the modern European state, particularly given that Italy has only recently emerged as a receiver of immigrants.

Carter deserves praise for his efforts to address a subject that cuts across geographical constructs of the popular imagination and anthropology. His traversing of boundaries poses challenges for readers—some engaging the text with a background in Africa or migration, others with an interest in Europe and the state. It also challenges the author to be cognizant of the differing backgrounds of his readership, though Carter frequently is not. For instance, readers are first told on page 38 that the Martelli Bill is important for having regularized immigration to Italy. It is not until chapter 7, however, that readers learn how the bill regularized immigration and about its implications for the lives of immigrants. While the Martelli Bill may be second nature to Europeanists, it is not to Africanists. Greater attention to points such as this would have enhanced the book’s readability for its potentially broad audience.

An important caveat to potential readers is that the book is far less about Senegalese in Italy than is suggested by its subtitle and introduction. Rather, Carter focuses heavily on the Italian state; the Sengalese play only a supporting role in his central arguments concerning discourses about immigration. More broadly, the book is not very ethnographic. Carter notes eloquently, “In short, there are many cities in the mist of the Po on a Turinese morning, and these form parts of the lives of the inhabitants and the stories told or imagined about them” (p. 24). Unfortunately, Carter rarely lets readers into their lives, and I learned far less about the inhabitants of Turin—Senegalese or Italian—than I hoped to learn from this book. Only in chapter 3 does Carter significantly explore the lives of Senegalese in Italy. This is also the only chapter in which Carter draws heavily on his fieldwork in Italy. Much of the rest of the book emphasizes theoretical works, analysis of literary and popular culture, and material drawn from others—accounts of life and politics in Italy and Senegal. Chapter 2 is engaging, and I would have liked to have seen more of this type of ethnography.

Carter fails to address a range of basic questions concerning concrete aspects of Senegalese immigration to Italy. There may be good reasons for this, but the absence of fairly straightforward information that is germane to Carter’s case requires explanation. For instance, how many Sengalese were actually in Italy during the periods Carter examines? How long did they stay? What were their patterns of remittance? What were their aspirations for the future? Further, readers do not learn the significance of Sengalese within contemporary immigration to Italy. Carter relies on an endnote to convey that the Italian government estimates there to be up to a million immigrants in Italy. But he does not state what percentage of immigrants are Senegalese, or their specific significance to the state discourses to which Carter devotes much of the book. Are Senegalese immigrants numerically important; important from the standpoint of representation; or, though a legitimate subject of study, not exceptionally important in comparison to other immigrant groups Carter mentions (such as Arabs or Asians)? Attention to these questions would have been an important contribution of the book and, moreover, would have clarified and strengthened Carter’s central argument.

The book holds important promise for an anthropology that seamlessly integrates processes in the developing world with life in the industrialized world. For the reasons discussed above, this promise is not entirely fulfilled. The book should, nevertheless, be of interest to scholars of Africa and migration, and perhaps more so to those of Europe and the state.


JANET FINN
University of Michigan

Widespread hunger and malnutrition persist among the Ifugao people of the Philippines despite decades of national nutrition programs and international development projects informed by Western understandings of biomedicine. In this ethnographic encounter with the contradictions of development, Lynn Kwiatkowski argues that the Ifugao’s contemporary experience of hunger and malnutrition stems from a history of political and economic relations that have created and maintained unequal access to food, land, work, and health care. Biomedically informed health programs and international development projects have
largely ignored these complex relations of power operating within local communities and among nations. Kwiatkowski critically examines the relationships among international development, gender, hunger, and political violence and their power in shaping Ifugao people’s experiences. She pays particular attention to historically institutionalized gender and class relations among the Ifugao and the ways in which local, national, and transnational relations of power intersect in the lives of Ifugao women.

While a number of projects aimed to combat malnutrition have incorporated a “women in development” perspective in recent years, Kwiatkowski argues that these projects’ efforts to include women have generally been constricted by their construction of women as mothers. This limited perspective is often at odds with the more dynamic views and practices of Ifugao women. Kwiatkowski details the consequences of gender bias when she describes how health and development projects blame women for their children’s nutritional deficits, exclude men from home- and community-based education and intervention efforts, and increase women’s burdens by encouraging volunteer labor to address the problem of malnutrition.

In Struggling with Development, Kwiatkowski returns to the site of her 1984–86 Peace Corps experience as a community health worker to pose questions about multiple and often competing beliefs of development personnel, state administrators, community development workers, and Ifugao people. These beliefs inform presumably well-intentioned development efforts. She traces the Ifugao’s long history as an agricultural society living among the rice-terraced slopes of the Cordillera mountains in northern Luzon island. Ifugao have faced a history of intrusions by Spanish colonizers, Christian missionaries, U.S. occupiers, Philippine state administrators, and international “helpers.” As Kwiatkowski traces Philippine political economy and history, she examines colonial legacies and their impact on land tenure, the military and economic exploitation of the islands under U.S. control, the commoditization of agriculture that further impoverished small lowland farmers, and the emergence and repression of peasant resistance movements that have struggled against systemic inequalities since the 1940s.

