960 in the romantic pursuit of 'Japanese culture' and an 'authentic' training experience. Rogers lived in Tokyo for a little over five years (1960 – 1965), where he was able to hone his abilities in judo, enabling him to succeed in the sport at both the national (Canadian heavyweight champion ['72, '67, '66, '65, '64]; '65 All Japan University Games – gold) and international level ('67 Pan American Games – gold and silver; '65 Pan American Games – gold; '64 Olympics – silver).

In this paper, a shortened version of the first chapter of my Master's thesis, I am interested in the act and the idea of travel: not only Rogers' experiences of travelling to Japan, but also how his experiences intersect with the evolution of travel practises in the West between the late 18th century and the middle of the 20th century, and the manner in which 'travel' has been reviewed and reported in anthropology. I found that Rogers' travel to Japan paralleled some of the ideals associated with 'romantic' travel undertaken by men, for the most part, during the latter half of the 19th century in Europe, which celebrated unconstrained impulse, individual expression, the creative spirit and the desire to experience 'exotic', local colour (Baranowski and Furlough 2001; Duncan and Gregory 1999; Withey 1997). As Rogers said to me, there was a certain amount of "wanting to get out on my own." He wanted to travel to a Japan that, from his vantage-point in Canada, appeared "mystical," "exotic," "special," "natural," and "superior."

In relation to the work being done in anthropology on travel and tourism, I found that my interest in Rogers' travel was not congruent with some of

the more prominent concerns in this field, such as the moral discourse on travel (related to travel between 'first' and 'third world' nations) (Butcher 2003; Lanfant 1995b; Strain 2003; Wilson 1993), and definitional concerns that attempt to determine who is a 'tourist' and who is a 'traveller' (Boorstein 1961; Cocker 1992; Cohen 2001; MacCanell 1976; Risse 1998). Rogers' travel experiences elide easy classification. To demonstrate this point I illustrate how his experiences are in some ways consistent with the image of the heroic, masculine adventurer-traveller, who attempts to escape the mundane everyday (Clark 1999; Featherstone 1995; Minh-ha 1994; Ravi 2003; Williams 1998;) – but how, at the same time, Rogers really did not prize 'the journey' above all attachment to person or place. The stories he tells, some of which are presented in this chapter, recall his everyday struggles of 'getting by' in Japan and highlight the intense bonds he formed with individuals while he was there. Overall, Rogers feels that his travelling to Japan (1960-1965) furnished him with a myriad of positive experiences and memories. I go on to review this against the fact thats a great deal of the theoretical work being done on travel in anthropology (which draws on refugee, migration and diasporic studies) frames human movement as an unnatural and tumultuous event (Carey 2003; Gungwu 1997; Masquelier 2003; Sarup 1996).

*   *   *

To begin this exploration of Rogers' travel experiences to Japan I will start with the term 'travel'. At the most basic level travel can be understood "as the movement between geographical locations and cultural experiences" (Ravi 2003:1); or simply, "movement from one place to another" (Robertson *et al*. 1994:2). These minimal descriptions, though, belie the fact that travel is a far more complex and unsettled matter, for travel depends upon one's reason to move; one's position of gender, race,

class, and ethnicity; and one's relations to place, power and identity (Roberson 2001). Under the umbrella of 'travel' such disparate experiences as a seaside vacation, a shopping trip to the mall, political exile, and immigration have been theorised and reported. At one end there is travel as movement between fixed locations with self-arranged departure and arrival points, and the intimation of an eventual return. Whereas the other end is marked by variations of migrancy, suggesting that neither departure nor arrival are immutable or certain, and the privilege of "domesticating the detour" is all but an impossibility (Chambers 1994:5). This being said, it is difficult to slot Rogers' travel to Japan at one point on the spectrum – one's experience of travel, particularly one's freedom, can shift markedly over the course of a trip – but, for the moment, Rogers' experience can readily be compared to Clifford's (1997) definition of travel. One that sees travel as a set of more or less voluntarist practices of leaving 'home' to go some 'other' place for the purpose of gain: material, spiritual, scientific. A process that involves obtaining knowledge and/or having an 'experience' – that is often exciting, edifying, pleasurable, estranging, and/ or broadening. This is a description that is built upon a classic understanding of travel that is predominantly Western-dominated, strongly male and middle or upper class.

Leisure travel prior to the late 18th and early 19th centuries in Europe was principally the prerogative of aristocrats and other wealthy elites. Privileged young men participated in the embodiment of leisure travel, the Grand Tour, which enhanced their cultural education, health and pleasure (Baranowski and Furlough 2001), and furnished them with a "socially acceptable form of escape" (Withey 1997:3). Rather than a necessary evil and the source of great suffering – a burden to be borne by pilgrims, merchants and explorers – travel came to be seen as an end in itself, a form of pure pleasure. Later on travel was no longer an exclusively aristocratic preserve. As the 19th century progressed it was increasingly construed as a quintessentially bourgeois experience that had its origins in the combined development of romanticism and industrialism. Romanticism effectively marked a severance with the sovereignty of Reason and, instead, glorified unconstrained impulse, individual expression and the creative spirit (Duncan and Gregory 1999). At the heart of 'romantic' travel lay a celebration of the wildness of nature, cultural difference and the desire to be submerged in local colour. Travel of this type was considered to be most effective if it was unhurried, unregimented and solitary. Even the very indeterminacy of wandering, which the ancient Odysseus found an ever-present burden, became the ultimate source of freedom the Romantics valued in travel (Leed 2001). Thus by the 19th century, travel's most characteristic figure was the young male "fleeing the dull repetitions and the stifling mundanity of the bourgeois" (Duncan and Gregory 1999: 6). Parallels can be drawn if Rogers' experiences are compared to the formal Grand tour-type excursion and later 'romantic' travel. There exists the voluntariness of Rogers' departure; the experienced indeterminacies of his movement; the pleasure of travel free from strict necessity; and, perhaps most importantly, the autonomy provided, which nurtured a sense of independence from one context or set of defining associations.

Rogers' voyage needs also to be considered against the backdrop of travel practices in North America during the early and middle parts of the 20th century. Within North America the initial wave of mass tourism took place during the 1920s and 1930s, as transportation costs dropped, tour companies expanded, leisure time increased, paid holidays became more common, car ownership expanded, and motel chains made lodging more affordable

(Shaw and Williams 1994). Baranowski and Furlough's examination of tourism and vacation policies at this time reveals an "emphasis on tourism and vacations as a means toward social and national harmony, as well as their potential to mitigate conflict and promote the 'democratisation of leisure' through expanded access to leisure practices connoting social prestige" (2001: 1889:16). The advantages of tourism and vacations were touted for workers' health, hygiene and, ultimately, productivity upon return to the workplace. The Second World War furthered this enthusiasm for moving outside one's home, as millions of North Americans had earlier left the boundaries of their community to assist in the War effort. After the War, popular magazines and newspapers filled their pages with helpful advice aimed at assisting uninitiated travellers, highlighting and debating the benefits of travel for both the individual and the family unit. With nation, commerce and sentiment intersecting, "Holidays had become almost a marker of citizenship, a right to pleasure" (Dubinsky 2001: 325). Ultimately this (illusion of) freedom supplied by the regime of commodified leisure was a precious thing during the early and middle part of the 20th century as the "shades of the modern prison-house [were] closing in, when the passports and queues and guided tours and social security number and customs regulations and currency controls [were] beginning gradually to constrict life" (Fussell 2001:106). But just like the paint-by-numbers kits that flourished during the rigid McCarthy era, one was expected to travel within the lines.

Rogers did not navigate entirely within the lines. The general furore and acceptability of travel during the 1950s played on his thoughts about going elsewhere, but his voyage to Japan marked a step outside the boundaries of the well-worn, pedestrian journeys to such places as the National parks or Niagara Falls. Rogers' conservative, religious parents were particularly concerned about and opposed to his declaration to go to Japan, for Japan was an alien territory to them, a place populated by a people that had been 'the enemy' in the not-so-distant past. Rogers' decision did not fall in line with the Canadian identity-reinforcing travel practices of the time. It was instead a choice steeped in the romantic desires of exploration, experience and 'other'. Furthermore, it is possible to glimpse in Rogers' travel a rejection of certain facets of modern life in Canada during the middle part of the 20th century. Rogers was not yet netted into the daily grind of employment by the time he left for Japan, but he was well aware of limitations and responsibilities afforded by such circumstances. His father was a United Church minister and, at one time, a chaplain onboard a Canada naval ship during the Second World War; thus Rogers was privy to the social, economic and political obligations that were part and parcel of Canadian church and military life. Dreaming of Japan – an 'exotic' land of 'authentic' traditions – offered Rogers an escape from the expectations of his parents and peers at school in Montreal. His parents expected him to pursue the routine, respectable and economically secure existence of either a doctor or lawyer. Yet he found organised student life at McGill University tedious and bland when compared to the excitement of training in the *dojo* and the allure of participating in the sport of judo, something that felt outside the rules and habits of his everyday life in Canada. He mentioned that his attendance at McGill during this time was "not what it should have been" because he was "trying to practise at *dojos* all over Montreal."

Over and over again in our conversations Rogers would use such adjectives as 'unique', 'traditional', 'special', 'pure', 'superior', 'mystical', and 'artistic' to describe the Japan that he imagined as a teenager living in Montreal. Compared to Canada, Japan was 'authentic'. This is

consistent with MacCanell's belief that "for moderns, reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler lifestyles" (1976:3). It also speaks to Chambers perspective that "to go elsewhere to find such 'authenticity'" perpetuates that drive "to return to the beginning, no longer our own, but that of the other who is now requested to carry the burden of representing our desire" (1994:71). The version of Japan that Rogers constructed for himself in Canada was a Japan that was 'natural' or 'traditional', that existed for its own sake – a Japan that lay in opposition to life in North America where almost everything appeared devised and structured for profit, and under market control (Strain 2003). The important point to note here is that the 'authenticity' Rogers assigned to Japan was not necessarily 'real', but created by Rogers based upon contingent circumstances and ideas. In truth, it was the Japanese who actively revised their own history, articulating and practising 'authentic' traditions for self-serving reasons – and not to quench the desire of Western travellers in search of the harmonious, simple life (Igarashi 2000; Lie 2001). Moreover, Japan could be described as 'modern' by the time Rogers arrived there in 1960 (Minear 1980). To analyse Rogers' experiences entirely in relation to the simplistic authentic-inauthentic couplet is theoretically unsound, but this fantasy image of Japan as 'the land of tradition' remained a consistent theme when Rogers spoke of his early reasons for travelling there.

Rogers pieced together an image and understanding of Japan and the sport of judo in Canada based on a variety of sources: comic books, movies, books about judo, advertisements, and participating in judo in Montreal – all of which played upon his imagination and fuelled his desire to travel to 'exotic' Japan. It should also be noted that these sources often did not come directly from Japan, but were mediated through non-Japanese individuals who had (some) knowledge of Japan and its customs, and in turn packaged this information in one form or another for consumption outside of Japan.

DR: When I was in Victoria – I think I was there when I was four-and-a-half, sometime after that – I used to read comic books, and on the backs of these comic books there would be advertisements, secret jujitsu or combat judo. Sometimes in the comic books themselves the characters would have knowledge of this mystical Asian fighting art. This really intrigued me, so at an early age I started thinking about the martial arts as something very spectacular, very mystical, and it was something that the Japanese had knowledge of. I think even then I was determined to seek out and learn as much as I could about it…I used to go to the library, whether it was the city public library or the school library, and search for as many books as I could on Japan and the martial arts. And then sometime in the early fifties there were a few publications starting to come out, which you could buy at the news stand. Some of them were specific to judo – some were written by the Japanese, some by Europeans, and some were the result of Caucasians who had come in contact [with the martial arts] because of the War. You just started to see this interest…Most of my information was second hand; I had no firsthand information…I remember one movie I saw before I went to Japan called *Sayonara* (1957) with Marlon Brando, and again there was just an idea that almost everything Japanese had to be good, and I guess it was because I got so caught up in judo, this system seemed so perfect. I was having such a good time competing and practising. I just knew I had to go to Japan.

From Rogers' commentary on his early interest in judo and Japan it is possible to glean the singular importance that the imagination plays in the lives of people in the 20th century. Writing elegantly on this point, Appadurai argues that there is a peculiar new force to the imagination in social life today.

More persons in more parts of the

world consider a wider set of "possible" lives than they ever did before. One important source of this change is the mass media, which present a rich, ever-changing store of possible lives, some of which enter the lived imaginations of ordinary people more successfully than others…That is, fantasy is now social practice; it enters, in a host of ways, into the fabrication of social lives for many people in many societies (1991:197-198).

*   *   *

Overall, my interest in Rogers' travel to Japan is a departure from some of the more popular concerns of anthropologists who study travel and tourism.

Up until the 1970s, anthropology largely ignored travel and tourism (Wilson 1993). The reason for the lacuna in the analytical development of travel was partly a function of leisure travel being considered a side issue to the more serious business of industrial production (Meethan 2001). Yet a few scholars were successful in establishing leisure travel as a topic worthy of serious investigation during the 1970s, demonstrating its social, economic and political significance in contemporary life. For the most part, though, the discussion of leisure travel has continued to circle around moral and definitional concerns.

Travel and tourism are frequently determined to be either 'bad' or 'good' (Butcher 2003). Travel is either a fatuous interaction between the privileged 'first world' and an objectified class of 'third world' others; or it is reviewed positively because tourists are confronted with a radically different culture that confounds and challenges their Western epistemologies (Strain 2003). In the first case the 'third world' performs a degraded form of their native culture for a moneyed audience, perpetuating economic dependence,

stunted industrial development and power relations smacking of colonialism. In this perspective the traveller is condemned as a harbinger of globalisation, sweeping away diversity in his or her wake (Butcher 2003). Alternatively, the second 'utopic' model argues that tourists' dollars provide an economic impetus for preserving indigenous traditions and staving off the encroachment of homogenising forces (Strain 2003).

