Sociocultural Anthropology

Revolution, Occupation, and Love: The 2011 Year in Cultural Anthropology

Christopher Dole

ABSTRACT   What does anthropology have to offer for making sense of the events that have come to be known as the "Arab Spring"? In this article, I use this question to organize my discussion of the prominent scholarly conversations occurring in cultural anthropology for the year 2011. The topics I consider in this review are the critical study of secularism and liberalism; affect, intimacy, and care as registers of politics and economy; space, place, and time; and indigeneity. I will suggest that last year's publications, while by no means anticipating such revolutionary transformations, do offer us a rich body of conceptual approaches and methodological innovations for productively engaging the emergent conceptual and worldly horizons being associated with the "Arab Spring." [*secularism and liberalism, affect, place, indigeneity, Arab Spring*]

The year 2011 marked the 50th anniversary of the publication of Franz Fanon's *Les damnés de la terre* (*Wretched of the Earth*), as well as Fanon's tragically early death. Perhaps because of anthropology's ambivalent relationship with Fanon's writings, or perhaps because of its fascination with the postcolonial (rather than colonialism itself), anthropology seemed to take little note of either event.[1] It would appear, however, that this anniversary was commemorated across North Africa—a region of such importance to Fanon's thinking—with popular uprisings threatening and toppling one regime after another. These events would, as the reader knows, quickly become the "Arab Spring"—as a wave of demonstrations and protests challenged (and continue to challenge) regimes in Syria, Yemen, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine, Bahrain, Iran, and beyond. Add to this the now global scale of the Occupy Movement, and 2011 seemed to be the year when the language of popular protest and revolution became (again) unexpectedly persuasive. Indeed, *Time Magazine* would celebrate "the protester" as the 2011 "Person of the Year."[2]

As revolutions are wont to do, the events being gathered under the label "Arab Spring" raise difficult questions about the future. Although there are others for whom these questions are far more urgent (namely, those people taking part in the uprisings), it does raise significant questions for anthropology as well (and not just for the anthropologists taking part in the uprisings). Among other implications, these events call for a substantial if not radical shift in the analytic coordinates of those conducting research in the Middle East and North Africa, which likely foretells a

shift as well within anthropology as a whole. (If the reader thinks I exaggerate on this last point, one need only reflect on the influence of the likes of Clifford Geertz, Pierre Bourdieu, Edward Said, Talal Asad, Lila Abu-Lughod, and Saba Mahmood—among many others—to appreciate the impact within anthropology of research, most of it ethnographic, grounded in the region.) In the span of a few weeks, previous research agendas in the region came to feel precariously outdated and courses focused on the Middle East suddenly appeared, at best, partial. If only for now (although the "now" has endured for some time), it seems that new visions of political possibility have gained legs and a voice, as well as an audience and a reality, to usher in models for collective political life that are not but repetitions of what was already there.

Beyond asking what these events portend for the future of anthropology, I also find myself asking what does anthropology have to offer for making sense of these events? In an effort to organize my enormous assignment—to review, in the following pages, the year in cultural anthropology—I want to build my discussion with this question in mind. What might prominent themes of cultural anthropology in 2011 have to offer in our efforts to chart the new conceptual and worldly horizons being associated with the "Arab Spring"? I will suggest that last year's publications, while by no means anticipating such revolutionary transformations, do offer some indications for how these political and conceptual horizons can be productively engaged, and possibly transformed. The topics that seemed to occupy anthropologists in 2011, and will thus occupy me in this review, include

the critical study of secularism and liberalism; affect, intimacy, and care as registers of politics and economy; space, place, and time; and indigeneity. Needless to say, the following is not to be read as any sort of rigorous treatment of the "Arab Spring"; it is, more than anything, my take on the 2011 year in cultural anthropology.

In an effort to review the year's publications in cultural anthropology, I considered in detail publications appearing in the journals *American Anthropologist*, *Cultural Anthropology*, *American Ethnologist*, and *Current Anthropology*. My discussion is also informed, although less comprehensively, by publications appearing in *Anthropological Quarterly*, *Public Culture*, *Anthropological Theory*, and the *Journal for the Royal Anthropological Institute* (JRAI). As the above suggests, this review is based primarily on peer-reviewed journals published in the United States, although it is worth noting that many of their contributors were affiliated with institutions outside of the United States. In addition to these conventional venues of scholarly discourse, my review also took into consideration several blogs (e.g., *Somatosphere*, *Savage Minds*, *The Immanent Frame*) and online spaces associated with the above journals. To this can be added a rather unsystematic tour of the 2011 American Anthropological Association (AAA) meetings in Montreal.