Kwiatkowski pays attention to the impact of long-term militarization and the persistent presence of low-intensity conflict in the daily lives of Ifugao people. She addresses the ongoing warfare between the Philippine military and New People’s Army and efforts by both sides to make strategic use of health care ideologies and resources. Kwiatkowski draws on ethnographic data to illustrate Ifugao women’s critical consciousness of militarization as a community problem and how state and international development officials silence the women’s critiques. She effectively argues that the question of malnutrition among the Ifugao cannot be separated from the context of war and fear in which the Ifugao experience it.

Kwiatkowski critiques the failure of biomedically informed approaches to appreciate cultural meanings of thinness and practices of healing to which the Ifugao traditionally ascribed. She contends that biomedical interventions to combat malnutrition have incorporated and promoted a view of poverty as an individual problem to be overcome through increased human productivity, improved nutritional education, intensified crop production, and further integration into the market economy. Cultural practices of healing and food sharing that have mitigated hunger among the poorest of the Ifugao population have been variably ignored, devalued, or openly and negatively sanctioned through political and economic modernization projects. Beliefs about individual responsibility have been reinforced through the discourses and practices of Christian religious organizations that have maintained a conspicuous presence among the Ifugao since Spanish colonization. These constructions of poverty both mask and maintain underlying systemic inequalities. Kwiatkowski seeks to unmask them by examining the interplay of gendered identities, class relations, religious ideologies, and cultural practices among the Ifugao and the diverse others who have sought to shape their history and future.

The author’s treatment of competing spiritual ideologies, beliefs about illness, and practices of healing values the capacity of cultural actors to negotiate complex, contradictory terrain. Her effort to appreciate complexity, however, results in a dense and at times repetitive narrative that detracts from the importance of the account. A problem of presentation lies in Kwiatkowski’s inclusion of data gathered from
field surveys as part of her narrative. The use of tables to summarize such results would be much more useful to the reader and would lend clarity to the presentation. Curiously, despite her critique of biomedically informed approaches, Kwiatkowski describes at length her own participation in such efforts—in particular, her monitoring of weight and food intake among children and adults, both as a community health worker and during the course of her fieldwork. Kwiatkowski’s failure to engage in a critique of the very biomedically informed practices in which she participated is problematic. Her description of collecting anthropomorphic measures and food-recall lists from Ifugao households in her research sample begs for an ethnographic analysis of the Western gaze in practice. How did the author negotiate her own contradictory positioning as critic and participant in the development process? What transpired in those moments when her informants submitted to the scrutiny of measurement? What sorts of power relations were at work? The author has missed an opportunity to submit her own ethnographic practice to the theoretical and political critique she develops in her text.


KYUNG-KOO HAN
Kangwon National University

In Pursuit of Status is a well-balanced description of Seoul’s upper-middle-class life in the Korea of the mid-1990s. Denise Potrzeba Lett bases her ethnographic study, which is consciously modeled on Ezra Vogel’s Japan’s New Middle Class (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), on her fieldwork in a prosperous apartment complex in Kangnam area, Seoul’s newly developed boom town. In Pursuit of Status is one of the few ethnographic studies of Korea’s middle class available in English and contributes to Korean ethnography as well as East Asian Studies. It is full of interesting anecdotes and observations that can be acquired only by a highly competent fieldworker who succeeds in gaining trust and is allowed to share the intimate details of other people’s private lives. Some of her stories—analyzed through Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of class (Distinction, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988)—would make most thoughtful Koreans nod and smile in acknowledgement. Although Potrzeba Lett conducted most of her observations in Kangnam area, she does not use a community-based approach. She tries her best to give readers a well-balanced picture of Korea’s new middle class and to overcome the limitations of data that are inevitable in localized anthropological fieldwork that deals with supralocal issues such as class and status. She does this by skillfully combining her personal observations and interviews with excerpts from novels, TV drama scenes, and other people’s ethnographic descriptions of Korean society. The result is an excellent introduction to contemporary Korea’s upper-middle-class life for students of Korean Studies, but advanced readers already familiar with Korea may find the book redundant at times.

I have some misgivings concerning In Pursuit of Status. One cannot help but feel uneasy about Lett’s choice of the families she studied more or less intensively. The desire to have contact with Americans is certainly very strong and widely shared by Koreans, as Lett points out, but only a very small number of Koreans would actually use every opportunity to realize this desire. Therefore, Lett’s decision to accept as a key informant a man who approaches the anthropologist in a subway to practice his conversational English makes a native anthropologist a little uncomfortable—not because this person will tell lies to the anthropologist, but because he and the result of networking through him might not provide a representative sample.

Also, I wonder whether Lett’s conclusion that, compared to Japan’s new middle class, “Korea’s contemporary urban middle class actually displayed characteristics that have more typically been associated with an upper rather than a middle class” (p. 205) is due to her choice of studying lower-upper- and upper-middle-class families rather than middle-class families. Lett asserts that the “growth of South Korea’s middle class can be characterized as the yangbanization (yangban signifying the upper class of traditional Korea) of Korean society in the modern context” (p. 212). She then resorts to a cultural explanation by arguing “not only that Korea’s contemporary urban middle class exhibits upper-class characteristics, but also that this is due to a culturally