It cannot be ignored that the tourism industry is often a transmission belt of post-industrial 'sending' societies and developing 'receiving' nations on the end (Kinnaird *et al*. 1994; Lanfant 1995a, 1995b; Wilson 1993), but this type of unequal exchange did not occur between Japan and Canada. These two nations have never been involved in an unequal, hierarchical tourism dynamic, as both countries have progressed industrially, militarily and technologically over the past century (Lie 2001; Minear 1980; Nitobe 1931). This makes a moral discussion based on the non-developed – developed binary, in this case, theoretically unsound.

Anthropologists interested in travel have been equally concerned with who is a 'tourist' and who is a 'traveller', and how their journeys differ. The preoccupation with this distinction has early roots. Tourists were thought to be more socially diverse than their elite predecessors on the Grand Tour, and were instead marked as part of the modern mob or crowd. European tourists stimulated class anxieties in the wake of the French Revolution about the mobility of the lower orders of society (Buzard 1993). The perceived inundation by tourists visiting continental capitals, viewing the Alps and touring the favoured destinations of the elite Grand Tour, prompted 'travellers' to assert their cultural superiority. Elite travellers proposed that they possessed an 'authentic' (as opposed to passively received) knowledge about these locations, and had an originality and self-sufficiency in judgement that tourists lacked (Baranowski and Furlough 2001). Leaning on this early distinction between

tourists and travellers, Boorstein argued that the traveller was working at something, but the tourist was a mere pleasure-seeker: "The traveler was active; he went strenuously in search of people, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him" (1961:85). For Boorstein, tourism was diluted, contrived and prefabricated, and it lay in opposition to the sophisticated pleasures sought by the well-prepared, intellectual man. Yet MacCanell (1976) later reasoned against Boorstein's strict dichotomy, finding that many tourists also actively demanded and searched for authenticity, just as many travellers do.

Consistent among most definitions of a 'traveller' appears to be an emphasis on the discomfort with the journey. Cocker writes that "travellers thrive on the alien, the unexpected, even the uncomfortable and challenging" (1992:2); and Fussell (1980) remarks that travel is to work and suffer. For etymologically a traveller is one who endures *travail*, a word that is derived from the Latin word *trepalium* – a torture instrument consisting of three stakes designed to rack the body (Robertson *et al*. 1994). According to Risse (1998), differentiating between travellers and tourists on the basis of physical toughness is one of the most popular means to solidify the boundary between the two groups; however, she suggests that there are four other ways: how much a person knows about a country visited, how much money the person has, where the person is travelling, and when the person is travelling. Risse wanders into the definitional thicket when she declares that "travellers make all the logistical decisions about their trip; tourists don't. A traveller, thus, is the active creator of the journey…Tourists, as I use the term without negative implications, follow someone else's agenda" (1998: 48). Cohen (2001) expands the tourist-trav-

eller division, offering instead what he describes as the five main modes of touristic experiences: recreational, diversionary, experiential, experimental, and existential. They are ranked so that they span the spectrum between the experience of the "tourist as the traveller in pursuit of 'mere' pleasure in the strange and the novel, to that of the modern pilgrim in quest of meaning at somebody else's centre" (Cohen 2001:34).

Pulling away from these directions in the study of travel and tourism, I do not want to examine Rogers' narrative in an effort to determine whether his travel experiences were 'right' or 'wrong' or to conclude whether he was a 'traveller' or a 'tourist'. Personal histories of travel offer a chance to explore the specific factors that motivate people to go abroad and their experiences once they arrive in a foreign place. What is of interest to me in Rogers' story was his desire to travel to Japan, that was based on his construction of Japanese culture in Canada, and the unique experiences that he had in Japan that were contingent upon his decision to stay and train in this country between 1960 and 1965. To work towards tidily determining whether Rogers was a tourist or a traveller would ignore the complicated reality of his experiences and how they elide easy classification. To demonstrate this point, I outline in the next section how Rogers' travel experiences were, in many ways, heavily steeped in a romantic, masculine travel rhetoric. But how, at the same time, his travels defy such a simple reading. He was not the steady, observing adventurer; oftentimes he was uncertain and lonely, especially during the first year he was there.

It could be argued that Rogers' travel to Japan was an escape from the quotidian, mundane routine of everyday life in Canada. It could also be said that his journey was a quest for greatness in the area of judo, signalling a dash of the 'heroic'.

DR**: I had not done judo all across Canada before I left, just in Montreal, and I had gone up**

to Toronto a few times…and I had won a few championships locally against some reasonably good fellows. I was determined to go to Japan to outstrip them all, to learn judo. It wasn't to go to the Olympics, it was to become really, really good at judo. Otherwise I could have gone anywhere, I suppose. I suppose I wanted to leave home too. There was a certain bit of that, wanting to get out on my own.

As Rogers sailed away from Canada he was leaving behind the comforting, cosy environment of home. In the mid-20th century, middle and upper class Canada, 'home' represented civility and the social contract, not to mention compromise: home, for most, was associated with monogamy, propriety, respectability, 'the law', organised religion, and cleanliness. Alternatively, the open road and the sea "all bespeak something 'strange', perhaps 'wonderful', not 'settled'; liberty, movement, sometimes even lawlessness, in the wilderness wild" (Williams 1998: xxi-xxii). The inclination to travel can be strong, for there is the pull of the unknown and the push to extricate one's self from the well-trodden paths of domestic life. Despite the physical and existential difficulties travel often entails, it deeply satisfies the desire for detours and displacements in our new global circumstances (Minh-ha 1994). The dialect of travel – "the affirmative sense of groundlessness and the negative pleasure of displacement" (Ravi 2003: 2) – emerges as a desired space to inhabit. And the 'time out' of travelling works to delay the otherwise irrevocable passage of time; one can escape the present and choose to bask in the unhurried and traditional pleasures of the 'other'.

There can even be an oedipal resonance to 'the journey'. The moment of departure represents the son's refusal to stay within the household and so he defies paternal authority by embarking on a rite of passage from adolescence to adulthood. "Travel might thus be seen, in highly abstract terns, as a refutation of the father, and a denial of intimacy with the mother" (Clark 1999: 19). Lévi-Strauss (1964) suggests that Western adolescents feel compelled to get clear, by one means or another, of civilisation: some climb mountains, some go far below the ground and others escape horizontally to penetrate some foreign land. This outer journey of physical and spatial mobility can function as a metaphor for the interior journey of the soul, mind or consciousness that is said to mark the maturation process of the adolescent. Freud, speaking of his own desire to travel, writes:

> My longing to travel was no doubt also the expression of a wish to escape from that pressure, like the force which drives so many adolescent children to run away from home. I had long seen clearly that a great part of the pleasure of travel lies in the fulfilment of their early wishes – that it is rooted, that is, in dissatisfaction with home and family. When first one catches sight of the sea, crosses the ocean and experiences as realities cities and lands which for so long had been distant, unattainable things of desire – one feels oneself like a hero who has performed deeds of improbable greatness, (1973:247).

Intimately connected to this masculine, adolescent adventuring is the idea of the 'heroic life'. To talk of the 'heroic life' is to risk sounding dated, as scholarship in the post-colonial era has long sustained strong counter-cultural traditions favouring an anti-heroic ethos. Recent scholarship leans more towards a valuation of the popular and the detritus of everyday mass and consumer cultures, than the idiosyncratic and the exceptional. Yet strands of the 'heroic' appear to be woven through Rogers' story. If everyday life is principally aligned with the taken for granted, com-

mon sense pursuits of wealth, property and earthly love, then the heroic life points to the opposite qualities: extraordinary deeds, virtuosity, courage, endurance, and the capacity to attain distinction. The heroic life points to a life "fashioned by fate or will, in which the everyday is viewed as something to be tamed, resisted or denied, something to be subjugated in the pursuit of a higher purpose" (Featherstone 1995:55). Nietzsche went so far as to label as 'genius' the qualities of energy, endurance, seriousness, and single-mindedness with which the individual may approach the project of living a fulfilled, authentic life; where one thinks and acts in a particular direction, using everything he or she experiences to that end. In this way, we can see how Rogers turned away from ordinary life in Canada in his singular effort to pursue excellence in the sport of judo, which ultimately led to success at the international level, affording him a degree of fame both in Japan and Canada.

If Rogers' experiences are read as a compact overture they could be viewed as an unfolding of the poetic travel narrative: the departure, the crossover, the wandering, the discovery, the return, and the transformation (Minh-ha 1994). In this tale, Rogers departs from the everyday sphere of care and maintenance, only to return the hero of his chosen quest – but such a closed reading as this would be incomplete and simply incorrect. If the heroic traveller's space is marked by a reduction of everything and everyone to raw material – "an existence of temporary pickups and friendships, of people dropped as soon as met, of indifferent, deep egoism of moving for moving's sake" (Raban 1986:183) – then these are circumstances that *cannot* be found in Rogers' story. I would not characterise Rogers as the categorising onlooker who subordinates all interests in others to a kind of primal narcissism: a fellow that

prizes 'the journey' above all other human attachments (Clark 1999). If his original reasons for travelling to Japan are glazed with the romantic, his *actual* stay in Japan is marked by an acute sense of the day-to-day logistics of getting by and stories that involve the friends he made during his stay there. During our stay in Tokyo, Rogers recalled his first days in Tokyo, forty-three years earlier, as we stood in front of the Kodokan, the official judo-training hall. This memory emphasises that he was anything but a swaggering adventurer.

DR**: After I arrived at the Kodokan, my second day here, I was feeling a little bit lost. I didn't know where to go. All the surroundings were strange, etc. I started out really timidly by just going out across the street from the Kodokan to the coffee shops…For a couple of weeks I would be in there every day. They took pity on me and a couple of the girls would come over and sit down and try to cheer me up. Later on one of the girls and her boyfriend took me to see a baseball game…They knew I had just come over and I was only nineteen.**

Admissions such as this suggest that instead of searching out the obvious moments of arrogance and self-assured chauvinism in travel stories, post-colonial critiques might also address points of unravelling, conflict and uncertainty in the travelling subject (Musgrove 1999). Here we see Rogers in his first days in Tokyo rather lonely and even searching for some type of stabilising routine through his repeat visits to the coffee shops. Travel can also have its oddly passive aspects; it can be boring at times, requiring tolerance or repetition, as much as the ability to surmount enormous ordeals. Life elsewhere can be much like life at home, filled in with "insipid details" and "incidents of no significance" (Lévi-Strauss 1964:17). Most trials are of the minor variety and one slowly becomes accustomed to a slightly different rhythm of life. Looking at a photograph of a futon in one his apartments, Rogers was reminded of the familiar presence of cockroaches in Japan.

Fig.1

DR: This little picture here, it brings back memories. That's my futon on the floor. I had a little apartment that was four-and-a-half, five *tatamis* [Japanese mats] and I had a little gas burner in the corner for cooking, a Bunsen burner. And I shared this with a lot of cockroaches. You can't find an apartment without them. Even some of the best hotels, if you look hard enough (actually, you don't have to look very hard) you can find the odd cockroach. We'd often find, sometimes, a little bit of a leg in our soup in some places, some places more than others, but we'd always consider it a little bit of extra protein. It's a funny thing, once you're living in Japan – I think this goes for any country – you kind of get used to the standard and no big deal.

For the most part, when Rogers reflects upon his time in Japan, he tends to relate stories about the relationships he formed while living in Tokyo and how much he enjoyed his time there. It is apparent that his time in Japan was not composed of a series of fleeting accidental encounters, in which the journeying ego removes all alternate ties. Japan was a place where he came of age, developed important and lasting bonds with other individuals, and intensely practised the sport he loved. Even his attachments to his routines in Japan and his friends there made his transition back to life in Canada all the more difficult. He was reminded of the difficulties of leaving Japan when he saw a photograph of himself at the airport about to leave Japan.

Fig.2

DR: When I left Japan to come back to Canada the judo team came to the airport to see me off. I had to give a little speech in Japanese. I think they gave me a big bottle of sake to take home with me. I was supposed to go back to Japan. I couldn't do it.

MR: How come?

DR: I was torn. It was very difficult. I had some opportunities [in Japan]. They weren't really in areas that I thought of myself doing long term. In the back of my mind I perhaps had the idea that I would like to get into flying and I realised if I didn't get back and start at that I would have a difficult time getting employment. As tough as it was, I made that choice. They phoned me a lot and wrote me, waited for me to come back. They were still looking at me as one of their big guns.

Rogers also spoke about the importance of his relationships in Japan and how leaving Japan effected him while we were relaxing at an inn in Morioka, Japan after we had spent the day visiting the *dojo* at Fuji University.

MR: It was interesting when you said you grew up in Japan to that fellow.

DR: Oh yeah; well, it's true. I came at nineteen

and, of course, I had always moved around in Canada. I had never lived in a place for more than six or seven years because of my Dad's – your grandpa's – work. We kept moving so it was difficult to get life-long friends. I was nineteen when I came to Japan, so I made a lot of friends while I was here and they were very formative years for me, so when I went back to Canada, off to Vancouver where I had never lived before, it was difficult. I met people in Vancouver through judo, but all my real friends for the last five years were Japanese, even those that weren't Japanese, were living in Japan. I really felt out of place for quite a while, and then I missed the activity of judo because I was used to doing a very high level of judo and everything was geared towards that. Practices weren't challenging and I missed the high level of physical activity. To have to back off from that kind of physical conditioning was kind of traumatic for me. It was hard to handle at times. I started teaching eventually, but it wasn't the same. Where you're aware that you're losing your edge, it's kind of difficult. At a time when I could have been getting stronger, that was difficult. I was always looking back to Japan, and there I was at twenty-five or twenty-six thinking of the 'good old days'. But anyway, that worked its way out…It was such a big part of my life, plus it was a lot of fun too. Training was good. Training was hard, very enjoyable. It was its own reward, training and the fellas that I was with. Just to leave that cold turkey was difficult.