IS REVOLUTION LIBERAL?: SECULARISM, LIBERALISM, AND POLITICAL PROTEST

A common refrain in U.S. media coverage of the "Arab Spring"—and Egypt's revolution in particular—was that these events represented the collective unleashing of a seemingly universal democratic impulse, a refusal of repression that we all share. Although a seductive narrative, a number of articles published in 2011 suggest that a more complicated account is necessary. The limits of this explanation become most apparent in those publications that take secularism as an object of critical examination, explore the grammar of liberalism and liberal democracy in the constitution of social worlds, and investigate the dynamics of political protest and social movements. Together, as I discuss in this section, these articles invite us to attend to the specificity of the events being subsumed under the label "Arab Spring," events that emerge out of distinctive (albeit intertwined) histories, find a footing in differently organized social milieus, and give voice (in many languages) to divergent demands.

The most direct engagement with secularism and liberalism as anthropological problems was to be found in a thematic section appearing in *Cultural Anthropology* dedicated to "Secularism," which brought together a collection of articles by Charles Hirschkind (2011), Mathew Scherer (2011), Talal Asad (2011), and William Connolly (2011). Reflecting a further consolidation of Talal Asad's legacy in anthropology (see, among other examples, Scott and Hirschkind 2006), as well as the extent to which this legacy is indebted to a continuing conversation between Asad and Connolly, the contributions to this forum remind us of the varying contingencies of secularism, as well as the dangers of confusing norma-

tive models of the modern, liberal state for the realities of (political) life.[3] That is, this collection of articles—although taking up a wide range of topics—highlight the historically contingent arrangement of people, sensibilities, ideas, institutions, bodily and affective dispositions, and forms of public sociality that underwrite secularism and secular models of liberal democratic governance. As they "sound out the layered sensibilities, obscured histories, and dense conceptual and practical networks that produce and sustain various forms of secularism" (Scherer 2011: 623–624), these works also seek to draw attention to the often unspoken and unacknowledged attachments of secularism and liberalism. Asad, for instance, in his response to Hirschkind's contribution "Is There A Secular Body?" (2011), turns to the figures of the hypochondriac and sadist to argue that they each exemplify distinctive configurations of desire, self-care, and care-for-others that are embedded within modern assumptions about liberal democracy, assumptions which presuppose different kinds of bodies living in different ways (2011). Taken together, these works shed important light on the varied sensibilities and multiple histories that traffic under such monolithic labels as "Secularism" or "Democracy" (or "Arab Spring"), as they also demonstrate the distinctive value of ethnography for the study of secularism and liberalism.[4]

A recurrent setting for such research—which is at once a central trope within secular, liberal models of collective political life—was that of the "public sphere." Erickson's study of neighborliness and ritual sociality in Catalonia (Spain) is a case in point (2011). Joining a growing conversation about the place of Islam in Europe, Erickson tries to understand why a police raid against suspected "Islamic terrorists" in a Catalan city led not to increased hostility toward immigrants, as would be expected, but a renewed sense of neighborliness. Drawing on the concept of *convivència*—a term with deep historical resonance that alludes to the coexistence of Christians, Muslims, and Jews in medieval Iberia—Erickson (2011) explores this unexpected neighborliness by examining a set of discursive and ritual practices shaping embodied socialities and virtuous aspirations that seem to fall outside "both xenophobic and liberal multiculturalist discourses circulating in Europe": 114. A similar concern with the affective, bodily, and social labor necessary for producing, however contingently, a "public sphere" informs Brenner's (2011) study of public morality in Indonesia. Brenner argues that gender and sexuality, especially as they relate to discourses on "the female body," have become central settings for the struggle between Muslim "conservatives" and "liberals" to gain symbolic control over public morality, a struggle that has called into question preexisting distinctions between "public" and "private."

Alongside an interest in the public sphere as both liberal trope and ethnographic setting, a number of anthropologists writing in 2011 drew particular attention to the political logic of difference and plurality in relation to liberalism. Middleton (2011: 250), for instance, examines the use of ethnography by the Indian state in the classificatory practices

of granting or withholding "tribal" identity in Darjeeling—practices "by which state ethnography actualizes the ethnologics of India's multicultural order". Indeed, this relationship between "tribal" or "indigenous" difference and state power as a "multicultural order" was a recurrent theme in 2011, which I will consider in more detail below. We could also return here to Erickson's study of *convivència* in Catalonia—which highlights the challenge difference poses to liberalism's vision of its own tolerance and the forms of violence it can incite, especially within contemporary western European contexts. Turning the language of liberalism back onto anthropology, Nigel Rapport (2011)—in a provocative and "untimely meditation on culture and civilization"—explores the implications of imagining a "cosmopolitan anthropology" oriented not by a multiculturalist ethic of toleration (of difference), but by a liberal "magnanimity" that would allow the anthropologist to overcome the simple toleration of difference in the securing of "true knowledge."

