luz del pluralismo legal (Franz y Keebet von Benda-Beck-mann, Boelens y la escuela de Wageningen), los aportes sobre el *project law* (F. y K. von Benda-Beckmann, Wei-lenmann) o los estudios sobre el *forum-shopping* (K. von Benda-Beckmann), la interlegalidad (Santos, Hoekema) y el derecho local (F. von Benda-Beckmann) como un con-cepto que permite superar la manida discusión sobre la naturaleza del derecho indígena, campesino o consuetudi-nario. Por último, cabe recordar que Orlove propuso hace años el concepto de *negligencia benigna del Estado* para ilustrar la otra cara del *abandono* que reporta Rasmus-sen. Habría sido sugerente integrar ambas explicaciones.

Por supuesto que estas observaciones no restan impor-tancia ni interés al magnífico trabajo reseñado. Más bien contribuyen a resaltar la calidad de la etnografía que sus-tenta el libro y el valor de contribuciones teóricas crea-tivas que, desde la ecología política, aportan a la mejor comprensión de los grandes y pequeños procesos de adap-tación y cambio en los Andes Centrales.

Armando Guevara Gil

Salazar, Noel B., and **Nelson H. H. Graburn** (eds.): Tourism Imaginaries. Anthropological Approaches. New York: Berghahn Books, 2014. 292 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-367-3. Price: $ 95.00

This book tells the story of the rapid upward mobil-ity of an English adjective (imaginary) first to a noun (the imaginary) and then to its plural form (imaginaries) in the field of anthropological approaches to tourism (hence "Tourism Imaginaries"). The various intriguing features of this narrative of linguistic advancement include the re-lationship of the now English noun to the French *l'imagi-naire*, carrying as this word does rich theoretical and lit-erary associations and connotations, and the sheer scale of the linguistic and theoretical ambition of its newly found English cousin – despite the substantial difficul-ties the editors seem to have in settling upon its meaning. In her scholarly Afterword, Naomi Leite poses the ques-tion "[w]hat does the concept/category of imaginaries of-fer anthropology that related terms – ideology, discourse, worldview, narrative, myth, representation, image, and so forth – do not?" (274). Holding this question in mind in order to return to it, we need, first of all, to describe the book in more detail.

The bulk of the volume is made up of 10 ethnographic chapters, five in part one on "Imaginaries of Peoples" and five in part two on "Imaginaries of Places". In part one Rupert Stasch argues that anthropologists need to give equal attention to the stereotypic perceptions that both tourists and the people they visit– in his case the Korowai of Papua, Indonesia – have of each other. Dimitrios Theo-dossopoulos begins his examination of tourism amongst the Emberá community of the Changres National Park in Panama with the assertion that "[s]corn and idealization represent two dominant orientations in the exoticization of indigenous communities" (57) and proceeds to explore how tourists and tourees construct ideas about the other, in this case finding that some visitors' notions about the visited are less polarized than the reported dominant ori-

entations might suggest. Alexis C. Bunten writes about the Aboriginal-owned Tjapukai Cultural Park in Australia. She identifies what she describes as the "cultural tourism formula" that the Tjapukai use to represent themselves in museum like performances that emphasize, *inter alia*, greeting styles, traditional architecture, feasting arrange-ments, and crafts. Margaret B. Swain's chapter consists of a comparative examination of the representations con-structed for tourist consumption by the Sani Yi and Axi Yi of the Chinese province of Yunnan's Shilin (Stone For-est). João Alfonso Baptista considers the development of a community-based tourism project in Canhane, a village in southwest Mozambique. The involvement of external agencies (including a Swiss NGO and USAID) frame the ethnographic narrative of a village said to be committed to ideas and values of exclusivity and difference from sur-rounding settlements.

Part two opens with a chapter by Michael A. Di Gio-vine on Pietrelcina, the birthplace (in 1887) in Italy of Padre Pio (canonized as a saint in 2002) and its relation-ship with the town of San Giovanni Rotondo, to which Pio was sent at the age of 31 by his Capuchin order to live and work in for the rest of his life. Federica Ferraris explores the way in which ideas held by Italian tourists about Cambodia tend to focus more on the "mythical em-pire of Angkorian Cambodia" than the country's more re-cent history and contemporary state. Paula M. Santos' fine and detailed chapter examines the "Portugal dos Pequeni-tos" theme park in Coimbra, Portugal. This park is dedi-cated to representing "Portugal as a colonial empire … through miniaturized examples of the vernacular archi-tecture" throughout the country and its "colonial posses-sions" (194). She describes the park as "a work of the imagination" (211) that retains public popularity partly because it mirrors and fits into the way Portuguese history has been taught in the last eighty years. Kenneth Little ex-plores his reencounter, months after it first came into his possession at a party in Belize, with a beer coaster. This sets up opportunities for him to explore aspects of the "dreamworlds" and nightmares experienced by tourists and others of a Caribbean paradise (239). Finally, Anke Tonnaer describes the "rewilding project" in the "Dutch Serengeti" nature reserve in the Netherlands. She explores the ways in which visitors enhance their sense of belong-ing to the region by their creative interpretation of the symbolic space in which landscape, nature, and identity come together.