There exists a human tendency to review the past through a rose-tinted lens, but I think it is accurate to say that Rogers felt that his stay in Japan was a positive experience for him. But he did have difficulties when he was there. The first year Rogers was in Japan was not easy. He was injured for most of that year and he had to sell his return boat ticket back to Canada in order to have enough money to buy food and pay rent. Overall, living in Japan was not effortless for Rogers: he was lonely at first, learning a new language, becoming acquainted with a different way of life, struggling with injuries, trying to establish new social relationships, and at-

tempting to find ways to make money so he could eat and put a roof over his head. Yet the majority of the time when he concludes a story about his time in Japan, he references how his stay was such a positive experience for him: "We had a lot of good times together, that's for sure"; "Good times, really good times"; "I had a good time; it was really interesting"; "A great experience"; "A lot of fun"; "Judo was such a big part of my life, plus it was a lot of fun too"; "It was a great time. I really enjoyed the county." He was able to travel to Japan and enjoy the pure freedom of choice, and was made to feel welcomed by the majority of the people he met while he stayed there. The idea that he perceived his time in Japan to be, for the most part, a positive experience, can be reviewed against the fact that a great deal of the work on human movement in anthropology frames mobility as a tumultuous and painful event.

*   *   *

After reviewing the current literature on travel and human movement in anthropology – outside the self-described 'smaller circles' of tourism and leisure studies in anthropology (Kinnarid *et al.* 1994; Lanfant 1995a; Meethan 2001; Wilson 1993) – I was struck by the degree to which the theoretical work on mobility is analysed and presented in principally negative terms. A situation that led Featherstone to remark, "it is difficult to encounter positive images of mobility and migration, although they doubtless exist" (1997:258). There is a great deal of excellent ethnographic work on mobility, most of which focuses on migration (Coutin 2003; Guarnizo 1997; Gungwu 1997; Kearney 1986), and refugee (Kismaric 1989; Malkki 1995, 1992; Pellizzi 1988) and diasporic experiences (Foner 2001; Stoller 2002; Sullivan 2001). These studies bring to our attention the harrowing experiences of those who are often stunned and traumatised by events that propelled or forced them from their place of residence. I would argue, though,

that this type of work has had an impact on the theoretical developments in study of human movement in anthropology. It has influenced anthropologists' conception of travel, reinforcing the belief that travel is a generally unnatural and disorienting event (Barber 1997). To talk of human movement is to talk of the "crippling sorrow of homelessness" (Minh-ha 1994:12); the "agonies of isolation, loneliness, and alienation that most migrants [share]" (Gungwu 1997: 6); "the road as a part of a complex economy of violence, power and blood" (Masquelier 2002:829); and to believe that the new arrival feels him- or herself a 'burden', a 'disturbance' and an 'embarrassment'. Narratives of home and displacement reflect a "global drama of violence and misery" (Robertson *et al*. 1994:2); "where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds" (Anzaldúa 2001:235). It has even been suggested that the deviant has been replaced by the immigrant: "In traditional folklore, there were demons, witches, devils. Now we have visible deviants: the foreigners" (Sarup 1996: 12). This is a climate that has lead Said to remark upon the fact that the phenomenon of untimely massive wandering remains "strangely compelling to think about but *terrible* to experience" (1990: 237-8, *emphasis mine*). Even the leisure traveller on an extended trip suffers from a certain negative evaluation: estranged from her native soil the traveller is thought to lose her original sense of place and acquire other loyalties, subsequently putting her at odds with her 'home' society upon return (Carey 2003).

In pointing out many anthropologists' attachment to the most dramatic and upsetting modes of mobility, I do not mean to suggest that anthropologists and others should ignore this focus. To determine the negative effects of (often compulsory) relocation on individuals and groups – particularly those who are poorly educated, maintain lower-incomes and have strong attachments to their homes, land and livelihood – is deeply important work (Scudder 2001). What I am suggesting is that we aim to untangle the specifics of *all* types of movement experiences – travel, exploration, migration, tourism, refugeeism, pastoralism, nomadism, pilgrimage, trade, exile, war, and so on – in an effort to establish a theoretical base of greater nuance from which to grasp the motivations and effects of moving around in the world. For many, mobility is not a violent disturbance, but simply a contour of everyday life. For example, de Bruijn *et al.* argues that mobility in its ubiquity is fundamental to any understanding of African social life:

> Another crucial element of the present approach is how to move away from the interpretation of migration or mobility as a 'rupture' in society, as the result of a social system in disarray. Many forms of mobility are a part of life and making a livelihood. In some societies, not being mobile may be the anomaly…What we argue is that sedentary, i.e. remaining within set borders or cultural boundaries, might instead by perceived by some as an act of escaping from social obligations. Through travelling, connections are established, and continuity, experience and modernity negotiated, (2001:2).

Echoing this perspective, Rasmussen (1998), who works among the Kel Ewey Tuareg, a seminomadic society who predominate in the Air Mountains of north-eastern Niger, illustrates how home spaces are as important as travel spaces. She explains how these spaces cannot be rigidly separated, and understanding one requires an examination of the other. The central point being that travel should be viewed not solely through the recent modernist, transnational lens of current up-

heaval and crisis, but also the lens of long-standing local notions about travel, strangers and distance. While the work done by de Bruijin *et al*. (2001) and Rasmussen (1998) differs markedly from my own work on Rogers' travel experiences, these anthropologists do highlight the importance of understanding travel from the position of the local actor(s) and how travel can be a normal part of life.

Part of the reason for anthropologists' viewing mobility negatively stems from the fact that the movement of people and their cultural baggage disrupts earlier definitions of culture, nation, home, and identity. These are definitions that were founded on the presupposition of a radical difference between self and other, here and there, the West and the 'third world' (Lavie and Swedenburg 1996). Travel has since complicated anthropology's most prized concept, 'culture', in that the early 20th century image of this institution was highly localised, settled, holistic, and boundary-oriented (Appadurai 1990; Hannerz 1992). This image drew upon a nostalgic construction of a community-based preindustrial collective where there was minimal reference to the leakages of people and culture (Geertz 1995; Gungwu 1997). All elements of social and cultural life were thought to hang together, with groups possessing distinctive cultures that needed to be interpreted in their own terms (Gupta and Ferguson 1997a, 1997b). But individuals have undoubtedly been more mobile and cultures less attached to particular territories than static, categorising approaches would suggest. The recent technological explosion, largely in the domains of transportation and information, has encouraged "a new condition of neighborliness – even with those most distant" (Appadurai 1990: 2), which subjects older conceptions of culture and identity to strain and fatigue. This necessitates anthropologists having to be-

come increasingly sensitive to disunities, fragmentation, contestation, pluralism, and the processual nature of culture and social life (Wolf 1983).

Anthropologists have now, for the most part, accepted that it is an oversimplification and a misreading of history to assume that people have only ever had one home and one culture in a single location/ nation (Settles 2001). Yet they continue to fret over peoples' homelessness, their lack of attachment to particular territorial locations, and to worry about their getting lost in an increasingly face-paced and disorienting global space (Braudrillard 1989, 1983; Jameson 1984). It is true that this space can be lonely and even violent. bell hooks (1995) is correct to remind us that privileged travel is not an idea that can be easily evoked to talk about the Middle Passage, The Trail of Tears, the landing of Chinese immigrants, or the forced relocation of Japanese Americans; but this does not mean we should ignore the lives of the growing number of individuals, such as Rogers, who are able to be comfortably 'at home' in more than one location (or in transit itself!), practising a different or mixed cultural set. Having recognised this "multiplication of secondary residences" (Butor 2001: 79), the questions now become: how do people make themselves comfortable or 'at home' under such circumstances, and what, specifically, encourages individuals to live elsewhere? I believe part of the answer to the first question regarding 'comfort' connects to the idea that culture is primarily a thing of relationships rather than territory (Hannerz 1992). If one is *able to* (and *desires to*) engage in a particular constellation of social relations that meet and weave together at a particular locus, then one is able to minimise the negative feelings frequently associated with isolation and alienation (Massey 2001). Remember that most of Rogers' stories concern the friends he made while he was in Japan, and refer to his participation in activities (e.g. judo practice, teaching English and attending the Japanese University) that would

have encouraged his involvement in Japanese social life.

References Cited

Anzaldúa, Gloria
 2001 "The Homeland, Aztlán." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 232-243

Appadurai, Arjun
 1990 "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." Public Culture 2(2):1-24.
 1991 "Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology." In Richard Fox, ed. Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press. Pp. 191-210.

Baranowski, Shelley and Ellen Furlough
 2001 "Introduction." In Shelley Baranowski and Ellen Furlough, eds. Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. Pp. 1-31.

Barber, Pauline Gardiner
 1997 "Transnationalism and the Politics of 'Home' for Philippine Domestic Workers." Anthropologica 39(1/2):39-52.

Baudrillard, Jean
 1983 Simulations. New York: Semiotext(e).
 1989 Selected Writings. Cambridge: Polity.

Boorstein, Daniel J.
 1961 The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in American. New York: Harper and Row.

Butcher, Jim
 2003 The Moralisation of Tourism: Sun, Sand…And Saving the World? London: Routledge.

Butor, Michel
 2001 "Travel and Writing." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 69-87.

Buzard, James
 1993 The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800-1918. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Carey, Daniel
 2003 "Anthropology's Inheritance: Renaissance Travel, Romanticism and the Discourse of Identity." History and Anthropology 14(2): 107-126.

Chambers, Iain
 1994 Migrancy, Culture, Identity. London: Routledge.

Clark, Steve
 1999 "Introduction." In Steve Clark, ed. Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory and Transit. London: Zed Books. Pp. 1-28.

Clifford, James
 1997 Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cocker, Mark
 1992 Loneliness and Time: The Story of British Travel Writing. New York: Pantheon.

Cohen, Erik
 2001 "Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 29-55.

Coutin, Susan Bibler
 2003 "Cultural logics of belonging and movement: transnationalism, naturalization, and U.S. immigration politics." American Ethnologist 30(4): 508-526.

de Bruijn, Mirjam, Rijk van Dijk and Dick Foeken
 2001 "Mobile Africa: An introduction." In Mirjam de Bruijn, Rijk van Dijk and Dick Foeken, eds. Mobile Africa: Changing Patterns of Movement in Africa and beyond. Leiden: Brill. Pp. 1-7.

Dubinsky, Karen
 2001 "Everybody Likes Canadians: Canadians, Americans, and the Post-World War II Travel Boom." In Shelley Baranowski and Ellen Furlough, eds. Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. Pp. 320-347.

Duncan, James and Derek Gregory
 1999 "Introduction." In James Duncan and Derek Gregory, eds. Writes of Passage: reading and travel writing. London: Routledge. Pp. 1-13.

Featherstone, Mike
 1995 Undoing Culture: Globalization,

Postmodernism and Identity. London: Sage Publications.

1997 "Travel, Migration, and Images of Social Life." In Wang Gungwu, ed. Global History and Migrations. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 239-277.

Foner, Nancy
2001 Islands in the City: West Indian Migration to New York. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Freud, Sigmund
1973 [1936] The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, trans. and ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.

Fussell, Paul
1980 Abroad: British Literary Travelling between the Wars. New York: Oxford.

2001 "Travel Books as Literary Phenomena." In Susan L. Jackson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 105-116.

Geertz, Clifford
1995 After the Fact: two countries, four decades, one anthropologist. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo
1997 "The Emergence of a Transnational Social Formation and the Mirage of Return Migration among Dominican Transmigrants." Identities 4(2):281-322.

Gungwu, Wang
1997 "Migration History: Some Patterns Revisted." In Wang Gungwu, ed. Global History and Migrations. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 1-21.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson
1992 "Beyond 'culture': space, identity, and the politics of difference." Cultural Anthropology 7(1): 6-23.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson
1997a "Discipline and Practice: The 'Field' as Site, Method and Location in Anthropology." In Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 47-65.

1997b "Culture, Power, Place: Ethnog-

raphy at the End of an Era." In Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology. Durham: Duke University Press. Pp. 1-32

Hannerz, Ulf
1992 "The Global Ecumene." In Ulf Hannerz, ed. Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. 217-67.

hooks, bell
1995 Killing Rage: Ending Racism. London: Penguin. Igarashi, Yoshikuni
2000 Bodies of Memory: Narratives War in Postwar Japanese Culture, 1945-1970. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jameson, Fredric
1984 "Postmodernism and the consumer society." In Hal Foster, ed. Anti-aesthetic: essays on postmodern culture. Port Townsend: Bay Press. Pp. 111-125.

Kearney, Michael
1986 "From the Invisible Hand to Visible Feet: Anthropological Studies of Migration and Development." Annual Review of Anthropology 15:331-361.

Kinnaird, Vivian, Uma Kothari and Derek Hall
1994 "Tourism: Gender perspectives." In Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds. Tourism: A Gender Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Pp. 1-34.

Kismaric, Carole
1989 Forced Out: The Agony of the Refugee in Our Time. New York: Random House.

Lanfant, Marie-Francoise
1995a "Introduction." In Marie-Francoise Lanfant, John B. Allcock and Edward M. Bruner, eds. International Tourism: Identity and Change, eds. London: Sage. Pp. 1-23

1995b "International Tourism, Internationalization and the Challenge to Identity." In Marie-Francoise Lanfant, John B. Allcock and Edward M. Bruner, eds. International Tourism: Identity and Change. London: Sage. Pp. 24-43.