Whereas the above examples bring into focus the challenges that difference poses to liberal ideals of inclusion and tolerance, a set of related conversations appearing in 2011 extended a consideration of the everyday grammars of liberal democracy by examining what is commonly regarded as one of democracy's greatest threats, namely corruption. Anjaria (2011), for instance, takes up just such a concern with the relationship between governance and corruption in his study of unlicensed "hawkers" in Mumbai. Rather than regarding their illicit dealings with low-level state functionaries as a breakdown of urban governance—which would be the normative discourse of the liberal nation-state—Anjaria approaches these dealings as "ordinary spaces of negotiation" that constitute the grounds on which claims to substantive citizenship are made. Witsoe (2011a), also concerned with corruption in India (2011a), explores the ways that lower-caste groups in Bihar envision the state as inherently corrupt, especially in terms of the entrenched forms of political patronage perpetuating upper-caste dominance. Instead of reading corruption as an obstacle to democratic inclusion—again, the normative discourse of the liberal state—Witsoe demonstrates how corruption has been transformed into a lower-caste resource, whereby a new class of political leaders use similar practices of political corruption as tools of lower-caste empowerment (see also Witsoe 2011b).

Alongside these efforts to challenge normative assumptions about liberal democracy by exploring the ways that they move through actual lives, a number of additional publications in 2011 focused more directly on political challenge in and of itself. Susser, for example, considers the role of "organic intellectuals" in AIDS activism in South Africa as they struggle to constitute a commons and address social interests that span "from the local to the global" (2011: 733). Kendzior (2011) takes up related questions in considering the ways that the Internet shapes the efforts of Uzbek dissidents to forge political solidarity in diasporic settings. Fitz-Henry, in turn, traces the processes by which transnational peace activists opposed to a U.S. military base in Ecuador engage in a politics of "scale-making" that resulted in city residents viewing the activists as being "more imperialist than the U.S. Air Force" (2011: 323). To these could be added a number of additional studies that took protest and direct action events as their principal focus, such as Willow's (2011) examination of the importance of place among indigenous anticlearcutting activists in Canada, Bonilla's (2011) study of "memory walks" among labor activists in Guadaloupe (to which I will later return), Dave's (2011) consideration of lesbian activism in India (also discussed below), Murphy's (2011) discussion of political dissent among youth in France, and H. Weiss's (2011b) exploration of the ways that the logic of gift giving moves through—and forecloses—forms of social activism in Jerusalem.

What might these varied works have to offer us as we try to envision an anthropology—in the Middle East, and perhaps beyond—after the "Arab Spring"? Most immediately, they push us away from fixating on normative models of a modern, liberal state (as some sort of postrevolutionary "endpoint") and toward the everyday grammar of secularism, liberalism, and democracy as they form, circulate, and are negotiated within specific contexts. That is, they draw our attention to the terrain of typically unacknowledged sensibilities and histories supporting particular visions of collective political life and corresponding models of political governance. In so doing, these works begin to suggest a conceptual vocabulary for thinking through the political, social, and bodily realignments occurring with the "Arab Spring," a vocabulary capable of attending to the emergent qualities of social life as well as the unexpected configurations of events, conditions, and people that can give rise to new visions of future possibility.

FOR LOVE OF REVOLUTION: AFFECT, INTIMACY, AND ATTACHMENTS

If we can argue that the "Arab Spring" has created a range of new social worlds (and this is, for sure, a topic for debate), a question follows: How are those who ushered in these new social worlds going to live together, differently? And, perhaps more challenging, how are those who either opposed or remained indifferent to revolution going to live together with the former? In formulating a response to these questions—which are ultimately questions about the durability of emergent forms of political life—the works considered in this section would urge us to take seriously the terrain of intimacy, affect, and attachment in thinking about large-scale political and economic transformation. In particular, a number of anthropologists writing in 2011 explored along multiple lines and in numerous settings linkages between forms of love, intimacy, and care, on the one hand, and forms of (often-liberal) governance and (often-neoliberal) economic power, on the other hand. It is here, as well, where anthropology seemed to continue to distinguish itself with its efforts to travel—conceptually and methodologically—across enormous scales of inquiry, seeking to bring together

intimate economies of desire, affect, and bodily experience in a common frame with large-scale economies of empire, capital, and sovereignty.

