identity, and the settlement structure are investigated from within the context of the seminomadic seasonal procurement round, and the ecological specificities of the boreal forest environment.

Chapter five signifies a point of departure from more generalizing and "external" views of Khanty society, to one that explores a more local and "internal" Khanty perspective on the world, via an investigation of the role of animals in routine and ritual practice. The chapter stresses that Khanty cosmological concepts are neither deterministic nor free floating, but are intrinsic to – and grounded in – the creation, use, and deposition of material culture within a landscape rich in symbolic meaning.

Chapter six investigates the network of sacred places in the landscape and examines how they are of central importance to processes of social reproduction and the replication of particular forms of authoritative knowledge. A further theme to this chapter is the exploration of the ways in which different forms of temporality are mutually implicated in events at these holy sites.

Chapter seven constitutes a localized historical portrait of a particular community, exploring social and settlement pattern changes and the ways in which individuals are socialized within the enculturated material spaces inhabited by the community. Attention is drawn to broader webs of symbolism and power that link settlements of the sacred, the living, and the dead within the overlapping temporalities of community social practices. From this, Jordan suggests that the public area of the house is the locus within which diverging Russian and Khanty identities are worked out, while activities at the cemeteries and holy sites are the contexts in which more traditional Khanty views of the world are upheld and reproduced. Once again, a subtheme to the chapter is the idea that cosmologies are expressed through material culture rather than being purely mental constructions.

In chapter eight Jordan shifts the focus away from places marked by physical transformation and considers the appropriation of wider landscape spaces by these communities. Questions of land use and ownership are critically discussed in the context of reified differences between farmers and foragers by making the distinction between tenure and territoriality.

Some of the interesting outcomes of this research is the manner in which parts of the natural world are singled out by these mobile hunter-gatherer communities for special veneration. While this veneration produces local concentrations of material remains, which are structured symbolically, the deeper significance of these locales is inextricably linked to actions in the wider landscape. In this sense, holy sites do not exist in isolation, but are embedded – in a social and symbolic sense – in wider routine landscapes. Thus, these sacred sites, individuals, and communities are bound by ongoing relationships rather than being staked out in the dead spaces of cartographic maps. In effect, these local communities are engaged in ritual dialogue with divine beings, which reside in, or are contacted from, specific sacred places in the landscape. Within these relationships, material items form the media of reciprocal communication.

This leads us to a probably more appropriate understanding of complex property concepts that are obviously prevalent in Khanty society (and many other hunter-gatherer societies). In contrast to views of a "nature-as-parent" relationship with the local environment (Bird-David), or of distinct property relations between people with regard to nature, "every animal or fish and every space is part of a landscape that is in, or under, spiritual ownership. Here is a situation where communities are vulnerable, and individuals thus need to maintain, through active engagement, overlapping reciprocal relationships with these deities to negotiate a successful passage through life, both for themselves and for the community" (281). Erich Kasten

Kaneff, Deema: Who Owns the Past? The Politics of Time in a "Model" Bulgarian Village. New York: Berghahn Books, 2004. 220 pp. ISBN 1-57181-534-1. (New Directions in Anthropology, 21) Price: $ 49.95

What makes Deema Kaneff's "Who Owns the Past? The Politics of Time in a 'Model' Bulgarian Village" of particular interest is that it is based on research in rural Bulgaria right before the demise of communism. An Australian anthropologist of Bulgarian origin, Kaneff conducted research in the village of Talpa in northern-central Bulgaria in 1987–1988. The fact that Bulgaria's leader Zhivkov and his wife were personally connected to this village through their activities in the resistance during World War II, made the village particularly close to the regime.

Kaneff's main aim in this book is to delineate the role of the past in state-local relations in Bulgaria. Her main argument is that in a highly centralized state, village residents used the past to get access to power and resources through their links to the ruling elite. According to Kaneff, the Bulgarian state constructed the past through its particular understanding of history, tradition, and folklore. History represented the history of communism, tradition represented the rejected past (such as the church, replaced by the cultural center), and folklore represented a rereading of the past to create a new Bulgarian identity. To show the ways in which the past was used in and for the present, Kaneff uses the examples of the "model village" event, public celebrations, commemorations, museums, and folklore. She demonstrates how local leaders rewrote their personal histories by focusing on their activities as partisans during World War II. According to Kaneff, the fact that Talpa was chosen as a "model village" in 1987 was largely based on the longevity of communism in the village and the close association of the Zhivkov family with the village. Kaneff concludes that the Bulgarian state was successful in the case of Talpa to the extent that villagers complied with official discourse, getting much needed support in return.