Lavie, Smadar and Ted Swedenburg
1996 "Between and Among the Boundaries of Culture: Bridging Text and Lived Experience in the Third Timespace." Cultural Studies 10(1):154-179.

Leed, Eric
2001 "The Ancients and the Moderns: From Suffering to Freedom." In Susan L.

Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 5-12.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude
1964 Tristes Tropiques: An anthropological study of primitive societies in Brazil. New York: Atheneum.

Li, Victor
2000 "What's in a Name? Questioning 'Globalization.'" Cultural Critique 45:1-39.

Lie, John
2001 Multiethnic Japan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MacCanell, Dean
1976. The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Schoken Books.

Malkki, Liisa
1992 "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees." Cultural Anthropology 7(1):24-44.
1995 Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Masquelier, Adeline
2002 "Road mythographies: space, mobility, and the historical imagination in postcolonial Niger." American Ethnologist 29(4): 829-858.

Massey, Doreen
2001 "A Global Sense of Place." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 167-177.

Meethan, Kevin
2001 Tourism in a Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption. New York: Palgrave.

Minear, Richard H.
1980 "Orientalism and the Study of Japan." Journal of Asian Studies 39(3):507-517.

Minh-ha, Trinh T.
1994 "Other than myself/my other self." In George Robertson, Melinda Mash, Lisa Tickner, Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, and Tim Putnam, eds. Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement. London: Routledge. Pp. 9-26.

Musgrove, Brian
1999 "Travel and Unsettlement: Freud on Vacation." In Steve Clark, ed. Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory and Transit. London: Zed Books. Pp. 31-44.

Nitobe, Inazo
1931 Western Influences in Modern Japan: A Series of Paper on Cultural Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pellizzi, Francesco
1988 "To Seek Refuge: Nation and Ethnicity in Exile." In Remo Guidieri, Francesco Pellizzi and Stanley J. Tambiah, eds. Ethnicities and Nations: Processes of Interethnic Relations in Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific. Austin: University of Texas Press. Pp. 154-171.

Raban, Jonathan
1986 Old Glory: An American Voyage. London: Picador.

Rasmussen, Susan J.
1998 "Within the Tent and at the Crossroads: Travel and Gender Identity among the Tuareg of Niger." Ethnos 26(2):153-182.

Ravi, Srilata
2003 "Travel and Text." Asian Journal of Social Science 31(1):1-4.

Risse, Marielle
1998 "White Knee Socks Versus Photojournalist Vests: Distinguishing between Travelers and Tourists." In Carol Traynor Williams, ed. Travel Culture: Essays on What Makes us Go. Westport: Praeger Publishers. Pp. 41-50.

Roberson, Susan L
2001 "Defining Travel: An Introduction." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp.xi-xxvi.

Robertson, George, Melinda Mash, Lisa Tickner, Jon Bird, Barry Curtis and Tim Putnam
1994 "As the world turns: introducton." In George Robertson, Melinda Mash, Lisa Tickner, Jon Bird, Barry Curtis and Tim Putnam, eds. Travellers' Tales: Narratives of home and displacement. London: Routledge. Pp. 1-6.

Said, Edward
1990 "Reflections on Exile." In Russell Ferguson, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha and Cornel West, eds. Out There, Marginalization and Contempo-

rary Cultures, Cambridge: The New Museum of Contemporary Art and MIT Press. Pp. 357-366.

Sarup, Madan
  1996 Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Scudder, Thayer
  2001 "The Relocation of Low-Income Rural Communities with Strong Ties to the Land." In Susan L. Roberson, ed. Defining Travel: Diverse Visions. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press. Pp. 217-221.

Settles, Barbara
  2001 "Being at Home in a Global Society: A Model for Families' Mobility and Immigration Decisions." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 32(4):627-645.

Shaw, Gareth and Allan M. Williams
  1994 Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective. Oxford: Blackwell.

Strain, Ellen
  2003 Public Places, Private Journeys: Ethnography, Entertainment, and the Tourist Gaze. London: Rutgers University Press.

Sullivan, Zohreh C.
  2001 Exiled Memories: Stories of Iranian Diaspora. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Williams, Carol Traynor
  1998 "Introduction." In Carol Traynor Williams, ed. Travel Culture: Essays on What Makes Us Go. Westport: Praeger Publishers. Pp. xi–xxiv.

Wilson, David
  1993 "Time and tides in the anthropology of tourism." In Michael Hitchcock, Victor T. King and Michael J. G. Parnwell, eds. Tourism in South-East Asia. London: Routledge. Pp. 32-47.

Withey, Lynn
  1997 Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel, 1750-1915. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Wolf, Eric
  1982 Europe and the People without History. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Filmography

Logan, Joshua
  1957 Sayonara. 147 mins. USA: Warner Brothers Production.

Jennifer M. Sankey

Fitting Indigenous Rights to Land & Resources into International Human Rights Law:
The Challenge of Advocating Within a State-centred System

Abstract

The author questions whether it is effective to advocate for indigenous rights to land and resources in international human rights arena, given the state-centered structure of international law. The author examines why indigenous peoples have historically been excluded from the international legal arena; why the structure of international law causes challenges for the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights; why rights to land and resources are necessary components of indigenous peoples' fundamental human rights; and in what ways indigenous rights to land and resources have been recognized in international human rights doctrine over the past several decades.

Biographical Statement

The author is a graduate student in the Faculty of Law at the University of Victoria. She is currently completing an LL.M. thesis that explores the possibility of advocating for indigenous rights within multilateral trade regimes.

The failure of state governments to recognize indigenous peoples'[1] rights to land and resources is a common problem for indigenous peoples throughout the world.[2] In most cases, even in states where governments have legislated recognition of indigenous rights, indigenous peoples have yet to realize these rights in any tangible way (United Nations Subcommission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights [UNSPPHR] 2001). The lack of state response to their demands has caused indigenous peoples to look beyond state borders to pursue their claims at the international level. Indeed, the international indigenous rights movement has gained significant momentum over the past several decades and the international human rights arena can now be seen as a point of convergence where in-

digenous peoples throughout the world are uniting to act in a concerted fashion to bring their perspectives to the international community (Corntassel and Primeau 1995:360).

Some scholars maintain that the international indigenous rights movement has created a distinct space for indigenous peoples in global human rights debates and is causing the emergence of an international legal framework that addresses human rights specific to indigenous peoples (Anaya 2004; Barsh 1994). Others argue, however, that little advancement has been made in terms of practical recognition of these rights and that additional, and/or alternative, avenues of advocacy need to be explored (Alfred and Corntassel 2004). Thus, one is led to question what, if any, progress has been made by indigenous peoples in the international human rights arena, and whether it is effective to pursue claims for rights to land and resources within its domain. This paper attempts to answer these questions by examining: 1) why indigenous peoples have historically been excluded from the international legal arena; 2) why the structure of international human rights law causes challenges for the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights; 3) why rights to land and resources are necessary components of indigenous peoples' fundamental human rights; and 4) how indigenous peoples' rights to land and resources have come to be recognized and protected in various international human rights conventions and declarations over the past several decades.

The Exclusion of Indigenous Peoples from International Law

The classical state-centered structure of international law has been a key obstacle for indigenous peoples seeking to have their rights to land and resources recognized at the international level. International law emerged following the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War in Europe and laid the foundation for a new political order that was based on a system of sovereign states. Westphalian sovereignty holds that each state exercises supreme and exclusive rule over its territorial jurisdiction and is free from interference by other states. International law developed in accordance with the Westphalian system and was heavily influenced by Emmerich de Vattel's treatise, *The Law of Nations, or The Principles of Natural Law* (1758), which proposes the idea of having a discrete body of law concerned exclusively with states (Anaya 2004: 20). From Vattel's work emerged positivist notions of international law being the product of state treaties and custom, and thus international law became a legal system based solely on the consent of states (Meijknecht 2001: 4). From the nineteenth century through to the latter half of the twentieth century, the prevailing positivist international law doctrine held that only sovereign states could be subjects of international law in the sense of enjoying an international legal personality and being capable of possessing international rights and duties, including rights to bring international claims. Underlying this positivist notion of the state was the idea that human societies could be understood according to an individual-state dichotomy (Anaya 2004:20). This dichotomy, which heavily influenced the development of Western liberal thought, acknowledged the rights of the state on the one hand, and individuals on the other, but did not account for the rights of intermediary groups, such as indigenous peoples, that might exist in between (Anaya 2004:20).

Strongly rooted in a Western world view, the state-centered international law system developed to facilitate colonial patterns promoted by European states. When European colonial powers settled in and gradually overtook indigenous peoples' lands, the colonial powers became recognized in international law as the sovereign

authorities over these territories (Meijknecht 2001:17). Indigenous peoples were excluded from participating in international law because they were considered to have no international legal status or capacity (Meijknecht 2001: 17). In many cases, European colonialists viewed indigenous peoples as "primitive" and therefore incapable of holding sovereign authority over the territory they occupied. In some cases, treaties were entered into between the colonial powers and indigenous peoples; however, over time, colonial views of indigenous peoples being "inferior" took root, causing serious abrogation of the rights of indigenous peoples recognized in the treaties (Corntassel and Primeau 1995:355). In most cases, without conquest or consent, colonial powers simply asserted sovereignty over indigenous peoples' lands. Because international law only recognized the state-individual dichotomy, indigenous peoples, as collective entities existing within states, could not be accounted for within its framework (Anaya 2004: 20).

Since indigenous peoples have traditionally not been recognized as subjects of international law, issues concerning recognition of their rights have been considered domestic matters of the states in which they reside. The international law principle of non-intervention, which serves to strike a balance between state sovereignty and the power of the international community, recognizes that states are protected, to a certain extent, from intervention into their affairs by other entities (Meijknecht 2001:4).[3] Thus, states are entrusted to protect the human rights of their populations, including the rights of indigenous peoples that reside within their borders. This places indigenous peoples in a particularly disadvantaged position because states are typically the main violators of indigenous rights, especially with respect to expropriation of land and resources in indigenous traditional territories (Meijknecht 2001:17). With no effective international legal personality, indigenous peoples have, historically, had no forum to turn to, to bring claims against states for violations of their rights.

Fitting Indigenous Peoples' Rights to Land and Resources into International Human Rights Law

In recent years the international community has begun to recognize the legal significance of indigenous peoples' rights; however, because international law has developed to the exclusion of non-state actors such as indigenous peoples, it is not easy to fit those rights into its framework. Because international law is grounded in the concepts of liberal individualism and Westphalian sovereignty, it is generally adverse to the recognition of collective rights that appear to interfere with the territorial sovereignty of the nation-state.

A. COLLECTIVE RIGHTS

The liberal individualist framework of international human rights law has been a key challenge for indigenous peoples because their claims for rights to land, resources, and self-determination, among others, are collective in nature. Indigenous peoples claim that respect for their human dignity entails recognition of their collective rights to exist as distinct groups of peoples with their own cultural identities (Williams 1990: 686). Debates about the recognition of indigenous peoples' collective rights in international law were heightened during the United Nations (UN) Working Group on Indigenous Populations' (WGIP) discussion concerning the drafting of the *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (DDRIP)[4]. Many states voiced reluctance to recognize indigenous peoples' collective rights, with states such as Japan and France arguing that collective rights have never existed in international law

(Thornberry 2002:378-9).

As mentioned above, traditional liberal-democratic thought developed according to an individual-state dichotomy. Liberal rights theory recognizes that individuals have certain inalienable rights and that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed individuals (Van Dyke 1995:32). The clear thrust of most international human rights doctrine, therefore, is in accordance with a liberal individualistic paradigm, requiring states to promote human rights without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Traditional liberalism views collective and individual rights as being antagonistic, and thus has tended to view collective rights as dangerous and oppressive (Johnston 1995:179). Up until recently, international human rights law has generally protected individual rights and precluded the granting of legal status and rights to groups as collective entities whenever they are identified by characteristics such as race, language or religion (Van Dyke 1995:33). Johnston indicates that traditional liberal rights theorists have simply assumed that "group interests can be accommodated within the framework of either individual or social rights" and have argued that group rights are "translatable into either individual or social rights", thus denying "the existence of any genuine group rights" (1995:185). According to Scott, however, to deny the existence of indigenous peoples' collective rights is to deny the social, historical and political fact of their existence (1996:2). He says that "in the end, it amounts to a form not just of non-recognition, but, more seriously, misrecognition" (1996:2).

B. TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY
In addition to the individual-collective rights debate, the concept of territorial sovereignty has been a key obstacle for indigenous peoples advocating for their rights in the international arena. According to Patrick Thornberry, the "iron cage of sovereignty-based international law" imprisoned the legal imagination throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (2002:89). In other words, states' obsession with protecting and maintaining their territorial and sovereign authority preempted the emergence of any meaningful dialogue exploring how indigenous peoples' collective rights to self-determination, land and resources could be incorporated within liberal democratic states and the international law framework. Territorial sovereignty is defined as "the establishment of exclusive competence to take legal and factual measures within that territory and prohibit foreign governments from exercising authority in that territory without consent" (Malanczuk 1997:75). As discussed above, international law emerged as a "law of nations" with primacy being placed on the sovereign state. For this reason, control of a territory has come to be the essence of the modern-day state and states are highly protective of the geographical boundaries of their territories (Malanczuk 1997:75). Claims by indigenous peoples are often viewed as direct threats to state sovereignty and thus, states have traditionally rejected recognition of indigenous peoples as distinct peoples with the right to collectively hold land and resources. One can see how this has played out in the international human rights arena in that for a long time, the international legal community either refused to refer to indigenous people as a "peoples" in international doctrine, or insisted on limiting the meaning of the term.[5] The fear was that if indigenous people were considered "peoples," they would be able to rely on the right of self-determination found in the UN Charter and would be able to secede from the state.