An exchange between Michael Hardt and Lauren Berlant that appeared in a thematic section of *Cultural Anthropology* dedicated to "Love" does well to set the stage for this section's discussion. As with others writing about the affective and intimate in (and before) 2011, Hardt eschews a sentimentality that might construe love as realizing some sort of fundamental human interdependency, as well as a naïve conception of love as unity without difference. Indeed, love conceived as a process of unification—what he regards as "narcissistic" love, a confirming in another what is already present in oneself—is, for Hardt, an obstacle to a truly political concept of love. Instead, he argues that a "properly political" form of love is to be forged in the interaction with difference, a love that can operate in a field of multiplicity as a transformative force; "a political love . . . must designate a becoming such that in love, in our encounter with others we constantly become different" (2011: 678). And, moreover, the significance of this encounter, and the affective ties it can generate, always exceed the encounter itself. "A political concept of love," Hardt writes, "must move across these scales [of intimate love and love of nation], betraying the conventional divisions between personal and political, and grasping the power to create bonds that are at once intimate and social" (2011: 677).[5]

Berlant, while sympathetic to Hardt's project, is open about her disappointment. "I want," she writes (2011:687) "a bigger imagination of the affective dimensions that it would take to (re)build a world". And here, we return to Fanon. Rather than a concept of love reduced to singular questions of reciprocity and narcissism conceived independently of their larger political milieus, Fanon (as well as Chela Sandoval), for Berlant (2011: 688), "try to articulate love's various forms of binding (prophetic, erotic, aggressive, singular, collective) to deal with all the structural ways that we are not beginning from an 'all things being equal' ground, which it isn't". Berland continues:

> [W]hat if the ground for love includes the form of difference that inequality produces, insofar as our objects have qualities we don't have that we want to be around? Fanon worries about this, and Jane Gallop claims it. For them, and for me, we cannot leach from love that it requires interest and attention and disinterested self-discipline, in reparation for the over-absorption that leads to inattention and destructive will. Love requires a lot of patience for forcefully conflicting aims, and for working out what forms satisfaction will take. [Berlant 2011: 688]

As such, for Berlant, a "properly political" love must therefore be durable; it must provide a space, as well as the time and patience, to "deal with" the unease that difference and contingency tend to incite in the making and remaking of worlds.

This exchange between Hardt and Berlant maps out an important constellation of conversations occurring in 2011 (both in publications and conference panels at the AAA meetings in Montreal) that engaged affect, intimacy, relatedness, and care as vital terrains of political and economic life. Clara Han, for instance, writes powerfully about debt economies and familial ties among the urban poor of Chile (2011), raising critical questions about the forms of both violence and care that credit makes possible—a financial technology that at once leaves the borrower (often deeply) indebted but also creates material and temporal possibilities for caring for kin with mental illness and addiction within the home. Likewise concerned with the affective dimensions of economic reform, Rudnyckyj (2011) examines the ways that spiritual training programs in an Indonesian steel factory mobilize affect to fuse Islamic practice with neoliberal norms. In these programs, which conceive "the heart as an object of management," Rudnyckyj describes affect as the central medium through which a new subject of government is realized, a subject whose emotional life could be efficiently administered and thereby rendered amenable to the introduction of new norms. Muehlebach (2011), writing about the "culture of voluntarism" in Italy, draws on the language of "affective labor" to make a similar argument. Based on research likewise set in training programs (in this case, for volunteers), Muehlebach argues that the Italian state has "made compassion productive" in its promotion of new regimes of voluntary labor, regimes that instantiate forms of "state-mediated intimacy" as they call forth an "affectively laboring public" whose unwaged action is to complement (and facilitate) the privatization of social services under neoliberal reforms.

Muehlebach suggests a question relevant to all of the authors being considered in this section: What does it mean to labor together? How do we envision and practice a collective political life without effacing difference? These are questions that will no doubt be important for those trying to make sense of the events surrounding the "Arab Spring" and more so for those trying to build a durable political future that is not merely a reflection of what was already there. In turning to last year's publications in cultural anthropology, a series of suggestive starting points for thinking through these questions can be found in Singh's (2011) work on "agonistic intimacy" in India and Dave's (2011) study of lesbian activism in India. Indeed, Singh (2011) asks this precise question: "In what ways might anthropology offer more pluralized and empirically enriched terms for understanding how neighboring groups live together, in conflict and cohabitation?" (431). By tracing the significance of the arrival of a "new" god across neighboring groups in Rajasthan, Singh offers us the concept of "agonistic intimacy" to imagine a mode of relatedness that is not predisposed entirely toward "communitarian affirmation" (as with Hardt's "narcissistic love") or oppositional negation (as with the "enemy" in Schmitt's conception of sovereignty). Drawing on a similar conceptual vocabulary, Dave (2011) is likewise interested in exploring forms of subjectivity and relatedness as they travel through shifting fields of affect and intensity. Tracing the emergent social world that came into existence around a protest

placard that read "Indian and Lesbian" at a Delhi rally in 1998, Dave argues that the force of the sign inhered not in the commensuration of "Indian" and "lesbian" but in its introduction of an incommensurability that called for resolution. For Dave, this incommensurability stands as a site of affect, which is in turn "the participation of the unknown in the world of norms such that something new emerges that struggles between multiplication and closure" (650).[6]