Kaneff briefly follows events in Talpa after the fall of communism. According to Kaneff, the majority of

Talpians are against the current reforms and believe that they were better off in the past. After Zhivkov stepped down in 1989, the dismantling of the communist system, decentralization, the development of market relations, and the privatization of property transformed rural society, and villages became increasingly marginalized. Kaneff argues that in these changed circumstances the past was no longer a useful tool in connecting the center and the periphery. Not surprisingly, history was rewritten by the reformers, who underscored tradition rather than history as it was defined under communism.

This book is of value for its description of the nature of Bulgarian communism in villages which were closely linked to the center of power. The case study of Talpia gives the reader important insights into everyday life in a Bulgarian village and into the way in which the past was used by the Zhivkov regime and its supporters.

A major weakness of this book is the low level of theorization. While the study focuses on the state and the construction of the past in state ideology, none of these concepts are adequately theorized. There is minimal reference to the large literature on memory and to the ways the past is constructed. Not placed within a comparative frame, the study remains an isolated case study. Another weakness is the amount of repetition in a book that is already somewhat short.

While an advantage in allowing the researcher to study village leaders, Kaneff's inability to get close to nonparty members in the village due to her personal/family network makes it difficult for her to analyze the degree of resistance to the state. Kaneff's suggestion that the present regime is unpopular in Talpa is convincing, given the village's powerful position in the past. However, reference to nonparty members who refuse to speak to the anthropologist and to the fact that the community is made up of families of mixed ethnic origin, makes the reader eager to know more. The author claims that decentralization has meant that it is no longer important to cultivate personal links with the center – what has this meant for constructions of the past? She notes that reformists now focus on tradition in rewriting history: what has this meant at the local level? It is at this juncture that the minority the anthropologist did not – or could not – study come into play: the noncommunists and the Talpians of various ethnic-religious origins who until recently had to suppress their identities.

Leyla Neyzi

Kistner, Ulrike: Commissioning and Contesting Post-Apartheid's Human Rights. HIV/AIDS – Racism – Truth and Reconciliation. Münster: Lit Verlag, 2003. 207 pp. ISBN 3-8258-6202-X. (African Connections in Post-Colonial Theory and Literatures, 2) Price: € 25,90

The essays in this volume are part of a debate on human rights in South Africa in terms of their political contestation. A central argument of Kistner is the diverging path of basic human rights and civil/political rights. She argues that unlike civil/political rights basic human rights do not amount to legally enforceable obligations. She maintains that the tendency to separate fundamental human rights – including the protection of life and the security of health and subsistence – from civil and political rights holds dangers for democratic citizenship. The essays discuss the relation of the two different sets of rights through perspectives from various academic disciplines and diverse theoretical stances. The use of diverse sources broadens the terrain and the terms of critical engagement with rights claims and struggles. The disadvantage of this approach is that the reader, unfamiliar with the wide scope of concepts and theories, has at times difficulties following the line of thought. Condensed explanations of historical developments and theoretical concepts within the essays help in this regard.

The first essay analyzes the issue of restorative justice at the Truth and Reconciliation Commission that came to be linked to nation-building. Restorative justice favors reconciliation among former foes over punishment of perpetrators of crimes. It is, as Kistner posits, a justice that focuses on the future rather than on the past, on understanding and forgiveness rather than vengeance. She, however, points out that witnesses to the Commission found "justice" was traded for "truth" and "reconciliation." In their understanding truth was recovered at the cost of criminal liability of the perpetrators. Kistner posits that the uncoupling of truth from retributive justice and its re-inscription in reconciliation provides, what she calls, the founding myth of the new South Africa. The individual victim's attitude of forgiveness became directly linked to national reconciliation, without taking on the task of public retribution. She argues that in this process the dimension of retributive justice is lost and the whole restorative process is in peril. In her understanding retributive justice is fundamental to restorative justice guaranteeing human rights in South Africa.

The second essay in the publication looks at studies commissioned by the Human Rights Commission of South Africa in 1998 to investigate issues of racism in the media. She posits that the report's outcome is problematic due to methodological limitations. In her view analyzing racial utterances in terms of a discourse analysis utilizing formal semantics and assessing their truth values and truth claims is not reliable for reaching valid conclusions for human rights. She argues that speech-act-theory instead allows analyzing performative utterances in the context of the conditions looking also at communicative action-orientation. She also points out a gap in the report that seems to focus on white-on-black racism that it is to be dealt with by the constitution and the law. In contrast interethnic problematic stereotyping appears to be ignored and left to "anthropological explanation" and not be dealt with by the law. The author argues that this double standard is counterproductive to the development of a human rights culture.

The third essay critically examines the assumption of an unbroken lineage of white supremacy, linking racism and anti-Semitism. This view has a long history in South African political thought and activism. The author argues hat the comparison between fascism and