Like the issue of collective rights, the debate concerning the use of the term "peoples" was a key issue in the discussions surrounding the adoption of the DDRIP by the WGIP, and while indigenous

peoples have been successful in having the term "peoples" incorporated into the DDRIP, it was not without much resistance from various states (Scott 1996; Barsh 1996). What is interesting to note, however, is that many indigenous peoples have clearly indicated that they do not wish to secede from the territories of states in which they reside. Many indigenous peoples do not want to secede, but rather, wish to "wield greater control over matters such as natural resources, environmental preservation of their homelands, education, use of language, and bureaucratic administration . . . in order to ensure their groups' cultural preservation and integrity" (Corntassel and Primeau 1995:344).

Indigenous Rights to Land and Resources as Fundamental Human Rights

Given the clear thrust of international human rights law is in accordance with a liberal individualist paradigm, one might ask, why are indigenous peoples so intent on having collective rights recognized within its domain? The response by many indigenous peoples is that recognition of their collective rights is necessary to sustain their fundamental human right to survive as distinct peoples (UNSPPHR 2001). Indigenous peoples indicate that it is difficult to separate the concept of their relationship with their lands, territories and resources from that of their cultural differences and values because their relationship with the land, and all living things, is at the core of their societies (UNSPPHR 2001:7). Anaya and Williams state that indigenous peoples' right to "cultural integrity necessarily includes the obligation to protect traditional lands because of the inextricable link between land and culture" (Anaya and Williams 2001:53). In other words, rights to lands and resources are "pre-

requisites for the physical and cultural survival of indigenous communities" (Anaya and Williams 2001:53).

Indigenous peoples' relationships with their lands and resources vary from culture to culture; however, there are certain aspects that tend to converge. Land use patterns, for example, frequently provide, or provided, subsistence, and are/were linked to familial and social relations, religious practices, and the very existence of indigenous communities as discrete social and cultural phenomena (Anaya and Williams 2001:49). Language, as a form of knowledge, is often intimately linked to the territories of indigenous peoples. Furthermore, as was keenly observed by Special Rapporteur Cobo in the UN *Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations,* spirituality is a central aspect of indigenous peoples' relationship with land (UN Sub-commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities 1986:196).

One can argue, then, that for indigenous peoples, property rights are inextricably linked to their fundamental human rights. However, as Henderson explains, "to speak of modern legal notions of 'ownership' and 'property' rights in the context of Aboriginal languages or worldview is difficult, if not impossible," because indigenous peoples' "visions of land and entitlements were [and are] unlike the European notion of 'property'" (1995: 217).[6] He states that "the Aboriginal vision of property was [and is] ecological space that creates our consciousness, not an ideological construct or fungible resource" (Henderson 1995:217). Indigenous peoples' understanding of property ownership often differs from the dominant Western conception; however, it is no less deserving of respect and recognition. Thus, when considering indigenous peoples' claims to land and resources it is necessary, as Scott has espoused, to "decolonize the international imagination" (1996:3) so that appropriate mechanisms for recognition and protection can be adopted which have practical sig-

nificance for indigenous peoples on the ground. This may require recognizing forms of land and resource tenure distinct to indigenous peoples, and adopting unique legal remedies that accord with these forms of tenure.

Recognition of Indigenous Rights to Land and Resources in International Human Rights Law

Despite the obstacles indigenous peoples have faced, and continue to face, in advocating for their rights under the liberal, state-centered framework of international law, indigenous peoples have, over the past several decades, succeeded in capturing the attention of the international community. Since the early 1970s, two UN working groups have been established to address indigenous issues[7], the UN General Assembly has announced the International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples[8], and the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues[9] has been established to act as an advisory board to the UN Economic and Social Council. Furthermore, according to Anaya, "indigenous peoples have ceased to be the mere objects of the discussion of their rights and have become real participants in an extensive multi-lateral dialogue that has also engaged states, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and independent experts . . ." (2004:56).

Much of the focus at the international level has been on developing the DDRIP, which sets out a framework of human rights specific to indigenous peoples. However, indigenous peoples have also sought to use existing universal human rights doctrine to advocate for their rights. Article 27 of the *International Covenant On Civil And Political Rights* (ICCPR)[10], for example, has become an important convention in the emerging body of international law that recognizes indigenous rights to land and resources. It states as follows:

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language.

Article 27 has been relied on in several cases concerning indigenous peoples' rights to land and resources. For example, in 1984, Chief Ominayak, of the Lubicon Lake Band of Cree, initiated a claim against Canada using the Optional Protocol[11] to the ICCPR.[12] The Option Protocol allows individuals of member states to present their case to the UN Human Rights Committee (HRC) for consideration if the individual believes his/her rights under the ICCPR are being violated. Chief Ominayak claimed that the Lubicon Cree's right to self-determination according to Article 1 of the ICCPR was being violated on the basis that the Alberta government was allowing resource development to take place in their traditional territory without the Lubicon's consent. The HRC found that it could not adjudicate a claim for self-determination brought on behalf of the Lubicon Cree because the Optional Protocol only permits claims made by individuals and a claim for self-determination is inherently a collective claim. The Committee found, however, that the facts submitted gave rise to an individual claim under Article 27, and concluded that the Canadian government violated Chief Ominayak and other individual Lubicon Lake Band members' rights in its historical dealings with the Band, particularly by allowing the Alberta government to expropriate the Band's traditional lands for the benefit of private corporate interests. Since then, other indigenous groups from Finland, Sweden and Tahiti have initiated claims alleging violations of Article 27 and have had varied success.[13]

The *International Convention On*

The Elimination Of All Forms Of Racial Discrimination (CERD)[14] is another example of a convention which does not refer to indigenous peoples specifically, but can be interpreted to apply to indigenous peoples. In 1997, the UN Committee on the CERD published a recommendation affirming that discrimination against indigenous peoples falls within the scope of the CERD, and stating that "in many regions of the world indigenous peoples have been, and are still being, discriminated against and deprived of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, and in particular that they have lost their land and resources to colonists, commercial companies and State enterprises" (The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination [CERD Committee] 1997). The CERD Committee urged state parties to recognize and protect the rights of indigenous peoples to own, develop, control, and use their communal lands, territories and resources, in an effort to combat racial discrimination, as is their obligation under the CERD (CERD Committee 1997).

In terms of doctrine strictly pertaining to indigenous peoples, the *International Labour Organization Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous And Tribal Peoples* (ILO Convention 169) [15] is currently the only international convention which fits this description. It was drafted in 1989 to supercede the 1957 ILO Convention No. 107[16], which is now regarded as anachronistic due to its assimilationist and integrationist approach. The provisions contained in ILO Convention 169 establish a basic framework for the protection and recognition of indigenous peoples' rights under international law, including substantial provisions regarding the rights to land and resources (Articles 13-19). It must be noted, however, that while ILO Convention 169 provides substantial recognition of indigenous rights, only 17 countries have signed on to this convention.[17]

The only other document strictly addressing indigenous peoples is the DDRIP. If adopted, it will represent the most comprehensive statement on the rights of indigenous peoples in international law. The current DDRIP, which has been adopted by the human rights experts of the WGIP and the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, goes beyond ILO Convention 169 in a number of areas including recognition of the right to self-determination (Article 3) and rights to own and control land and resources (Article 21, 25-30). Furthermore, as mentioned above, the DDRIP recognizes the collective rights of indigenous peoples to a much higher degree than any other international human rights doctrine, and refers to indigenous peoples as being "peoples." Professor Venne argues that because indigenous peoples actively participated in the drafting of the DDRIP, they are moving closer to being recognized as subjects of international law (1998:128). The DDRIP, however, has been the subject of vigorous debate and disagreement and the lack of consensus among states suggests that that it cannot be established with certainty what the practical consequences and implication of the DDRIP will be for the legal status of indigenous peoples (Meicknecht 2001:152). Furthermore, the DDRIP is a declaration, not a convention, meaning that even after it has been adopted by the UN General Assembly, it will not impose legally binding obligations on states.

In addition to the UN, Indigenous peoples have focused their advocacy at regional international human rights bodies such as the Organization of American States (OAS) Inter-American Human Rights System (Inter-American System), comprised of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Commission) and the Inter-American Court on Human Rights (Court). The Inter-American System is of particular importance because it has jurisdiction to hear complaints alleged by individuals or groups against OAS member States that have vio-

lated, or are violating, human rights. In recent years it has come to play a prominent role in addressing indigenous peoples of the Americas' rights to land and resources. Like the UN, the OAS has embarked on a process of drafting a declaration specifically concerning the rights of indigenous peoples.[18] Notwithstanding, indigenous peoples have been using the regular complaint process to advocate for their rights to land and resources using the *American Convention on Human Rights*[19] (American Convention) and the *American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man*[20] (American Declaration). Complaints alleging violations of the American Convention may only be made against state parties that have signed on to it; however, complaints of violations of the American Declaration are more universal. The Court has declared that the rights affirmed in the American Declaration are, at minimum, the human rights that OAS member states are bound to uphold; thus, they apply to all OAS states under the OAS Charter. Where the state is a party to the American Convention, and has accepted the jurisdiction of the Court, a case may be referred to the Court by either the Commission or a concerned state and the decision delivered by the Court is binding on that state. If, however, a state has not accepted the Court's jurisdiction, the process ends when the Commission publishes its report and recommendations.

Since the late-1990s four petitions have been filed with the Inter-American Commission by indigenous peoples from Canada, the United States, Nicaragua and Belize, alleging violations of their rights to land and resources as a result of states' expropriation of land for the purpose of resource development in indigenous traditional territories (Anaya and Williams 2001).[21] The outcome of the *Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingi Community vs. Nicaragua* (Awas Tingi Case) is highly significant.

Basically, the Inter-American Commission chose to bring the complaint made by the Awas Tingi against the government of Nicaragua to the Inter-American Court on the Awas Tingi's behalf. Relying on Article 21 (the right to private property) and Article 25 (the right to judicial protection) of the American Convention, the Inter-American Court found that the Awas Tingi had collective rights, as a matter of international law, to the lands and natural resources that they traditionally used and occupied (Anaya and Grossman 2002). In other words, the Court accepted that the right to property pursuant to Article 21 includes communal property. The Court found that the Nicaraguan government violated the human rights of the Awas Tingi by failing to establish legislative or administrative measures to delimit, demarcate, and title the lands of the Awas Tingi; by failing to provide judicial remedies to protect and enforce those property rights; and by authorizing access to Awas Tingi lands and resources without consultation or consent (Anaya and Grossman 2002). The case sets an international legal precedent as the first decision of an international court with binding authority to directly address the property rights of indigenous peoples.

Finally, any discussion concerning the sources of international law must address the possibility of emerging customary international law (CIL). Anaya argues that the international legal framework that is emerging concerning indigenous peoples' rights is significant to the extent that it can be understood as giving rise to new CIL (2004: 61). According to Anaya, norms of CIL arise when a "preponderance of states and other authoritative actors converge on a common understanding of the norms' contents and generally expect future conformity with those norms" (Anaya 2004:61). CIL is "generally observed to include two key elements: a 'material' element in certain past uniformities in behavior, and a 'psychological element', or *opinio juris,* in certain subjectivities of 'oughtness' attending such uniformities in behavior" (Anaya

2004:61). Anaya asserts that "there has been a discernable movement toward a convergence of reformed normative understanding and expectation on the subject of indigenous peoples," which is constitutive of CIL (2004:62). As support for his argument, he states that over the past several decades, the demands of indigenous peoples have been continuously addressed within the UN and other international venues of authoritative normative discourse, such as the OAS (Anaya 2004:61). Furthermore, he argues that the wide-ranging discussion promoted through the international arena has involved "states, non-governmental organizations, independent experts, and indigenous peoples themselves" such that it "is now evident that states and other relevant actors have reached a certain new common ground about minimum standards that should govern behavior towards indigenous peoples" (Anaya 2004:61). While CIL is a highly debated concept in the field of international law, it is an established doctrine accepted by states and international tribunals and thus, should not be ignored as a source of international law concerning indigenous peoples' rights.

Conclusion

The last several decades have given way to a more inclusive understanding of the participants of international law such that one can now see a range of participants including international organizations, transnational corporations, minority groups and indigenous peoples (Thornberry 2002:90). Clearly, indigenous peoples are now a distinct concern within the international human rights community; however, whether or not indigenous peoples have an "international legal personality" as defined in international law by the principles of international capacity, subjectivity and *jus standi* (standing), is still highly debated among international law scholars (Barsh

1994; Meijknecht 2001). Some argue that while changes have occurred which grant non-state actors' access to international forums, international law is still predominantly made and implemented by states and thus, indigenous peoples cannot yet be considered subjects of international law in any meaningful sense of the term (Melanczuk 1997:107). The question to ask, then, is whether it is effective to advocate for indigenous peoples rights to land and resources within the international human rights arena?

Anaya argues that although international law has historically been "grudging and imperfect, falling short of indigenous peoples' aspirations," it has moved away from its exclusively state-centered orientation and is continuing to develop to support indigenous peoples' demands (Anaya 2004:4). He sees that the advocacy and lobbying of indigenous peoples in the international arena over the past several decades has resulted in the emergence of international norms and a consensus among authoritative international actors that is laying the foundation for the emergence of CIL concerning the rights of indigenous peoples. Furthermore, Anaya and Williams argue that the developments regarding recognition of indigenous rights to land and resources in the Inter-American System are some of the most important developments in international law today (2001:86). Indeed, the Awas Tingi Case was successful in establishing a legally binding decision preventing the Nicaraguan government from expropriating lands in Awas Tingi territory. It must be noted, however, that there are uncertainties with respect to the enforcement of the Awas Tingi Case and others to come. It appears that shaming by the international community is, at present, the only available enforcement mechanism.