Although already touched on above, it is worth underscoring the seemingly distinct appeal of ritual for the study of the political and economic entanglements of affect and intimacy. Tambar (2011), for instance, in his study of ritual lamentation among Alevis in Turkey, explores ritual practices of affective excitation within a political and historical context defined by a state's effort to regulate norms of public affect. Erickson (2011), again, examines emergent forms of public ritual sociality in Catalonia as they forge affective ties that diverge from both xenophobic and liberal multiculturalist discourses in Europe. Sosis and Handwerker (2011), while addressing a very different set of conceptual problems, also consider the relationships among affect, ritual, and politics in their study of how Israeli women use psalm recitation to cope with war-related stress. Here, it is also worth mentioning a number of additional articles from 2011 that are similarly concerned with the political entanglements of affect and intimacy, even though they do not focus specifically on ritual sociality. These include: Alexy's (2011) study of the ways that Japanese women negotiate (neoliberal) standards of independence in relation to cultural norms and personal desires that encourage dependence in romantic relationships; Gershon's (2011) article, "Un-Friend My Heart: Facebook, Promiscuity, and Heartbreak in a Neoliberal Age"(2011), which explores the role of new media in promoting "neoliberal techniques for managing selves and relationships," and Ahn's (2011) engaging study of friendship among U.S. middle-class children.[7]

What lessons might these studies of the affective dimension of political and economic power offer for anthropological efforts to engage as well as imagine a future beyond the "Arab Spring"? Most immediately, they suggest a set of inquiries concerned less with the "success" or "failure" of revolution(s) than with those forms of relatedness, intimacy, and care that make such events possible, and what these forms of relating and caring have to say about future models of political relatedness. Indeed, who can forget the forms of solidarity and mutual support that appeared and endured on Tahrir Square? These studies likewise invite us to think seriously about the role of difference in the building of new futures, not as an obstacle to be overcome on the way to authentic relating but as an aspect of another that one must "deal with," in the way suggested by Berlant (2011) and detailed by Han (2011). In short, they demonstrate the analytic value of attending to intimacy, affect, and attachment as vital registers of politics and economy, as they simultaneously raise questions about the forms of difference,

(affective) labor, and patience necessary for the building of durable social worlds.

MAKING A PLACE AND A TIME FOR REVOLUTION

In her distinguished lecture at the 2009 American Anthropological Association meetings in Philadelphia (published in 2011 in the *American Anthropologist*), Setha Low (2011) made a case for the fundamental importance of the study place and space for anthropology. For Low, these themes are not merely of intellectual and methodological import, but they also hold considerable promise for building a critically engaged anthropology. If last year's publications are any indication, Low was indeed prescient. Although "space" and "place" have long been important anthropological topics, anthropologists writing in 2011 put these themes in conversation with recent conceptual, methodological, and worldly developments to underscore their lasting utility. Alongside the continuing interest in phenomenological approaches to place and place-making the authors considered in this section help us think anew about the pleasures of the "local," the perils of the "environment," and the play of past wounds and projected out futures in the making of inhabitable worlds.

Brad Weiss (2011) and Nana Gagné (2011), for instance, explore a range of questions concerned with place- and meaning-making as they relate to the making of the "local" within the "local foods movement." Taking up the follow-the-food-commodity genre of critique (popularized by Pollan [2007], among others), Weiss (2011) examines the experiential qualities of "taste" and "place" as they are cultivated and embodied in the production, circulation, and consumption of pasture-raised pork in North Carolina. Weiss (2011) is particularly interested in how a "place's tastes"— a taste, in this case, for quality pork—is "carefully crafted through a range of venues in a process attuned to the materiality of ecosystems, landscapes, animals, and meat; built through social relationships among farmers, craftsmen, and activists; cultivated in the educational mission of menus and market tastings, and, so, suffused in place" (441). If Weiss's article raises unsettlingly familiar questions—what sorts of pleasure does one derive from such disciplining of tastes, consuming of the "local," and the frequently exhausting "biographies" of ingredients that has become so fashionable within elite (but so "down-to-earth") dining experiences in North America?—Gagné's (2011) ethnographic study of a farmers' market in Washington, D.C., offers a response. In her discussion of the way shoppers and sellers coconstruct their exchanges as a "third space" wherein distinctions between commodity and gift become blurred and transgressed, Gagné (2011) argues that these experiences of consumption and exchange generate a "sense of ideological and emotional fulfillment" (282).

