tions in this regard are Suzuki, Taniguchi, and Fujiwara, all of which lead each of the three parts of the volume and might be thought of as anchoring points for the other articles. These contributions present compelling ethnographic examples of aging and well-being as engagements with possible futures and pasts. In some ways this has more resonance with works in philosophical and psychological anthropology on hope, empathy, and "the good" than it does with the standard ways of looking at age from the perspective of identity politics or developmental stages.

Putting together a broadly themed volume such as this is no easy task, especially when attempting to broach topics such as "well-being." Mercifully, the contributors do not merely highlight examples of happy senescence, but at the same time, there is almost no critical discussion of popular gerontological tropes such as "successful aging" or the "third age," both of which might fit well in a volume devoted to understanding well-being and could have a stronger impact on gerontologists trying to understand what anthropology can offer. That said, the volume is a timely contribution to the anthropology of aging and the life course, and should be of considerable interest to both nonexperts who hope to gain a sense of this quickly expanding field and to experts interested in fresh perspectives and frameworks. Jason Danely

Taylor, Julie J.: Naming the Land. San Identity and Community Conservation in Namibia's West Caprivi. Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2012. 266 pp. ISBN 978-3-905758-25-2. (Basel Namibia Studies Series, 12) Price: CHF 42.00

In "Naming the Land" Julie Taylor scrutinizes the way local actors (in this case the Khwe, a San group in northern Namibia) use environmental discourse and the NGOs that promote it to advance their own political goals. Conversely, she also investigates the latent functions these NGOs have on local actors and their politics. More in particular, she argues that in Namibia's Zambezi Region (the former Caprivi – the name change was decided by the Namibian government in 2013) the rise of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in combination with postcolonial politics en judicial policy (legal dualism) fuelled a resurgence and politicization of ethnic identity. As she states in her introduction, NGOs played a crucial role in this "hardening of ethnic difference": in their efforts to depoliticize the struggle over resources and make themselves more acceptable to the state, the NGOs she discusses "inadvertently reinforced the state's authority" in the unruly borderland that is the Zambezi Region, among a group that experiences itself as marginalized by the (post)colonial state.

"Naming the Land" questions the essentializing undertones in most studies of "the San" (as exemplified by the studies of the Harvard Kalahari Group) and explicitly places itself in the revisionist tradition started by Denbow and Wilmsen – but then, paraphrasing the author, *with* actors. The book obviously builds on Ferguson's analysis of the latent functions of development in the *anti-politics machine*, and offers an excellent contribution to the debate on the political ecology of southern Africa. It is a fine example of contemporary, exciting research in Namibia, and is in tune with the high standards the publisher, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, sets for its publications. Apart from this, it may prove to be very useful in the classroom for its analysis of, for instance, the local use of a "global" technology (i.e., Geographic Information Systems, GIS) in the chapter on mapping.

Apart from its introduction and conclusion, "Naming the Land" is structured into five thematic chapters that at the same time are loosely chronological in that they document the move from state control under indirect rule and apartheid to, respectively, conservation efforts and CBNRM initiatives in postcolonial times. A first thematic chapter sketches the history of the new conservationism in southern Africa, and then especially the place of CBNRM in Namibia. Here, Taylor also elaborates her central thesis: NGOs that focus on the use of resources enter a preexisting field of power and authority, and through their interventions also change that field. In the case study she presents, NGOs present a new form of governmentality (in the double sense of governing and being governed). At the same time, though, these development initiatives fragment local authority, while fuelling competition over resources, in this case "nature." Thus development interventions create new venues of power for especially the emerging elites who "talk the talk" to challenge the existing ("traditional"), but also the state's and NGOs' authority over resources, in this particular case "nature."

A second thematic chapter explores the history of colonial and apartheid identity politics, and how "material development" (*fisieke ontwikkeling*) was instrumental to "administrative" (and, we may add, military) development during the years under apartheid. This theme has been amply documented for other regions in Namibia (notably the northwestern part of the country). Perhaps here a more elaborate dialogue would have been justified, as it would have allowed for a more nuanced discussion of the ambivalences of the colonial past in the postcolonial imagination.

Next, Taylor discusses the paradox that after apartheid, with the new Namibian government going through pains to undo apartheid's legacy, ethnic difference and identity moved to centre stage in local politics and national political discourse. This paradox was more apparent in Namibia's Zambezi Region than in the rest of the country, as political dynamics and local sentiments fanned the Caprivi secessionist movement that was repressed *manu militari* in the course of 1999.

This political background also partly explains why Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC), a laurelled Namibian NGO that is one of the key players in CBNRM activities in the country, went through so much effort to convince the government of its nonpolitical intentions. This is the book's pivotal chapter, as it analyzes in detail the contestations CBNRM called into being, and the effects of "nonpolitical" NGOs such as the IRDNC on local micropolitics, ethnic identities, and the dynamics of identity, authority, and resource use.

In the last chapter before the conclusion, then, this overarching argument is further substantiated by a thor-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2014-2-744
Generiert durch IP '3.144.88.242', am 12.10.2024, 07:35:32.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

ough analysis of mapping. What Taylor adds to the existing discourse on mapping as a tool for disciplination and control is that she illustrates that local actors, such as the emerging elites found among the Khwe, engage in countermapping to undermine or counteract state (or NGO) supervision, refute other actors' claim and strengthen their own. In doing so, she demonstrates that the functions of a new technology (Global Information System, GIS) are to be located in the social and political domain rather than on the environmental level.

What struck me when reading this otherwise excellent case study were the parallels between the Kunene and the Zambezi Region when it comes to CBNRM efforts. This may not come as a surprise, one reason being that the most important national player here is the IRDNC, for whom the northern Kunene and western Zambezi (as "remote corners" in Namibia) are primary concerns. But it is no coincidence either that, respectively, the Himba and Khwe were "chosen" for community development, and personally I would have welcomed a more in-depth discussion of the historical and political reasons why these groups in particular are singled out by CBNRM efforts. Such a comparative discussion would also allow for a more thorough treatment of concepts such as power and authority, or processes of marginalization that remain undertheorized throughout the book.

A more profound criticism perhaps is that the author, while spending much effort on an actor-oriented approach of development efforts in West Zambesi, continues to regard the "state" as a monolithic, impersonal, unitary actor (and this, albeit to a lesser extent, also goes for "the" Khwe and Mbukushu). One, therefore, has the impression that the research was not finished, and could have benefited from an additional bout of fieldwork on top of the eight months the author spent in Zambezi. This may have to do with the mutual suspicion between on the one hand NGOs (and the IRDNC in particular) working in the region, and, on the other, the civil servants, military, policemen, officials, … that personify the Namibian state. As the author documents in the methodology part of her introduction, this suspicion also fell to her share, and she candidly illustrates how this profound distrust affected her research. Still, expanding the actor-oriented approach to also include "the" state would have shed an additional light on the "strategic essentialism" that characterizes contemporary Khwe politics. In addition, it would have placed into sharper relief the ambiguities and ongoing negotiations of power and authority between the various actors involved in community development.

Steven Van Wolputte

Trautmann, Thomas R., and **Peter M. Whiteley** (eds.): Crow-Omaha. New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2012. 348 pp. ISBN 978-0-8165-0790-0. Price: $ 65.00

"Who ordered that?" This was the response of one physicist to the discovery of the muon, a massive subatomic particle, in 1934. Scientists had figured out how molecules are made of atoms, and atoms of protons, neutrons, and electrons; the new particle had no place in this tidy scheme. It was only decades later that the muon was situated within a more fundamental theory of elementary particles.

"Who ordered that?" might have worked as an alternative title for the present collection. Anthropologists have figured out a lot about how the distinction between parallel and cross kin structures social organization, especially marriage (summarized in an earlier edited volume: M. Godelier, T. R. Trautmann, and F. E. Tjon Sie Fat [eds.], Transformations of Kinship. Washington 1998). From this perspective, Crow and Omaha systems, with their mirror-image sexual asymmetries and their problematic relationship with marriage rules and other social institutions, present a puzzle. This book, the product of a 2010 conference, attacks this puzzle from several directions.

A quick primer: "Crow" and "Omaha" are, to begin with, labels for types of kin terminology. In a Crow terminology, Father's Sister's Child merges upward with ascending generation relatives, called by the same term as Father's Sister or Father. The reciprocals of the terms merge downward, resulting in skewness. The reciprocal of Father's Sister's Child (Mother's Brother's Child) merges with the reciprocals of Father's Sister or Father (the descending generation Man's Child or Woman's Brother's Child). Some versions of Crow merge additional terms, like grandkin terms. And Omaha is skewed the other way, a mirror-image of Crow with the sexes switched.

It has long been recognized that Crow and Omaha are related to matri- and patrilineality respectively. Crow terms for Father / Father's Sister can be glossed as something like "man/woman of Father's matrilineage," while Omaha terms for Mother / Mother's Brother are something like "woman/man of Mother's patrilineage." Yet Crow-Omaha terminologies characterize only a minority of unilineal societies, and not only unilineal societies, so something more is going on.

Lévi-Strauss suggested that Crow and Omaha classifications are about marriage, and represent a step beyond Dravidian and other elementary structures that designate some kin as preferred or prescribed affines. Crow and Omaha systems, on this argument, by classifying cross-cousins and more distant consanguines as close consanguines, make these relatives unmarriageable and force families to look for new alliances in each generation. A number of authors in this volume follow up on this suggestion. Peter M. Whiteley discusses the Hopi, who have a Crow terminology. He shows how, by following Crow marriage proscriptions and avoiding marriage with spatially and genealogically close kin, they make dispersed alliances. Wendy James considers a number of cases from northeast Africa. Sister exchange is a starting point for some groups, and balanced exchange a general ideal, but often with a prohibition on repeating alliances in the next generation. The result is the appearance of Crow and Omaha marriage patterns, not as fixed rules but as the outcome of opportunistic strategizing.

Treating Crow-Omaha systems in the framework of alliance theory also suggests a particular place in social

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2014-2-744
Generiert durch IP '3.144.88.242', am 12.10.2024, 07:35:32.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.