Alfred and Corntassel take a much more critical approach. Calling the last ten years "A Decade of Rhetoric for Indigenous Peoples," they argue that the delay surrounding the adoption of the DDRIP is indicative of states' refusals to seriously con-

sider indigenous peoples' rights, and the overall inability of the UN to affect practical change in the lives of indigenous peoples (2004). They argue that the lack of progress within the UN system demonstrates a need for indigenous peoples "to head in a different direction and begin the process of rearticulating Indigenous rights within global forums" (Alfred and Corntassel 2004:5). They point to organizations such as the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organizations (UNPO), an organization comprised of 52 nations (not state governments), and argue that this institution will allow indigenous peoples to advocate for their rights outside the state-centric system of the UN (Alfred and Corntassel 2004:5). They also argue that indigenous peoples must build unity among themselves by reinvigorating the process of treaty-making among indigenous nations (Alfred and Corntassel 2004:5).

In answering the question posed above, is it effective to advocate for indigenous peoples' rights to land and resources within the international human rights arena, it is important to recognize that while there has been some success as a result of the international indigenous rights movement, there are definite limitations due to the state-centered structure of international law. Advocating for recognition of indigenous rights in the international human rights arena is an important starting point to the extent it opens up a dialogue in which indigenous peoples themselves can explain how their relationships to land and resources are intimately linked to their ability to survive as distinct cultures. Recognition alone, however, will not guarantee that states will grant greater access and control over land and resources to indigenous peoples. The principle of non-intervention and the concomitant lack of enforcement of international law at the state level have serious ramifications for the efficacy of in-

ternational human rights law. Furthermore, shaming is only effective for those states that have a voluntary allegiance to the international community; countries such as the United States, for example, reject the authority of any body outside the sovereign state and generally refuse to sign on to international human rights doctrine. The challenge, then, is to find ways of advocating for indigenous rights at the local, national and international levels that, either through threat or gain, place incentives on state governments to recognize indigenous rights. In some cases, where states have recognized the rights of indigenous peoples within their own domestic legislation, it may be more effective to direct advocacy at the national level, as national courts decisions will be binding on state governments.[22] In other instances, the international human rights arena may prove to be an effective tool to motivate state governments to act, as it was for the Awas Tingi in their struggle against the government of Nicaragua. As a final point, it is worth noting that if the problems of non-recognition of indigenous rights are, in many ways, a result of the Westphalian notions of state sovereignty, then perhaps new possibilities will emerge as globalization erodes the traditional sovereignty of nation states and the arbitrariness of state boundaries becomes apparent. Indeed, the challenge for indigenous rights advocates in the future will be to locate new sites of resistance within institutions of global governance, which are emerging as a result of globalization.[23]

Endnotes

[1] For the purposes of this paper, the author considers all peoples who fall within the following definition provided by Professor James Anaya to be indigenous peoples: "... the term indigenous refers broadly to the living descendants of preinvasion inhabitants of lands now dominated by others. Indigenous peoples, nations, or communities are culturally distinctive groups that find themselves engulfed by settler socie-

ties born of forces of empire and conquest" (2004: 3).

[2] Indigenous rights to land and resources include ownership, use and/or occupancy of land and resources of a particular territory inhabited by indigenous peoples now, or in the past; they are typically identified by indigenous peoples as being inextricably linked to their cultural distinctiveness.

[3] See Article 2(7) of the *Charter of the United Nations* June 26, 1945, 59 Stat. 1031, T.S. 993, 3 Bevans 1153 entered into force Oct. 24, 1945.

[4] *Draft United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/1994 (1994).

[5] See Article 1(3) of the *Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries*, June 27, 1989, International Labour Conference (entered into force Sept. 5, 1991).

[6] Professor Henderson refers to Canadian indigenous peoples as Aboriginal, as that is the term most commonly used in Canada.

[7] The WGIP was established in 1982 to draft the DDRIP, which it adopted in 1994, and submitted to the Commission on Human Rights (CHR). In 1995, the CHR established another working group to consider the DDRIP; these discussions are still ongoing.

[8] The UN General Assembly launched the International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples (1995 – 2004) to increase United Nations' Commitment to promoting and protecting the rights of indigenous peoples.

[9] The Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was established in 2000.

[10] *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,* December 16, 1966, G.A. Res. 2200(XXI), 999 U.N.T.S. 171 (entered into force Mar. 23, 1976)

[11] *Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976.

[12] Lubicon Lake Band v. Canada, Communication No. 167/184, UN Doc. A 45/40 (1990).

[13] See Lansman et al. v. Finland, Communication No. 511/1992, U.N. Hum. Rts. Comm. CCPR/C/52/D/511/1992 (1994); J.E. Landsmann v. Findland, Communication No. 671.1995, CCPR/C/58/D/671/1995; Kitok v. Sweden, Communication No. 197/1985, U.N. Hum. Rts. Comm., A/43/40, annex VII.G (1988); Hopu and Bessert v. France, Communication No. 549.1993 CCPR/C/60/D/549/1993

[14] *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* , December 21 1965, entry G.A. Resolution 2106 (XX) (entry into force 4 January 1969).

[15] *Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries*, June 27, 1989, International Labour Conference (entered into force Sept. 5, 1991).

[16] *Convention (No. 107) Concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and Other Tribal and Semi-Tribal Populations in Independent Countries*, June 26, 1957, International Labour Conference, 328 U.N.T.S. 247 (entered into force June 2, 1959.

[17] Canada is not a party to ILO Convention 169.

[18] See the *Proposed American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on February 26,1997, at its 1333rd session, 95th regular session.

[19] *American Convention on the Human Rights*, adopted Nov. 22, 1969, O.A.S. Treaty Series No. 36, 1144 U.N.T.S. 123 (Entered into force July 18, 1978).

[20] *American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man*, adopted 1948, Ninth International Conference on American States, Art. XXIII, O.A.S. Res. XXX . Canada has not signed on to this Convention.

[21] See Mary and Carrie Dann against United States, Case No. 11.140, Inter-Am C.H.R. 99 (1999); Maya Communities and their Members against Belize, Case No. 12.053, Inter-Am C.H.R. 78 (2000); The Case of the Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingi Community vs. Nicaragua 11.577 February 1, 2000; and the Carrier Sekani against Canada, Case No. 12.1279, Inter-Am C.H.R. (2000).

[22] See the Supreme Court of Canada decisions in *Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minster of Forests)* 2004 SCC 73 and *Taku River Tlingit First Nation v. British Columbia* 2004 SCC 74 where the Court ruled that the governments have a duty to consult and accommodate Aboriginal peoples prior to making decisions that might adversely affect their as yet unproven Aboriginal rights and title claims.

[23] See the intervention by Canadian indigenous organizations, the Interior Alliance and the International Network on Trade and Economies, at the WTO in the Canada-United States Softwood Lumber Dispute. The indigenous organizations argued that Canada is subsidizing its lumber because it has not settled land claims with the indigenous peoples from whose territory the lumber is obtained.

References Cited

Alfred, Gerald T. and Jeff Corntassel
2004 "A Decade of Rhetoric for Indigenous Peoples". Online. Internet. Accessed 25 Sept.   Available   <http://www.oneworld.ca/article.view 76589/1>.

Anaya, S. J. and Claudio Grossman
2002 "The Case of the Awas Tingi v. Nicaragua: A New Step in the International Law of Indigenous People." Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law 19: 1-15.

Anaya, S. J. and Robert A. Williams
2001 "The Protection of Indigenous Peoples' Rights over Land and Natural Resources Under the Inter-American Human Rights System." Harvard Human Rights Journal 14: 33-86.

Anaya, S. J.
2004 Indigenous Peoples in International Law Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barsh, Russel L.
1996 "Indigenous Peoples and the UN Commission on Human Rights: A Case of the Immovable Object and the Irresistable Force." Human Rights Quarterly 18(4): 782-813.
1994 "Indigenous Peoples in the 1990s: From Object to Subject of International Law?" Harvard Human Rights Journal 7: 33-86.

Corntassel, Jeff J. and Tomas H. Primeau
1995 "Indigenous "Sovereignty" and International Law: Revised Strategies for Pursuing "Self-Determination." Human Rights Quarterly 17(2): 343-365.

Henderson, James [Sakej] Youngblood
1995 "Mikmaw Tenure in Atlantic Canada." Dalhousie Law Journal 18(2):196-294.

Johnston, Darlene M.
1995. "Native Rights as Collective Rights: A Question of Group Self-Preservation." In Will Kymlicka, ed. The Rights of Minority Cultures. New York: Oxford University Press, 179-201.

Malanczuk, Peter
1997 Akehurst's Modern Introduction To

International Law Seventh Revised Edition. New York: Routledge.

Meijknecht, Anna

    2001 Towards International personality: The Position of Minorities and ndigenous Peoples in International Law. Antwerp: Intersentia.

Scott, Craig

    1996 "Indigenous Self-Determination and Decolonization of the International Imagination: A Plea." Human Rights Quarterly 18(4): 814-820.

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

    1997 General Recommendation XXIII (Fifty-first session): On the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Vol. A/52/18. Geneva: Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights.

Thornberry, Patrick

    2002 Indigenous peoples and human rights. United States: Manchester University Press.

UN Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

    1986 Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations. Jose Martinez Cobo, ed. Vol. E/CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7. Geneva: United Nations.

UN Subcommission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights

    2001 Indigenous Peoples and their Relationship with Land. Erica-Irene A. Daes., ed. Vol. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/21. Geneva: United Nations.

Van Dyke, Vernon

    1995 "The Individual, the State, and Ethnic Communities in Political Theory." In Will Kymlicka, ed. The Rights of Minority Cultures. New York: Oxford University Press, 31-56.

Venne, Sharon H.

    1998 Our Elders Understand Our Rights: Evolving International Law Regarding Indigenous Peoples. Penticton: Theytus Books.

Williams, Robert A.

    1990 "Encounters on the Frontiers of International Human Rights Law: Redefining the Terms of Indigenous Peoples' Survival in the World." Duke Law Journal 1990, 660-704.

Andrea Gemmill

Primate Paradigms: In the Field with Ringtailed Lemurs

Overview

This is a small sample of field notes taken while I was conducting research for my Master's thesis at Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve in southwestern Madagascar, from July to September, 2004.

The reserve is one square kilometre of protected riverine and xerophytic forest. The forest, protected as well as the unprotected, is inhabited by four species of primate: Verreaux's sifaka (<u>Propithecus</u> <u>verreauxi</u>), sportive lemur (<u>Lepilemur</u> <u>leucopus</u>), mouse lemur (<u>Microcebus</u> <u>murinus</u>), and, the focus of my study, the ringtailed lemur (<u>Lemur</u> <u>catta</u>). The protected forest is surrounded by a barbed wire fence that serves to eliminate, or at least greatly diminish, access to its lush flora by grazing livestock, such as goats and cattle. (It is important to note that this barrier does not limit the movements of any of the primate groups or any other animals within the reserve.) The unprotected forest is significantly less dense and has areas of barren dirt due to livestock grazing and removal of trees and brush for building material and fuel.

Myself, a Canadian assistant and two local Malagasy assistants collected behavioural and ecological data on adult female ringtailed lemurs for a period of three months. We focused on two social groups: one within the reserve and one south of the reserve, which also ranged into our camp area. With this information I hope to uncover possible dietary and within group behavioural differences that could potentially be related to the very different environments inhabited by these two groups. Primates worldwide are being faced with encroaching and expanding human populations. Alongside the work by local, national and international researchers to develop new options for agricultural and pastoralist practices in this region of Madagascar, studies such as this will serve to conserve and expand protected natural habitats, such as Béza Mahafaly, and in turn their associated flora and fauna.

Field Notes

<u>Day 1</u> – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve, Madagascar

Set up the tent today. I've never lived in a tent for three months – this will be an interesting experience on so many levels. On that note, red beans and rice for lunch was actually pretty good.

<u>Day 7</u> – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve, Madagascar

After observing the two ringtailed lemur study groups for a week now, we are getting a basic idea as to their favourite sleeping trees. That has made locating our subjects first thing in the morning a bit easier. This morning the reserve group, Green group, was found in their usual large *kily1* tree at the intersection of green trail and blue trail. We've been fortunate so far with this group as they have not ventured so high amongst the foliage making individual identification impossible. Some of these trees are close to 30 metres tall and the reserve forest can be extremely dense, so I'll be keeping my fingers crossed.

Day 9 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve, Madagascar

The non-reserve group, Black group, has been much more difficult to track in the mornings than has Green group. Their home range south of the reserve extends from the Sakamena River (completely parched since this is the cool/dry season) all of the way west into our camp – an area I estimate to be approximately 2km². To us human observers they don't appear to follow any discernable ranging or sleeping pattern. We have located them in various different sleeping trees so far (Fig. 1). Their only obvious, consistent group movement is into the human camp area at least once a day. All group members have been recorded feeding on buds, leaves and fruit in a handful of mature trees around the tents. They tend to linger for only about an hour, returning east into the non-reserve forest upon the arrival of another non-reserve ringtail group into the camp. Black group doesn't appear to be ranked very highly compared to the other groups they have encountered in camp. We have not witnessed any overly agonistic interactions between the groups in camp (actions such as lunging, chasing or hitting). Vocalizations between groups seem to serve as the cue for the lower ranking group to move along. Spending time in close contact with humans has become common place with many of these primates. I'm anxious to determine if it has an effect on their diet and behaviour.

Fig. 1 – A subadult female from Black group

Day 18 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve, Madagascar

There was a full moon tonight. We took a nighttime hike through the reserve without headlamps. Nights like this make me cognizant of just how removed I am from my everyday, city-person, 'First World' life. I read a book alone at 10:00pm in the dry riverbed and was passed by numerous *charettes*, *zébus2* (Fig. 2) and people from neighbouring villages heading to the morning market in town. They embark on this bumpy, dirt road, enduring a ten hour trek (in each direction) once a week to sell crops, livestock and sometimes woven baskets and mats.