As the above suggests, "locality" provided anthropologists writing in 2011 a thematic space to explore place-making in North America and, namely, the forms of pleasure and fantasies of escape (from impersonal exchange, market rationalities, and the alienations of industrialized production)

that take flight in consuming the "local."[9] If the "local" was the place for emotional fulfillment, then the "environment"—also a repeated theme in 2011 among those interested in space and place—appeared to be its inverse, as a site of and for decay, alienation, and pollution. Jackson (2011), for instance, draws on Casey's notion of "emplacement" (1996) to examine the embodied experience of air pollution on a First Nations reserve in Ontario, a reserve set squarely within what is known euphemistically as Canada's "Chemical Valley." For Jackson, the reserve's high levels of air pollution created a "smellscape" that fosters a sense of alienation from the residents' ancestral lands, a process she characterizes as "dysplacement." Writing with a similar interest in "emplacement" and pollution, Reno (2011b) explores the ways that the experience of place is deployed as evidence in making environmental claims about a large U.S. landfill. Attempting to go beyond an analytics of "risk" and "danger," the author suggests that we "[set] aside interest in limited calculations of futurity"—an interest ubiquitous in discourses of environmental risk—to emphasize "the spatial praxis of contested place as well, the ways they are experienced, narrated, and known" (2011b: 527). We could also return here to Willow's (2011) study of anticlearcutting activism on a Canadian reserve, which similarly invokes Casey's work on the production of place to examine the political constitution of landscapes.[10]

In addition to their shared interest in place, it is worth noting that the above examples also converge in their geographic concentration in North America. For anthropologist writing about place in 2011, however, North America was not the only place for place-making. Pardue's (2011) study of hip-hop and public radio in Brazil (2011), for instance, describes how participants in both conceive of their work in terms of "conquering space," a form of "spatial occupation" capable of forging a productive public sphere. Anjaria's (2011) discussion of the negotiation of urban space by street hawkers in Mumbai is also relevant here. Ghannam (2011), in turn, explores the practices of "urban mobility" that residents of Cairo engage in as they navigate the city beyond the home and neighborhood. Conceiving of such mobilities as "liminal," Ghannam argues that these travels through the city—as they are comprised of "encounters with middle-class bosses, outings with coworkers, confrontations with police officers, negotiations with shop owners, chats with restaurant staff, and discussions with cab drivers" (797)—both reproduce a range of socioeconomic inequalities and potentially catalyze the questioning and challenging of inequalities, as "new possibilities emerge for different ways of being and doing that may be learned, critiqued, transformed, and normalized" (2011: 797). To these examples of the study of place-making and spatial mobility could be added a number of articles published in 2011 that were concerned with migration and transnational mobility (see Pellow 2011; Coe 2011; Reichman 2011), especially as they relate to issues of citizenship and belonging (Croegaert 2011; Vora 2011).

The study of place-making and spatial mobility commonly, if not inevitably, intersects with themes of time and temporality. Bonilla (2011), for instance, situates her study of political protest in Guadeloupe at just such an intersection of place, mobility, and temporality. Through an examination of the development of "memory walks" by labor activists in Guadeloupe—a form of political walking that aims to reanimate as it retraces salient moments of historical action—Bonilla argues that particular arrangements of political mobility and movement can be conceived as constituting spatial, kinesthetic, and sensorial forms of historical and (postcolonial) archival production. Along a related vein, the study of "heritage" and "heritage making"—with its attention to practices of place-making as they relate to the politics of historical memory—would provide an additional conceptual setting for themes of place and time to come into close conversation in 2011. Murray et al.'s (2011) study of the historical effects of the creation of Lake Sakakawea on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota is a case in point. Building on Meskell's notion of "negative heritage"—those sites that serve as repositories of "negative memory" in the "collective imaginary," such as massacre sites, detention camps, and battlefields (Meskell 2002)—Murray and her colleagues explore the lake's ambivalent status as both a symbol of loss or erasure and a "locus of knowledge, continuity, and meaning" in the reservation community (469).

Although North America was a prominent setting for talking about place last year, it is not (as the slow motion financial catastrophe of the United States and western Europe has made abundantly clear) the future. Indeed, if we were to speak of the future—or of futurism, or futurity—anthropologists writing in 2011 would seem to suggest that Africa is the place to be. Working in the Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, Boeck (2011) examines the history of urban development and contemporary urban planning projects in Kinshasa to ask what sorts of futures are being project out in these instances of "spectral urban politics." Smith (2011), based on research conducted in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo on the mining of "digital minerals" (which feed the global demand for digital devices), argues that these mined materials can be approached as "a prism for understanding Eastern Congolese people's violent and unpredictable relationship with global capitalism, which many experience as violent temporal dispossession, or the inability to plan, predict, or build futures in an incremental way" (18). Lastly, the themes of place and mobility as they relate to both foreclosed pasts and imagined futures come together evocatively in Caroline Melly's (2011) article on the "missing men" of Senegal. Exploring the play between absence and presence that characterized widely circulating tales of failed clandestine voyage, Melly reads these stories as commentaries on the troubling predicament of the Senegalese present, a predicament marked by an ambivalence and tension between the ways that the Senegalese nation has long been imagined as contingent on transnational migration—which is becoming increasingly difficult

to realize today—as it collides with neoliberal discourses privileging entrepreneurial risk taking and future-oriented investment.