All this ethnographic work is good and interesting. The chapters by Santos, Swain, and Di Giovine, are par-ticularly relevant to this review. All three examine clearly defined local institutions and institutional relationships. Theoretical issues emerging from their analyses include considerations of the ways in which images, represen-tations, and narratives about identity and belonging are woven together by political, economic, and ideological structures and processes. Putting it this way does raise the issue of whether any of them have gained theoretically or ethnographically from the ideas of the imaginary or imag-inaries, what they might have lost without their usage, and/or whether their work advances our understanding of

the meaning of these terms. For this reviewer the jury remains out on all three questions. Moreover, the authors responsible for the most effective chapters, Di Giovine and Swain, choose to frame their work with two yet further invented and highly imaginative expressions – *imaginaire dialectic* in the former case, and "imaginarium" in the latter (103). Swain describes this delightful term as "playful" and as being reminiscent of museums or toy stores. We might add that it also conjures up aquariums in which fish swim in all directions.

The collection of ethnographic miniatures described above is followed by Leite's "Afterword" and preceded by the "Introduction" by the editors. It is these chapters to which we will now turn.

Leite's essay, a model of thoughtful clarity, starts by drawing attention to the fact that the imaginary and imaginaries originated from a variety of disciplinary sources outside anthropology and that they appear routinely to be used with "a basic lack of conceptual unity" (260). They are used variously to apply to "tourism-related images, interactions, imagery, institutions, and imaginings … [as well as other numerous terms] … each involving different imaginative phenomena" (261). In an attempt to bring a common thread to such heterogeneity Leite follows Claudia Strauss's (The Imaginary. *Anthropological Theory* 6/3.2006: 322) recommendation that we need to steer a passage through the maze with the idea of "shared mental life" without substituting the term the imaginary for culture. Indeed Strauss, as one of the definitive anthropological thinkers on the topic, warns, early on in her classic paper "The Imaginary", that in some of the ways it is presently used the imaginary comes close to "just *culture* or *cultural knowledge* in new clothes."

This brings us to the editors' "Introduction," most of which consists of a large number of quotations and accompanying reflections about the nature and meaning of the imaginary and imaginaries. Their own position on the meaning of these terms is not always clear to this reviewer. They assert early on, for example (1), that "it is hard to think of tourism without imaginaries or 'fantasies'" seeming to imply that these two terms could, and possibly should, be elided, but they further tell us that imaginaries are "socially transmitted representational assemblages that interact with people's personal imaginings" (and that they are) "used as meaning-making and world-shaping devices" (1). Some might find this assertion elliptical (assemblages of what?) but it appears to come close to Cornelius Castoriadis' notion, which they quote, of the imaginary being similar or indeed the same as a society's "cultural ethos" (3) thus calling to mind Strauss's anxieties. In her own essay Strauss (2006: 322–344) is very clear: we should drop what she calls the "cultural model" altogether because imaginaries are properties of individual thinkers rather than collectivities. Societies (cf. Strathern, The Concept of Society is Theoretically Obsolete. In: Group for Debates. Anthropological Theory 1989: 4–11), nations, or other kinds of groups do not imagine. People imagine. Yet the editors seem to find Edward Tylor's (Primitive Culture. New York 1889) use of the notion of "mental culture" congenial, suggesting to the reader that

for them imaginaries are indeed cultural realities – a position borne out by their notion of imaginaries *interacting* with people's personal imaginings – suggesting that the former has a separate existence from the latter.

Some of the quotations and references are puzzling. Assertions are made on the basis of alleged quotations from others in ways that often make it impossible to follow up what the quoted authors actually said or what evidence was used to make the assertions in the first place. Readers are given names and dates but sometimes no actual quotes and seldom page numbers. For example, the editors assert that "for Said" (in "Orientalism") "geographic imaginaries refer, literally, to how spaces are imagined" (4) while Selwyn is reported to have pointed to the similarity between myths and tourism imaginaries (3). But, given that neither Said (who wrote of "imagined geographies") nor Selwyn actually used the term imaginaries in their work, it is hard to support either claim. These are just two examples of the editors' system of referencing which sometimes seems to lack completeness or coherence. This turns out (unexpectedly) to constitute a route leading us to the main theoretical issue of the book itself. On the basis of quoting others the editors' approach to imaginaries yields illustrations of "shared imaginaries" which are very general and very vague. One example of this is their assertion that "in the early 20th century European[s] imagin[ed] … African people … as cannibals" (3). *All* Europeans? *Some* Europeans? If so who, when, and in what context?

It will be clear by now that for this reviewer the answer to Leite's question is that the "cultural model" adopted by the editors remains unsupported by proper evidence and thus has little new to offer us. That said, if we follow Tine Gammeltoft's (Toward an Anthropology of the Imaginary. Specters of Disability in Vietnam. *Ethos* 42/2.2014: 153–174) reading of the anthropological uses of the imaginary in her brilliant essay on the imaginings of a pregnant mother in Vietnam who knows (through the hospital's ultrasound) that her baby will be born disabled, we may partially redeem the efficacy of the terms in question here. Thus, if we, as ethnographers, closely observe the imaginaries of a single individual as her/his mind interacts with state policies and commercial imperatives – in this case to "improve" the physical health of the population after the depredations of the war and to sell formula milk to new mothers –, then we can not only agree with Leite (274) about the "centrality of the human capacity for imagination" but also finally begin to understand where and how the imaginary and imaginaries may and may not be usefully employed in anthropological work.

Tom Selwyn

Sanjek, Roger (ed.): Mutuality. Anthropology's Changing Terms of Engagement. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015. 374 pp. ISBN 978-0-8122-4656-8. Price: $ 65.00

This volume includes 16 essays concerning mutuality, organized into four sections (each with four chapters). Editor Roger Sanjek, who also wrote the book's introduc-