

the events recorded for the summer are quite distinct due to their many references to the annual sun dance meeting.

Chapter Three, entitled “The University of Oklahoma Calendar,” which examines and discusses the recently discovered version of the Silver Horn record in detail, is the main part of the publication. As the size of the original document is rather fitting for horizontal format, the reader has to turn the book around 90° in order to be able to read this text. Besides, on the upper page appears a color reproduction of every sheet of the winter count which pictures several events. The lower page, on the other hand, comprises year, season, and the chosen name of each entry, as well as explanations of the drawings, comparisons with other remaining version of the Silver Horn chronicle, the related Kiowa annals, and additional information extracted from Euro-American sources. To ensure that the text concerning a drawing is at least on the next page, the volume includes several pages which are empty with the exception of a single decorative drawing from the Silver Horn winter count. If readers of the publication experience a *déjà vu*, then the likely reason is that they have a book that is bound in an identical way to my copy in which four double pages appear for the second time some pages later.

This very long chapter is followed by the one entitled “Kiowa Glossary and Guide to Pronunciation,” contributed by Gus Palmer Jr., which contains terms and personal names mentioned in the book. Additionally, the volume includes three appendices. The first one presents a version of the Little Bluff winter count collected by Hugh L. Scott in 1894, which is kept in the Fort Sill Museum Archives. The second one also makes public a chronicle which is related to that of Silver Horn, and specifically the record handed down by his half-brother Hauvahte and written down by Mark R. Harrington in 1909, now in possession of the National Museum of the American Indian. The third appendix comprises a list of Kiowa annals which are published or stored in public libraries and archives.

In general, the publication is a solid scientific work rich in information. As it is often the case with winter counts, some questions are left to be answered perhaps in the future by other documents yet to be discovered. A bit bothering is – as the chosen subtitle of the book demonstrates – that the author, despite criticism, is not willing to abandon the idea that winter counts can be called “calendars.” This designation is inappropriate because all calendars provide dates for the future, and winter counts only document events that already took place. What makes the publication particularly valuable is the set of drawings by Silver Horn. In contrast to other indigenous historians from the Plains, however, Silver Horn’s drawings are not just simple mnemonic devices but rather elaborate pictures that include many details. If not its historical and ethnographical content then the beauty of Silver Horn’s winter count alone makes the book a fascinating and recommendable reading.

Dagmar Siebelt

Halstead, Narmala, Eric Hirsch, and Judith Okely (eds.): *Knowing How to Know. Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Present*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008. 210 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-477-7. (EASA Series, 9) Price: £ 15.00

This edited volume presents a series of critical arguments on knowledge construction in anthropology, the production of ethnography, the nature of fieldwork, and the key concepts and assumptions that anthropologists utilize in doing fieldwork and writing ethnography. Out of the collection of essays emerges a narrative which draws attention toward the problem of how anthropologists know what they know. While some of the authors provide more historically based accounts of the production of ethnographic knowledge, collectively the compilation draws attention to the complexities of working and writing in the postmodern present. Rather than seeing the anthropological notion of the ethnographic present as a “crisis” of knowledge construction the authors, collectively and individually, envision writing in the ethnographic present as a way in which anthropologists can facilitate knowledge construction (3). The volume methodically takes the reader on an important epistemological journey through their authors’ experiential moments in the field and their subsequent reflections on how knowledge is created in their ethnographic texts.

In thinking about the creation of ethnographic knowledge and its place within the discipline some of the authors present new and on-going research while others reflect back on many years of fieldwork. For example, Judith Okely discusses her methodology which at first focused heavily on the use of field notes. Eventually, Okely’s concern about the process of knowledge construction changed. To her, knowledge was not simply located in field notes and the events of fieldwork itself but also somewhere “in-between” (67) what was written and what was embodied during fieldwork. She tells us “... I carried and remembered, without intention, the unwritten flotsam and representations which I was to disentangle through thinking and writing only long after the encounters” (66). This mode of retrospective analysis, digging back and reflecting upon moments of shared time and space, offers the reader highly textured, sophisticated ethnographic accounts. In turn, the accounts of the authors’ experiential moments in the field direct the reader to a multiplicity of epistemological concerns in the doing, writing, and thinking about anthropology today. Collectively the essays cover a diverse range of field sites, from Sikkim in the northeast of India, to Java, northern Italy and the northwest corner of Namibia in southern Africa. They also represent an equally broad range of research agendas. The range of field sites and the varied research agendas presented add to the text’s depth.

From Halstead’s “Introduction” to the final article by Munasinghe on theorizing the nation state in Trinidad, the authors take up the challenge of revisiting the problems associated with writing in the ethnographic present. How, for example, can anthropologists reconcile the disjuncture between doing anthropology in a time and space shared with others with the resulting representations of

those others created elsewhere in time and space? Guided by theoreticians such as Fabian (*Time and the Other*. New York 1983) and his view of the necessary position of *coevalness* in ethnographic writing and Hastrup (*The Ethnographic Present. A Re-Invention. Cultural Anthropology* 5.1990: 45–61) and her reexamination of the ethnographic present as “shared time and space” the authors reclaim the concept of the ethnographic present as central to how we know what we know. As Hirsch states, “what I have learned, and what I should have already known is that past, present and future are not radically separated (as presupposed by history and historians) but are deeply connected in ethnographically unique ways” (33f.). Reimagining the ethnographic present not as crisis but as a bridge, opens up a space of reflection for knowledge construction. Crucial to this reimagining is what Halstead calls the interfaces between Self and Other which result in the fieldworker “*becoming or re-positioning the other*” (16). In various articles the authors draw attention to their roles, positions or repositions within their cultural fields. How we see others and how they see us, it seems, changes how we know what we know.

Halstead argues that the experiential, embodied knowledge gained in the field is constructed in a shared time and place but that it also goes beyond these moments and stays with us in the “extended field” (11). Grasseni provides insight into her positioning and “ways of seeing” suggesting that they stem from acquiring “skilled visions” or practices. In reflecting on his relations with others Retsikas points out that we will always return from the field and we will never take up living there full-time, thus we are left with a partial perspective, a partial embodiment of a way of life. This brings him to ask if partial embodiment is to be “... deemed adequate enough for offering a vivid account” (126).

I highly recommend this book. It is an important text for ethnographers in any stage of their careers. In particular, graduate students and professionals interested in the issue of the ethnographic present will find this book a stimulating read. The articles provide insight and define possible future direction into the process of ethnographic construction, a process which connects the lives of ethnographers and others in the field to the formation of anthropological analyses.

Denise Nuttall

Harkin, Michael E., and David Rich Lewis (eds.): *Native Americans and the Environment. Perspectives on the Ecological Indian*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007. 367 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-7361-0. Price: £ 13.99

Michael E. Harkin and David Rich Lewis have assembled a formidable group of scholars, mostly anthropologists and historians, to extend the debate and discussion of issues raised by Shepard Krech and his influential 1999 book, “*The Ecological Indian. Myth and History*.” Krech sought to assess how the pervasive Western image of Native Americans as natural conservationists (exemplified by the Iron Eyes Cody “crying Indian” and other

tropes) squared with the behavioral realities of resource use by Native American peoples in various times and places, from hunting of Pleistocene megafauna to more recent historical pursuit of buffalo on the Plains, deer in the southeastern woodlands, and beaver in the subarctic, among other cases.

It was not surprising that Krech found discrepancies between image and behavior. After all, imagery is a construction and, axiomatically, *not* reality. He meticulously documented case after case of overhunting or overharvesting, subsequent waste or spoilage of resources, and an apparent absence of overt conservation strategies. More surprising, perhaps, was the heated critical reaction to Krech’s book. Some Native Americans, including scholars and activists like Vine Deloria, disputed the specific findings in Krech’s work but also chided him, a non-Indian, for presuming to characterize the resource-use traditions and knowledge of Native Americans. Also unanticipated, was a warm reception by conservative commentators who saw Krech’s book as affirmation of a contrasting image, Indians as rapacious killers, and justification for eroding Indian lands, resources, and sovereignty. Reverberating throughout these varied reactions is a painful legacy of colonialism: the reduction of real human beings to stereotypes and the continuing power play by various parties to legitimize their conceptions of Indians and Indianness.

The complex aftermath of Krech’s book, including the 2002 University of Wyoming conference which resulted in “*Native Americans and the Environment*,” is discussed in a foreword by Judith Antell, a preface by Brian Hosmer, an introduction by Michael E. Harkin and David Rich Lewis, and an opening chapter and afterword by Shepard Krech III. The latter insightfully counters the critiques of his original work: that the case studies are selective rather than exhaustive or representative, that the historical evidence is incomplete and Eurocentric, that the book is politically incorrect, imperialist, and racist. At the same time, Krech welcomes new research on resources his book did not cover (notably, salmon, caribou, whales, shellfish, and plants) and on the late 20th-century rise of environmentalism in many Native American communities. Also, Krech cites some favorable reviews of his work by Native Americans, dispelling any notion of a monolithic reaction from Indian people.

Harkin and Lewis’ introduction establishes a thematic framework for the subsequent chapters. They also introduce three definitions of “ecological” as a reference point to bind the various authors’ discussions. “Ecological₁” is the basic notion of population-environment interaction. “Ecological₂” addresses sustainability, the ability of a population to persist in the same environment over time. “Ecological₃” involves discourse with political support for sustainability through conservation measures. While Harkin and Lewis view Ecological₃ as an artifact of recent industrial society, they also note that Krech appears to conflate all three meanings in his analyses. Only a few contributors to this volume make overt use of these definitions. Moreover, not all of the authors directly address Krech’s arguments.