The research described in this section confirms the continuing salience of place, space, and time as anthropological and ethnographic problems. At the same time, these works also introduce a range of methodologies, settings, and conceptual challenges for productively charting a research agenda in a post–"Arab Spring" anthropology. They offer, for instance, a set of models for exploring the varied political stakes and social entanglements of making a "place" amid dramatic political transformation. Indeed, it is hard to imagine a future that does not include publications that examine the making of Tahrir Square as a space and place of revolution and political possibility. These studies additionally remind us that political "movements" literally entail a movement through space and time, a mobility and mobilization that can be a generative site of political praxis in and of itself. Alongside such an interest in the spatial dimensions of social emergence, these works simultaneously raise significant questions about the ways that the past, and past wounds in particular, can be put to use as resources for the building of an inhabitable place within a changing world—which is at once a setting for imagining new political futures, as a place to come.

INDIGENEITY

For as many years as these reviews have been written, "indigeneity"—as a concept, field of study, political claim, social process, subject position, identity, relation, and form of life—has proven itself to be a theme of enduring interest. Last year was no different. As the authors discussed in this section demonstrate, the year of publications in cultural anthropology for 2011 can be read as further evidence of anthropology's continuing ethnographic investment in the varied articulations of indigeneity across a wide range of ethnographic settings and historical contexts. Writing against a conception of indigeneity that construes the "indigenous" as inhabiting a temporality that necessarily precedes or anticipates the nation-state, several anthropologists writing in 2011 examined the role indigeneity played in making claims for political and economic inclusion, as well as the ways in which "indigeneity" is itself produced through such demands for recognition.

McCormack (2011), for instance, explores negotiations between Maori tribes and the New Zealand government concerning the ownership and cultural use of coastal spaces. In an effort to move beyond a framework of identity politics, she argues that Maori negotiators work within a contradictory space defined on the one end by national and international rights discourses (themselves bound within a neoliberal political and economic framework) and on the other by local understandings of *hapu*, or subtribe, rights. Middleton (2011), again, offers an account of "state ethnography" in Darjeeling that puts a twist on (or a mirror to) such projects of indigenous claims-making by exploring the way a community's struggle for "tribal" recognition drew on and

was mediated by the state's use of anthropology's own principal mode of knowledge production, that of ethnography. Taking as his object of analysis the ethnographic encounter itself, he examines the "real-time dynamics by which state ethnography actualizes the ethno-logics of India's multicultural order" (250)—in terms of both the classificatory demands imposed by state officials charged with determining "tribal" status and the ways in which these demands elicited performances of an "ethnic self," in a process Middleton describes as "autoethnology."

As others writing on related themes in 2011 were careful to emphasize, such indigenous claims for legal and political recognition should not be conceived as the suppression of some sort of primordial "indigenous" subject but, rather, a setting for generating new forms of (indigenous) subjectivity and new visions of (indigenous) possibility. Along these lines, Rosenblatt (2011) takes issue with the way that conceptualizations of indigenous revival—especially, in his case, among the Maori of New Zealand—are conventionally regarded as merely responses to (or symptoms of) modernity (or globalization, or capitalism, or postcolonialism) and constrained within a language of political instrumentality, approaches that harbor an implicit doubt "that projects like the Maori Renaissance will succeed in the terms they envisage" (412). In response, Rosenblatt examines efforts of Maori to "find a place for their culture in the city" that can provide frames for the interpretation of experience (à la Boas), resources for processes of self-making, and possibilities for Maori to become agents of their own history—which, together, cannot be reduced to a discourse of a self-conscious "politics of culture." Here, we could also return to Murray et al. (2011) and their study of "negative heritage" on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation as a certain inversion of Rosenblatt's account, in which a history of "irreparable loss" operates as both a "negative memory" and a resource for ongoing processes of indigenous community- and culture-making.

The intersection of loss, governance, and emergent forms of subjectivity and communal sociality was a recurrent interest among those writing about indigeneity in 2011. These themes came together perhaps most explicitly in Bessire's (2011) provocative article on "apocalyptic futurism" among recently contacted Ayoreo-speaking people in Paraguay. Bessire examines Ayoreo apocalyptic thought and imagery to suggest that "apocalyptic futurism"— rather than a discourse of "culture"—represents a prominent frame through which recently contacted Ayoreo-speaking people find a place as "indigenous people" in Paraguay. Importantly, for Bessire (2011), attention to this apocalypticism brings into view a range of "emergent subjectivities" and "senses of life" that escape the temporal confines of either a notion of "traditional culture" or the conceptions of the world and time offered by Christian missionaries (754). Cepek's (2011) study of indigenous conservation in Ecuador's Amazon region works across a related set of problems. Based on long-term ethnographic research among indigenous Cofán communities in Ecuador, Cepek

