

Studies in Applied Anthropology, 2005). *Applications of anthropology*, however, establishes a very effective and thoughtful benchmark in a developing field of writing in anthropology, and deserves to become one of the central works in its field. It provides both a historical overview in the chapters by Sarah Pink and Susan Wright, and a broad sample of case studies by the other contributors. Perhaps the most satisfying of these studies, for some readers, will be those that demonstrate the classic ethnographic values that run across the outdated and factitious categorization of 'pure' versus 'applied' research.

ANDREW STRATHERN & PAMELA J. STEWART  
*University of Pittsburgh*

SILLITOE, PAUL (ed.). *Local science vs global science: approaches to indigenous knowledge in international development*. xi, 288 pp., maps, figs, bibliogr. Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books, 2007. £80.00 (cloth)

This collection is much more than a plea for valuing 'indigenous' knowledge. It is a reasoned set of arguments to value those things that cannot be measured; to recognize that not everything that can be counted counts and that not everything that counts can be counted. The current concerns with the measurement of outcomes in a whole variety of different fields blind us to the 'fact' that measurement is about management and control – over resources and over people. The book is of much wider interest than the apparently narrow focus on environmental anthropology and ethnobiology that provides the framing perspective.

*Local science vs global science* originates from the British Association's Festival of Science at Salford in 2003 and from the Decennial Conference of the Association of Social Anthropologists in Manchester in the same year. It attempts to break down some of the stereotypical representations of 'indigenous' knowledge. It moves us 'beyond science' in our thinking about the future concerns for 'sustainable' development and the elaboration of measurable indicators to achieve the millennium development goals. The various contributions implicitly if not explicitly promote the search for opportunities that can transcend the two dominant paradigms competing for legitimacy. One is associated particularly with economic, reductionist, and linear thinking and the ideology of relentless economic growth (now subtly re-labelled as 'poverty alleviation')

as the panacea for sustainability. The other is associated with participatory strategies for development. This latter paradigm recognizes the hegemony of such linear thinking that blinds us to understandings that the world comprises many parallel cultural universes. This is more than merely holding 'indigenous cultures' up to confront the 'developed' world with differences. It is also, centrally, about the anthropological perspective and its place in what is deemed as 'scientific', rational inquiry.

The collection is introduced by the editor, who provocatively argues that 'relativity is relative' and contrasts the physical and the social scientists' notions thereof. He argues for the importance of understanding the 'other', not just to build more inclusive and participatory (and thus more sustainable) processes and programmes, but also for countering the hegemonic processes of standardization associated with globalization and the destruction of biodiversity – processes aimed at standardizing and simplifying. The various contributions certainly do not advocate a set of dichotomies between indigenous and Western or traditional and modern, but rather search for a less hegemonic compromise. This involves the 'fusion' of different worldviews – not only between different cultures but also between what have been termed the 'hard' and the 'soft' sciences; between objective, linear, dissociated, competitive, rational ways of ordering the world and subjective, circular, context-dependent, co-operative ways of living in and with the world. This is as important in the evolution of anthropology as it is in the evolution of organizations to manage sustainable futures – whether we are talking about the shaping of the development assistance agenda, building good governance structures, or encouraging corporate responsibility as integral to good business for companies' investment strategies, at home or abroad.

There are essays that focus more on the 'ethnography' of research institutions and on the political and social dynamics of the context in which they operate. Other essays focus on the debate between private acquisition and control of intellectual property rights. This is resonant of the processes during colonial periods when common land was unilaterally expropriated as private property (land-grabbing in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America, or as government 'forest reserves' in places like India and Africa).

Other essays focus on the role of maps and of 'mapping' to legitimate administrative control. These maps then become the main

evidence to justify control. 'The illegible (and thus illegal?) cacophony of local property regulations and communal tenure' gave way to the official, standardized, administrative order. Much attention has been given recently to these imposed landscapes and the effects they have had on different societies and cultures (see, among others, the works of David Mosse and Michael Scott).

Echoing Gadamer, Heckler makes the argument that it is impossible to pursue knowledge without an interpretative horizon, and her essay on the Piarao in Venezuela argues for the recognition of a variety of 'knowledge paradigms' that need to be taken into account and their value negotiated in the pursuit of joint and perhaps more sustainable solutions. Rhoades and Nazarea argue a slightly different case in their discussion about 'envisioning the future' with two communities in an ecological reserve in Ecuador. They argue that the future is envisaged very differently by scientists concerned to maintain biodiversity and villagers concerned with jobs, livelihoods, and relationships, where forests are seen as areas to exploit rather than areas to preserve. They also significantly argue that the scientists would adopt a similar response to developments in their own backyards.

Space precludes further elaboration of the rich mix of approaches developed here, except to mention the important encounter with mathematics in the final chapter by Sillitoe with the question 'can we count on numbers?' – an important reminder that we cannot measure what is most valuable and that Western society may not prove to be the best adapted or most advanced social formation in a sustainable future.

DAVID MARSDEN *European Investment Bank*

SILVERMAN, MARILYN. *Ethnography and development: the work of Richard F. Salisbury*. vi, 398 pp., tables, bibliogr. Montréal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 2004. £38.95 (cloth)

This memorial volume in honour of Richard F. Salisbury is produced by a group of his students who were profoundly struck 'with the breadth of his knowledge, with his ability to move into other disciplines, and to pursue issues laterally, into adjacent theoretical areas'. *Ethnography and development* is a collection of eighteen of Richard Salisbury's interesting and often also provocative essays. These essays are presented in six groups, each of which is introduced by one of his

students. The topics of these groups of essays range from ethnography and social structure in New Guinea, political anthropology, anthropological economics, and anthropological praxis to developing anthropology. The eighteen essays constitute an eclectic mix of Richard Salisbury's wide range of interests and expertise and concentrate on his perception of the interplay between fieldwork, ethnography, and theory.

Most of his arguments and analyses are based on the fieldwork he conducted in Papua New Guinea among the Siane of the New Guinea Highlands and the Tolai of the Gazelle Peninsula of New Britain. He maintained that the development of bad theories was the result of bad fieldwork. Some of the methods of his own field studies were impressively innovative. For instance, he studied kinship structure and village organization through the eyes of a child that has to adapt to it. Yet 'the dependence of the political on the economic persisted as a central theme throughout Salisbury's career' (p. 95). However, though he regarded himself as an economic anthropologist, he seemed never really to have grasped the fundamental difference between anthropology and economics, namely that the former is principally inductive whereas economics insists on being a deductive science. Salisbury refers to the phase sequence macro-models that development economists have been building and compares them with the phase sequences micro-models that anthropologists have been constructing without seeming to realize that the economic models were based on rational 'economic man' assumptions which anthropologists can never accept. He was obviously unaware of the basic assumptions of economic analysis which Frank H. Knight, the founder of econometrics, spelled out clearly in his critical review of Melville J. Herskovits's *Economic anthropology* when he said: 'The principles of economy are known intuitively; it is not possible to discriminate the economic character of behaviour by sense observations; and the anthropologist, sociologist or historian seeking to discover or validate economic laws by inductive investigation has embarked on a wild goose chase; economics is a purely deductive study' (Melville Herskovits, *Economic anthropology*, 1960, p. 512). It is a pity that Salisbury decided to venture into economics in general and economic development in particular, where he obviously lacked the expertise he had in the field of anthropology. This emerges clearly when he discusses the supply and use of shell money among the Tolai,