Fig. 2 – Myself and some friends in their charette

Day 25 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve

We had a little bit of rain last night, which coaxes out the radiated tortoises. Green group was unamused, or perhaps confused, by the presence of one of these reptiles, even though the tortoise poses absolutely no threat to the ringtails, or anything other than ground level foliage for that matter. Nonetheless, it was a great opportunity to hear their ground predator alarm call. This differs somewhat in pitch and cadence from their aerial predator alarm call, which we witnessed the other day when a hawk was circling and grazing the tops of the trees. When the ringtails saw the immense raptor (it looked huge to me, an adult human – I cannot begin to imagine how it appeared to domestic cat-size animals that were more than twice as close to it), their vocalizations were ear splitting. I was nervous for them – it's amazing the individual ringtail 'personalities' I've come to enjoy. I was also angry with this hawk for coming so close to and disturbing MY lemurs. Maybe I have become slightly territorial myself.

Day 27 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly Special Reserve

Day off today so I brought my video camera into the reserve. There was a great deal of ground predator alarm calling taking place. I looked around. No snakes that I could see (the true ground predator the ringtails need to be cautious of). Not even any tortoises. I realized that the adult females who were vocalizing seemed to be directing their concern towards the base of a particular tree. I walked cautiously in that direction, and followed their gaze towards my rather large and imposing camera bag.

Day 33 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly

Okay, so Green group has become completely noncompliant. All four of us searched for any sign of them in their usual sleeping trees and favourite feeding spots near and on the ground (ringtails are the most terrestrial of any lemur species – what we've seen definitely supports the findings of previous studies that they spend about one third of their active hours on the ground). We could not find them anywhere. I realize that this is an expected occurrence when conducting primatological research, but it was frustrating nonetheless. After two hours of literally scouring high and low, a faint 'meow' – a contact call – was detected. I plodded off the trails towards the eastern boundary of the reserve, the embankment of the Sakamena River, and peered over the edge. There sat Green group, gorging on thistle leaves that had grown in the dry riverbed (Fig. 3) – another addition to the list of species of plants on which they feed. Even though it is the dry season, Green group appears to have decent selection of temporally available flowers, buds, fruit (Fig. 4) and leaves. Though I have yet to observe any of the individuals drinking water. I'm sure they get what they need from the plants, and conserve or store their energy and water by not ranging great distances each day. Their regular noon time snooze has also gradually been lengthening. What started as a two-hour rest time four weeks ago has now become a four-hour full out sleep. The adult females are all gestating, so I'm sure that combined with the lack of water resources has contributed to the less costly, low energy behaviour.

Fig. 3 – Collecting observations in the riverbed

Fig. 4 – Adult female from Green group feeding on fruit

Day 40 – *Campement*; Béza Mahafaly

Black group has been spending an increasing amount of time in camp. They no longer come in once a day for about an hour. The group now sleeps very close to the edge of camp and passes most, if not all, of their day in camp. Unlike Green group, their early afternoon siestas are still about two hours in length. All of the adult females in Black group are also gestating, so I believe that their higher activity levels are due to their constant access to water resources. The researchers and the Malagasy people who live at the camp get their water from a well by the main building. Water gets spilt on the cement that surrounds the source. Ringtails have been observed lapping up the tiny puddles that collect on the cement. There are also buckets of water everywhere – by our tents for washing, by the cooking stove for rinsing, washing and fire extinguishing and by the Malagasy homes for the same purposes. The ringtails take advantage of these buckets and are undeterable from their drinking until the human pail-owner is only a few steps away. How does this unnatural, constant availability of water affect the health of the lemurs? Does it affect their behaviour? How about their social organization? Just as importantly, I wonder how being in such close proximity to humans, their foods, waste and ailments, could potentially affect all of those same factors. This provides a textbook example of human encroachment on the natural habitat of primates. The nonreserve forest in gradually disappearing, and the ringtails are in turn foraging through scrap piles in an area of human habitation. The water is undeniably a major draw.

Along that same vein, but on a much lighter note, I have witnessed various pail-drinking techniques, such as scooping (Fig. 5) and dunking (Fig. 6). I wonder if they will be passed on and taught to future generations of ringtailed lemurs.

Fig. 5 – An adult male using the 'cupping' technique

Fig. 6 – An adult female using the 'dunking' technique

Day 45 – *Campement*; Béza

45 days of rice and beans. 45 more to go. The red beans have all been eaten. Hope we can make it to the next market day. Will it be the big, flat white beans or the tiny white beans for lunch tomorrow? Mmm.

Endnotes

[1] *Kily* is the Malagasy name for Tamarind trees (*Tamarindus indica*) found in the region.

[2] *Charettes* are hand-made, wooden carts used for transportation of people and goods. They are very common in the remote, rural, financially poor area of southwestern Madagascar. *Zébus* are cattle used to pull charettes. They are also used for meat, milk, and gifts and as signifiers of wealth.

Goran Doki**æ**

A Review of No Aging in India:
Alzheimer's, the Bad Family, and other Modern Things

Cohen, Lawrence. No Aging in India: Alzheimer's, the Bad Family, and Other Modern Things. *Berkeley: University of California Press. 1998. xxv +367 pp.*

On the cover of the paperback edition of *No Aging in India* (Cohen 1998) is a print of a Ghar Kali satire with an Indian man carrying a young woman on his shoulders while at the same time pulling a rope tied around the neck of another elderly woman. The print asks for an explanation: how and why do people take such positions? This question echoes the inquiry Cohen has set to investigate in his ethnography: "… how people comprehend the body and its behaviour in time… [and] how generational and other sorts of difference come to matter" (p. *xv*).

Cohen started his initial training in the comparative study of religion. He then continued in medicine, and was finally "caught" (p. *xxii*) by new ways of thinking about health and the roots of suffering through anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley. The effects of these diverse experiences clearly influenced his analytical choices in the making of this ethnography. Although his discussions are rooted in the

frameworks of biology, culture, and economy, Cohen is clear in his attempts to resist the traditional dualistic theorizing by providing "…a sort of thick analysis… continually adding different sites and methods of inquiry to [the] project until these juxtapositions ceased to produce interesting challenges to the main arguments" (p. *xv*). The result is a book with a web of detail centered on the discourses of old body as "a victim of Alzheimer's" (p. 33) and "an embodiment of the bad family of middle class modernity" (p. 87).

Cohen never falls short of data in support of his arguments. Using research material gathered in a period of over a decade, he blends an overwhelming amount of information collected from various sources; such as seminars in Europe, North America, and India, interviews with families in several Indian cities, the sensationalism of tabloids, popular Hindi films, as well as the rhetoric of journalism and the language of medical professionals. This broad range of sources and sites made possible an ethnography that is "not quite about India", or as

he further cautions, "nor is it quite a comparison, for… there is no place called the West out there with which India can be compared" (p. 8).

Although the social drama of Cohen's fieldwork began during the 1988 Zagreb convention (p. 19), the most absorbing experience of ambiguity and suffering captured in the processes of growing old comes from the Indian city of Varanasi. To explore the connections between representations of lived experience and the decay of the old body, Cohen wisely chooses to collect some of his most detailed accounts from the families living in the city that is characterized in traditional structuralist ethnographies as the model of Indian spiritual and material contradictions. He shuffles the images of the social scenes in four different neighborhoods, from the cosmopolitan Bengali, through Hindu and Muslim middle class colonies, to Nagwa slums and the lowest caste of "untouchable *jati*" (p. 42). His juxtapositions reveal a variety of meanings and relationships between the individuals at different layers of social existence within Varanasi neighborhoods. In his reflections on the sacredness of the Ganga River, he talks of the old person as the iconic figure of Varanasi that motivates a rethinking of senility. These meditations invoke the images of widow renunciates *(kasivasis)* and holy men *(sadhus),* and add a dimension of contested gender meanings to his analysis. The former are captured in local narratives as both coming out of devotion *(bhakti)* and ousted by their bad families, and the latter as completing the four-stage life cycle of searching for salvation *(moksha)* through "learning to forget" (p. 40). The recurring narrative of the 'bad family' becomes one of the central themes explaining the appearance of the senile old body as a result of the "… inevitable decline of the universal joint family," (p. 17) driven by 'Western' ideas of moderni-

zation and development.

Cohen cannot help but try to balance the irony of the transformation of intentional forgetfulness if not against the Western links of incurable memory loss and the pathology of the Alzheimer's, then with the classic Ayurvedic rejuvenation therapy (*rasayana*) that seeks, as he suggests, "avoidance of old age altogether through longevity" (p. 93). However, he does not explain *rasayana* therapy as an inversion that can cure old age. In fact, although citing the popular labeling of *rasayana* as "Indian geriatrics", Cohen recognizes the shifts in the tradition caused by the impact of biomedical categories and the availability of modified *rasayana* drugs that are increasingly targeted at younger users because their effects are becoming too potent for the elderly (p. 111).

The temporal dimension of old age and the shifting meanings attached to the process of growing old are a binding thread throughout the ethnography. Cohen reflects on his childhood experiences of senility as "…loosing your marbles, in old people who weren't getting enough blood to their brains", and college lectures about "…senility [as] a cognitive defense against the mindlessness of institutionalized old age" (p. 5). He was able to trace the rewriting of the standard narrative of Alzheimer's into a distinct disease category, which was separated from the "normal" anatomy of senile dementia (p. 79). He further argues this shift to be one of the crucial moments responsible for the organic changes in the brain to be included as a part of the classic narrative of the modern Alzheimer's movement. As well, this allowed for the subsequent rebirth of the disease in popular tabloids as the "fourth leading killer" (p. 60). Following the logic of tabloids, it appears that the true sufferer is not the initial victim, but what Cohen phrases as "the body of the caretaker" (p. 51). In this way, instead of just providing a critique of medicalization, Cohen engages a larger debate to include the relationships of multiple agents involved in the processes of

aging with shifts in social dynamics allowing for the exchange of constructed symptoms.

Although Cohen states early in the book how his intentions are not to compare (p. 7), he does fall into the trap of trying to locate the frame of reference about aging and dementia in India that would fit his medical categories. However, he quickly comes to realize the reliance on formal assessments and regional demographic data can easily become misleading. By shifting his focus from a "… hoped-for sample" (p. 36) to "… asking about old age" (p. 37), other questions become more relevant. This allows for the recognition of one of the central themes in his ethnography: the paradox of no aging in India. Cohen argues that the task of Indian gerontology is to re-create the old age that was once erased as its object and appropriated by narratives about the decline in the joint family that are constructed only from experiences of the elite and urban middle class men (p. 89). From this it follows that the processes of aging in India are not conditioned by only biological decay of the body, but with the changes in the structure of the family and social support, which is influenced by modernization and Westernization. In his review of the academic critiques on the gerontological myths about the change in the treatment "before"and "since" modernization, Cohen draws attention to the calls for "indigenous' gerontology that would counter the "Bad Family" as a creation of international gerontology (p. 103). However, he continues that narratives of the Fall keep repeating themselves and should not be that easily dismissed. Indian narratives about what it means to grow old are less concerned with memory loss as a marker of normal versus abnormal aging than with the sense of family experience. In contrast to memory loss as the key symptom connected with Alzheimer's, Cohen brings forward a number of narratives that reflect the varieties of experiences that are completely ignored when the body is reduced only to organic processes in the brain. Perhaps the closest term to the English "senility" is "going sixtyish" *(sathiyana)*. Cohen presents this as an intergenerational concept in aging, where the authority of the "hot brained" sixty-year-old may be challenged as result of the shifts in the power dynamics within family (p. 157). Other narratives concerned with aging shift in their focus across different classes. In interviews with middle-class residents of Varanasi, Cohen finds how people often speak of balancing their tension *(kamzori)*, which is in turn quite different from worry *(cinta)* (p. 194). Weakness is also central to the experience in Nagwa, however, rather than attributing its origins to the Western influences on the demise of Indian family, the burden is credited to the existing caste order. Furthermore, Cohen notes a difference where weakness is "quantified" through the distributed pieces of food *(chapati)* shared among the residents (p. 230). In contrast to the medical treatment, the embodiment of old age in these neighborhoods is dependent on the family and it requires care *(seva)*. By juxtaposing the experiences of individuals from different social setting and across generational spans, Cohen is able to uncover the shifting meanings of the old body and its relationship to the creation of social and cultural practices that form the basis of the process of growing old.

The selection of themes in this review includes only a small part of data Cohen brings forward in his ethnography. His critical engagement with issues of the aging body and its relationship to the social and cultural experience of what is often captured in terms "Western" or "Indian", provides a departure from the common perceptions of aging as a universal life stage. The central themes of medicalization and the Bad Family provide the core of Cohen's arguments and the basis for most

of his reflections, but the importance of other detail cannot be overstated in an ethnography that draws on such a broad scope of collected data and reflects on one of the most challenging issues in gerontology and medical anthropology. Cohen's attention to detail, juxtapositions of themes, and use of theories has the potential to inspire a new wave of research interests in anthropology and gerontology. His use of language mirrors the diversity of issues and theoretical approaches, as well as the broad extent of the audience he may reach and inspire to think broadly. This book can be considered one of the great pieces of anthropological scholarship, as well as a detailed account on the culture areas in both India and North America. Although the overwhelming amount of detail may appear to dilute some of the themes and make them seem less significant than others, a careful reader can always discover a new layer in Cohen's analysis that motivates a rethinking of the more traditional hierarchies of causes.

Cynthia Korpan

Visual Anthropology:

A review of Working Images

Biographcal Statement
Cynthia Korpan is a M.A. Candidate in Anthropology at the University of Victoria. Her interests lie in visual studies, performance culture, media, and the arts. She is currently working on "The Inkameep Day School Project" taking a visual and textual analysis approach to plays produced by children in the 1930s.

Sarah Pink et al.'s most recent edited book addressing visual research is comprised of a compilation of papers that were given at the *Working Images Conference*, held in Lisbon, Portugal in 2001. This conference was organized by the editors of this volume and the European Association of Social Anthropologists. The conference and this subsequent book are centered on the use of the visual in ethnography and would be of interest to researchers in visual anthropology and sociology. As Felicia Hughes-Freeland correctly points out in the epilogue, the publication brings together a "wide range of arguments and approaches" (204) to visual research and representation. The case studies and fieldwork experiences represented in this book explore through an interdisciplinary lens how various visual media are involved in the process of knowledge creation. What the contributors stress are the "processes of research and representation" (3), with the obvious inclusion of the now common recognition of the importance of reflexivity. The book has been divided into two sections: the first is about visual research methods in ethnography and the second concerns visual ethnographic representation. Each chapter provides visual examples of the various types of representations

with which the various authors are working: archival photos, illustrations, photographs, or snapshots of multimedia pages.

The methods section covers video, photography, and drawing with the first chapter by Cristina Grasseni exploring video both as a means of filming and as used by a community of cattle breeders. The crux of Grasseni's inquiry is in examining the ways we see, arguing for the study of "vision as a skilled sense" (27), and the need for anthropology of vision. The cattle breeders who are the focus of her study use visual documentation of cattle in their work; as a result, the training of their vision becomes an important element in the process of successful breeding. This is a reliance on the skilled eye: what could be termed tacit sight, or professional vision. The author, just like the subjects of her ethnographic work, had to learn how to *see* cattle.

In the next chapter, Gemma Orobitg Canal, looks at various ways that images can be used in ethnographic data production specifically focusing on the authors work in the Pume village of Ricieto. Orobitg's experimentation with visual documentation happened by chance when local documentarians expressed interest in a film about Venezuela. This led Orobitg to take photographs in Ricieto upon her first visit there, which subsequently led her to realize the potential of images for her work in several ways. Firstly, as a memory tool, similar to a notebook; secondly as a communication device between herself and the people with whom she was working; and thirdly, so as to reconstruct the focus of her work, the imaginary sphere. This imaginary sphere refers to the dream world which has become the real place of existence for the Pume: a place where the ill are cured, mythical beings are communicated with, and social conflicts are resolved. Orobitg decided to use black and white film for the waking documentation and colour film to represent the world of dreams.

Chapter 4 by Lazlo Kurti investigates the relationship between postcards and what they represent to a community near Budapest. Kurti continues the overriding theme in all of the chapters: the relationship between images and texts, and how they can work closely together to provide different types of knowledge. Kurti's work began as an archival photo project for the community, whereby he describes his approach to this archive and his methods of categorizing and analyzing. Through this investigation into the design and the featured iconography, Kurti is able to identify the changing political face of this community, evident in the public images produced for these postcards. This highlights the overly constructed nature of postcards since they are part of a larger process of dissemination of information.

The next chapter moves into the realm of drawing and how this mode of expression has been little used or analyzed as a viable means of anthropological inquiry. The author, Ana Isabel Afonso, labels this medium "graphic anthropology" (87). Afonso discusses how gaps of information were filled in with regards to her ethnographic work in Portugal, through the production of illustrations about historical information that was provided by local informants. This began a process and series of drawings, whereby the drawings became a mnemonic device: once a certain activity was revealed through the illustrations, the informant's memories would be recovered, and this would lead to more drawings. By employing this method in her research, which the author refers to as "a continuous crossover between words and images" (89), Afonso was able to provide a much more detailed account of social change in regards to her work, even opening up new areas of inquiry.

In Chapter 6, Iain R. Edgar explores the experiential research method of image work in ethnographic fieldwork. The author explores three types of image work

which he explains as: the first is introductory image work, whereby the participants are simply asked to imagine something; the second is memory image work where they are asked to specifically recall earlier events from their lives; the third, spontaneous image work, uses a Jungian active imagination technique. To analyze any of the work from these three types, the author suggests four stages: the first is the participant's description; the second is their explanation of symbols they used; the third is the analysis of the models they used; and lastly their work is compared to other participants. Image work outputs can include art, drama, dance, or mask making. The author gives examples of each type from his own work, ending with a weighted discussion about the ethical aspects of this work, offering ethical and safe guidelines for practitioners.

The second part of the book focuses on representation, beginning with Paul Henley looking at observational cinema as a valuable tool in generating knowledge during fieldwork, and subsequently how this knowledge can be represented through this same medium. Via an extensive exploration of the history of observational cinema Henley situates his own understanding of this method.

The chapter "Revealing the Hidden" is about a Spanish ethnographic film making unit that considers themselves to be interdisciplinary, democratic, and collaborative, viewing the films produced as instruments of social transformation. The films arise from the subjects themselves who identify social issues that need to be addressed. These same subjects become full research and film making collaborators, all working together to make their story public. The authors discuss their methodologies and process, highlighting the collaborative stance and the subject's involvement.

In the "Drawing the Lines"

chapter, the author looks at *ekphrasis*, which means description in Greek and is "conceived as an important tool in the study of the aesthetic impact of a description in the reader's/spectator's mind" (148). The author combines anthropological fieldwork with illustration, which creates activities that help explain his work as well as create a space of discussion with the people he is working with: producing images for intercultural communication. Examples of where this approach has been successful and not successful are provided by the author.

Chapter 10 entitled "In the Net" is a collaboratively written chapter between the documentary photographer, Olivia da Silva and visual anthropologist, Sarah Pink. They take a look at da Silva's project called "In the Net" which was approached by the photographer with ethnographic research and anthropological concepts in mind. The photographer used long-term participant observation and visual ethnographic methods to compare the culture and identity of two fishing villages: one in England and the other in Portugal. Pink's interest was to learn of innovations in documentary photography and how this may inform new ways of "representing ethnography photographically" (160).

In the next chapter Sarah Pink takes a look at hypermedia and how it offers a way to integrate the visual and textual in anthropological arguments in a manner that showcases the best of both modes of representation. To illustrate how this may work, Pink draws on her own work on the gendered home. Importantly, Pink identifies how each component of a hypermedia project needs to be analyzed and scrutinized to ensure that their stitching together is strong. She then utilizes montage style to layer all of the components together so that the reader/viewer can access the information they want. In the epilogue, Hughes-Freeland notes how this medium provides a new experience of writing where pictures are not simply illustrative of the words. This new relationship requires new ways of

thinking about the medium.

The next chapter is about Roderick Coover's ethnographic work is situated amongst the vineyards of France and centered upon the intersection of actions, events and the use of objects. To produce a documentary, Coover combines a melange of participant observation, interviews, archival research, photo studies, video recordings, and digital programs. By the utilization of this method, Coover points out that "The reader-viewer can examine the ethnographic process, image-making choices and intellectual arguments at the same time" (200).

The epilogue is provided by the experienced words of Felicia Huges-Freeland, who challenges anthropologists to "explore his (David MacDougall's) challenge to start from the (visual) image and to think about how we might develop image-led learning" (210). As well the author cites institutions of resistance as providing another challenge to the future of visual research. This resistance is against technology and other forms of knowledge production, when compared to "the power of the word" (216).

As I embark in my own graduate work as a visual researcher, what this book provided for me were ample examples of the complexity of visual culture, which fittingly explains the vastness of approaches to the subject. Of practical use are the nuggets of experiential wisdom from researchers, such as: Grasseni utilizing the video camera like a video diary and the resulting film as a commodity, exchanging edits for food, time, and access; Orobitg's explanation of the attributes of photo-elicitation in her work, the effect of how she framed her shots, and the insight that drawings provided into the Pume world view; Kurti's archival methodologies which provided information about what was outside the frame; Afonso's recognition of the plasticity of drawing and the wealth of information this simple tool can provide; Edgar's ethical concerns regarding visual work; Henley's suggestions for ways to approach an updated observational cinema; Baena et al.'s collaborative experience and their interest in applied visual anthropology; Ramos' lessons about intercultural interpretation; Pink's expansion of how to think about photography's contribution to anthropology; and Pink's and Coover's experiments with hypermedia and the interplay of text and images. This new area of visual representation provokes challenges within the discipline, while at the same time providing an exciting new medium in which to express anthropological theories and research. I think that the articles within this volume touch on many of the aspects of concern that surface when working with interactive multimedia, such as intercultural interpretation, ethics, collaboration, and representation.

I highly recommend this book for anyone interested in visual research, especially if interested in a wide range of approaches and in the capabilities of the world of visual methods and documentation.

References Cited:

Pink, Sarah, Lasazlo Kurti and Ana Isabel Afonso, eds.
    2004 Working Images: Visual Research and Representation in Ethnography. London and New York: Routledge.

ANTHROPOLOGY GRADUATE FACULTY AND THEIR CURRENT AREAS OF INTEREST:

Hülya Demirdirek
(Ph.D. University of Oslo)

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, transnational labour migration, sex labour, identity, ethnicity, postsocialism, former Soviet Union, Moldova

Leland H. Donald
(Ph.D. Oregon)

ETHNOLOGY, social organization, ethnohistory, quantitative methods, Pacific Northwest

Lisa Gould
(Ph.D. Washington U. St. L.)

BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, primate behavior, ecology, primate demography and life history hormones and behavior, Madagascar

Yin Lam
(Ph.D. SUNY at Stony Brook)

PALAEOANTHROPOLOGY, Stone Age Archaeology, Zooarchaeology, Sub-Saharan Africa

Quentin Mackie
(Ph.D. Southampton)

ARCHAEOLOGY, Northwest coast, archaeological methods and theory, spatial analysis

Margo L. Matwychuk
(Ph.D. CUNY)

ETHNOLOGY, anthropology of power, rural societies, political economy, elites, feminism, theory, Latin America, Caribbean, Brazil

Lisa M. Mitchell
(Ph.D. Case Western Reserve U)

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, medical anthropology, gender, technology and the body, ultrasound imaging, children, Philippines, Canada.

April S. Nowell
(Ph.D. Pennsylvania)

PALEOLITHIC ARCHAEOLOGY, taphonomy; lithic technology, evolution of human cognition, origins of language, art, symboling, Western Europe, Near East

Eric A. Roth
(Ph.D. Toronto)

BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, demography, pastoralists, nutrition, growth and development in Africa

Peter H. Stephenson
(Ph.D. Toronto)

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY, medical anthropology, Aging & Society, Indigenous peoples in Global Perspective, communal societies, refugees, Native Peoples, Canada, Europe, Australia

Andrea N. Walsh
(Ph.D. York)

VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY, visual culture & theory, visual research methods, art, photography, film & new media, 20th Century + Contemporary First Nations Visual Culture, Canada

Margot Wilson
(Ph.D. Southern Methodist)

ETHNOLOGY, medical, development and applied anthropology, gender studies, Bangladesh, India

For information on the Master of Arts program in Anthropology at the University of Victoria, as well as a listing of current graduate students, please visit the departmental website: http://web.uvic.ca/anth/

OTHER ANTHROPOLOGY FACULTY

Michael I. Asch
(Ph.D. Columbia)

SOCIAL STRUCTURE, ethnomusicology, political and legal anthropology, hunting trapping economics, Sub arctic (Professor, Limited Term)

Heather Botting
(Ph.D. Alberta)

ETHNOLOGY, symbolic anthropology; anthropology of religion and political anthropology (Senior Instructor)

Moyra Brackley
(Ph.D. Toronto)

BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, population health molecular epidemiology, forensic anthropology (Anthropology Adjunct, Research Associate, Centre on Aging)

Marjorie Mitchell
(Ph.D. UBC)

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, linguistic anthropology, feminist anthropology development, Southeast Asia, North Pacific Coast First Nations (Adjunct Assistant Professor)

Michael P. Tsosie
(M.A. U of California)

*ETHNOLOG*Y, Ethnography, cultural anthropology, American Indian Studies, cultural history, tribal cataloguing, historical collections, art. (Director, Indigenous Studies Program)

Rebecca (Becky) Wigen
(M.A. Victoria)

ARCHAEOLOGY, faunal analysis; seasonality studies; comparative skeletal collections; taphonomy (Senior Lab Instructor)

ANTHROPOLOGISTS/ARCHAEOLOGISTS IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Lesley Butt
(Ph.D. McGill)

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, medical anthropology, Melanesia gender, sexuality, reproduction (Pacific & Asian Studies)

R. Christopher Morgan
(Ph.D. Australian Nat'l U)

ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY, ethnography and world systems, social structure, Fuji, Polynesia, Tonga (Pacific & Asian Studies)

Nancy J. Turner
(Ph.D. U British Columbia)

ETHNOBOTANY, ethnoecology, British Columbia (Environmental Studies)

Wendy Wickwire
(Ph.D. Wesleyan)

ORAL HISTORY, life history, ethnomusicology, history of anthropology, British Columbia (Environmental Studies and History)

R. Brendan Burke
(Ph.D. UCLA)

ARCHAEOLOGIST, Classical Greece, the Bronze Age Aegean, and Iron Age Anatolia (Greek and Roman Studies)

Marcus Milwright
(Ph.D. Oxford)

ARCHAEOLOGIST, Medieval Islamic Art and Archaeology (History in Art)

John P. Oleson
(Ph.D. Harvard)

ARCHAEOLOGIST, Ancient technology, Near Eastern archaeology maritime archaeology, underwater archaeology (Greek and Roman Studies)

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
P.O. BOX 3050 STN CSC
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
V8W 3P5 CANADA

Graduate Secretary: anthmain@uvic.ca; Ph: (250) 721-7046
Graduate Advisor: anthgs@uvic.ca