considers the extent to which the efforts of the Field Museum of Natural History (in Chicago) to promote scientific conservation among the Cofán can be characterized as an instance of *environmentality*—a term that Cepek (2011) takes from Agrawal (2005), who suggested that environmentalist projects can be productively engaged as forms of governmentality in the Foucauldian sense" (501). For Cepek, in the end, the museum's programs of scientific conservation—while regulatory regimes par excellence—generate not a "governmental subjectivity" among the Cofán people but a critical "alienated consciousness," a form of subjectivity that exceeds the logic of the regulatory regime itself. Lastly, Peutz's (2011) study of "Bedouin abjection"—the recurrent tendency of her interlocutors, the Soqotran pastoralists of Yemen, to demean themselves in everyday conversation through negatively valuing their identity as Bedouin (e.g., "We are ignorant; we are Bedouin")—reflects a complementary interest in the ways that particular forms of "cosmopolitan critique" can emerge in the meeting of indigenous communities and global classificatory regimes Peutz argues that these practices of self-disparagement—rather than confirming long-standing stereotypes of Bedouin as "primitive" and "backwards"—operate as an "ironic assessment of the Soqotran pastoral present" and, with the designation of the Soqotra Archipelago as a UNESCO World Heritage site, a critique of the global hierarchies of value they found themselves entering.

Mindful that the questions organizing this review can be stretched only so far—"indigeneity," after all, is not a concept that holds a great deal of purchase in the Middle East—I want to instead conclude this section by reflecting on the significance of indigeneity for anthropological futures. In a powerful commentary on Orin Starn's (2011) article "Here Come the Anthros (Again)"—which argues that anthropology and Native America have recently experienced a tentative "rapprochement," most clearly evidenced in the increasing number of Native people in the discipline—Audra Simpson raises difficult questions about such a "statistical premise" for historical remedy. I want to end by quoting Simpson at length, because it is important—for both the study of indigeneity, as well as the future of the discipline:

> The statistical premise is a way of acknowledging the genocidal origins of North America, whereby a few "survivors," representing "survivals" (and, thence, representatives) of an earlier order or an experience, perhaps may be incorporated into discipline and institutions and thence make the space better, or more just. Their incorporation is meant to heal the violence that made their numbers thin and therefore their presence significant. However, statistical, representative forms of justice are never enough and are never going to be enough in the normative order of things. . . . What is needed is, yes, more people, more Native people in all disciplinary locations, of course, but paired with structures, peoples, and institutions that labor for a radically different historical consciousness, one that is deeply cognizant of the means of its own societal production so that it may afford Indigeneity (and the conditions of many others) a robust present as well as a vigorous, variegated past and future. [Simpson 2011: 211–212]

CONCLUSION

In addition to the 50th anniversary of the publication of Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth,* the year 2011 also marked the 25th anniversary of the publication of *Writing Culture* (Clifford and Marcus 1986) and *Anthropology as a Cultural Critique* (Marcus and Fischer 1986). Unlike the anniversary of *Wretched of the Earth*, however, anthropology did take note. The publication of *Writing Culture* was marked by a conference organized jointly by the journal *Cultural Anthropology* and Duke University's department of anthropology ("Writing Culture at 25: Theory/Ethnography/Fieldwork"), as well as the release of a 25th anniversary edition of *Writing Culture*. In turn, the publication of *Anthropology as Cultural Critique* was marked by a two-day symposium at MIT and Harvard University ("25th Anniversary Celebration of *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*"). As I wind up this year's review, it seems only fitting—given these anniversaries—that I end on a reflexive note. I want to conclude, that is, by addressing an important opportunity for us to be self-reflexive as a field about our colonial legacy.

First, however, I feel compelled to eulogize all that was left out in the making of this review, as well as note some promising experiments and innovations in anthropological publishing. Although I have used the "Arab Spring" to organize this review of cultural anthropology in 2011, there were surely other events that could have served a similar purpose and likely led to a different sort of review. There were also additional themes I could have explored or alternate tags around which the above could be reorganized, such as food in both its production and consumption (Barlett 2011; Croegaert 2011; Gagne 2011; Hirsch 2011; B. Weiss 2011; Zlolniski 2011); ecology, environment, and resources (Anand 2011; Kaplan 2011; Reno 2011a, 2011b; Smith 2011; Zlolniski 2011); finance and corporate life (Aiello and Brooks 2011); gender and sexuality (Boellstorff 2011; Dave 2011; Inhorn and Wentzell 2011; Mitchell 2011), gift exchange (Gagne 2011; Lambek 2011; Venaktesan 2011; