minimally represents the vast anthropological literature on material culture.

The book's geographic focus within the comparatively recent U.S. borders is particular problematical regarding native peoples in what is now Texas, the Southwest, and California, considering the still-evident legacy of Spanish and Mexican influence. On one hand, this book moves away from constraining ethnographic present and culture-area concepts, but, on the other hand, it has reconsigned the contents to the limiting geographic and historical constraints of the U.S. borders. A few authors urge the need for a hemispheric awareness; Ramirez, defying the ethos of the book's bias, notes the value of "bridging groups divided by 'colonial' borders" (p. 408). However, there is no opening allowed here to pursue these necessary ideas.

There are frequent examples from Canada. In contrast, although some authors—including Hunn, Les Field, and Alice Littlefield—have worked south of the U.S. border, there is no mention of native peoples in Mexico or further south. This contradiction, coupled with the stated U.S. focus, infers an underlying "English speaking–centricity."

Because two-thirds of Indian people in the United Stated live in urban areas, the book is regrettably lacking in off-reservation and urban topics, as well as the dynamics among and within urban, rural, and reservation communities. There is only Raymond Bucko's mention of religious practices in urban areas and Ramirez's examples in San Jose.

As Whiteley sagely observes,

> Since World War II major anthropology departments had encouraged their graduate students to undertake ethnographic research overseas, and the prejudice that American Indians had lost their culture, been overstudied, or were otherwise no longer a worthy object of study had become entrenched. Combined with the hostility expressed by Deloria and others to the anthropological project, these attitudes began to marginalize North Americanist ethnography in the discipline. [p. 457]

Consequently many contributors note the lack of anthropological literature related to their chapter topics, especially politics generally, political ecology, economics, and education. Littlefield mentions that the book relies on "historians, psychologists, sociologists, educators, and American Indians themselves" (p. 321), making the book interdisciplinary, not strictly anthropological. Ultimately, this multidisciplinary approach is a strength, giving the reader a rich overview of the subject.

Castile observes, "In the larger arena of policy-making we have seldom offered usable solutions to the practical political, economic, and social problems that energize federal Indian policy" (p. 280). Ramirez and Field give examples here of the benefits from collaboration between Indians and scholars. Field succinctly urges for the "application of anthropological tools in Indian Country to accomplish tribal goals" (p. 472).

During the period of diminished anthropological work on American Indian topics, the interdisciplinary field of American Indian/Native American Studies was established. We have Vine Deloria and others, scholars and nonscholars, Indians and non-Indians, to thank for motivating anthropologists to be responsive to native peoples and consequently releasing American Indian studies from the exclusive domain of anthropology.

Ultimately this book is not so much a reflection of what anthropological American Indian scholarship is but, rather, what the contributors think it should and might be in the future. It will be discussed, referred to, and consulted widely, hopefully also stimulating increased work addressing contemporary issues of importance to native peoples within the United States and beyond.

REFERENCE CITED

Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1969 Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn from It. Robert Borofsky. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005. 372 pp.

JOAN VINCENT
Barnard College

The contribution of this book is both political and pedagogical. It is over 30 years since the Yanomamo of Napoleon Chagnon's ethnography became controversial within the academy: Combatants are immediately recognizable from their spelling of the name. Five years ago, the imminent publication of journalist Patrick Tierney's *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon* (2000) led concerned members of the American Anthropological Association to request that the actions of two of its members, Chagnon and medical anthropologist James Neel, be reviewed by the association's Ethics Committee.

Robert Borofsky's *Yanomami* is really two books in one. The political takes the form of an inflammatory response to matters raised in *Darkness in El Dorado* and the well-intentioned but misguided interventions of the AAA's Committee on Ethics. This is part of a programmed effort to expose the abuse of "the Yanamamo" among whom Chagnon and Neel worked and to mobilize professional intervention. The pedagogical is an impassioned book about widening discourse on the imbalances of power between anthropologists and the people among whom they work. The testimonials on its jacket from highly distinguished anthropologists are equally passionate. Four of the five pronounce its value as an introduction to critical issues within the discipline. There is no doubt that Borofsky's book performs a service for the profession and will doubtless head the required reading for a course that, it is suggested, the AAA might require of all aspirants to the profession (p. 288).

This said, the book requires a lot from its readers and, perhaps, even more from the instructors who use it. Some may find Part 1 overly dominated by Borofsky's views on the controversy (p. 314.) Others may welcome his step-by-step guidance over 103 pages toward the ethical

anthrosource

dilemmas that are to be discussed in the Round Table presentations of Part 2. These Borofsky initially (p. 20) likens to a jury trial but as challenges and counter-challenges mount over three rounds, a boxing match seems the more apt metaphor. Six combatants argue the nature and validity of the charges made against the fieldwork practices of Chagnon and Neel. As master of ceremonies, Borofsky summarises the professional status and Amazonian experience of each: a representative of an NGO, a Yanamamo fieldworker, a colleague of one of the accused, a medical human rights worker, a longtime resident with a missionary organization, and a professor long engaged in Amazonia human rights issues. Five are academics (pp. 73–75). Their photographs—along with that of Borofsky and Davi Kopenawa, a controversial Yanomami activist—precede their dialogue (pp. 109–281).

The reader is left with conflicting testimony and interpretations. To aid the student reader, Borofsky heads each exchange with what he considers to be the key accusations made, the issues raised, and questions the student might consider. An appendix (pp. 317–341) summarizes the positions taken. At the end of the debate, the participants agree on an open letter assessing the role of the AAA (one of the few matters on which all six appear to agree) and offering guidelines for any response its Ethics Committee might make on the questions raised by the Yanamami controversy.

Finally, Borofsky pleads (his term) with readers to decide (1) where they stand on the issues raised by the controversy, (2) whether blame should be directed at anyone, (3) how the Round Table letter and AAA final report might be faulted and improved, and (4) "how might the structures that fostered the controversy and the disciplinary ills so openly displayed in it" be changed and "things set right?" (pp. 313–315).

Having made it clear that his book seeks "in empowering readers, to develop a new political constituency for transforming the discipline" (p. 21), Borofsky ends by advising his readers against waiting to know more: "There will always be more references, more data, one could cite . . . But essentially all the information you need to form your views is right here in this book. To allow others to intimidate you at this point with data that they possess but you lack is only to perpetuate academic status games" (p. 314). Case closed. The book ends with a millenarian call to go public with www.publicanthropology.org.

Some 250 pages earlier, Borofsky quotes Kopenawa as asking, "Why are [these U.S. anthropologists] fighting among themselves?" He answers: "This is a fight between men who make money" (pp. 68–69). The royalties from Borofsky's *Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn From It* will be donated toward helping the Yanamami improve their health care. Case reopens.

REFERENCE CITED

Tierney, Patrick
2000 Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon. New York: Norton.

anthrosource

Collective Guilt: International Perspectives. Nyla R. Branscombe and Bertjan Doosje, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 339 pp.

ROBERT M. HAYDEN
University of Pittsburgh

Guilt has two distinct meanings: legal responsibility ("she was found guilty") and emotional responsibility ("she feels guilty about it"). This volume is concerned exclusively with the emotional aspect of guilt, when the feeling is "widely shared" by members of a group (ingroup) that their community has committed great harm against another group (outgroup). Although many people may seek to avoid feelings of guilt, the authors in this collection seem mainly to be concerned with ways to set up conditions to foster such feelings, as a means of promoting reconciliation between victimized and perpetrator groups. As might be expected, German atonement for the Holocaust is raised almost immediately as a model, although there is explicit recognition that the case is unusual.

The 17 chapters begin with theoretical discussions on collective guilt as opposed to collective shame. Guilt is a feeling held by individuals as self-identifying members of collectives, and the individuals need not themselves have committed any culpable action (in a concluding article, Elezar Barkun uses the very interesting and perhaps troubling term *passive perpetrators,* p. 312). Nylan Branscombe, Ben Slugoski, and Diana Kappen conclude that guilt is seen as being associated with members of perpetrator groups, because of misuse of strength, and shame is found more often amongst victimized groups, as it is about weakness. These authors also link guilt closely to injustice, constituting remorse for the unjust actions of the person's group.

The "international perspectives" represented are from a very limited range of societies. Three articles deal with Israel, another with Germany, two each with Australia and the Dutch in Indonesia, one with Ireland, another with U.S. race relations, and one with male collective guilt over gender inequality.

The studies involve the kinds of controlled psychological experimentation not commonly found in anthropology, but with some interesting results. A study of Jewish Israelis by Sonia Roccas, Yechiel Klar, and Leo Liviatan varied attributions of the same depiction of violence to the ingroup (Jewish Israelis), the outgroup (Palestinians), and a third group (Serbs), and the authors found, not surprisingly, that "moral outrage" was highest when the acts were depicted as having been committed by the outgroup, next highest when attributed to the third group, and least for the ingroup. Interestingly, a study by Michael Wohl and Nyla Branscombe showed that Jewish Canadians who were asked to remember the Holocaust before answering questions about the Palestinian–Israeli conflict assigned more collective guilt to the Palestinians and were less willing to forgive them than were Jewish Canadian subjects who had not had the Holocaust reminder, even though the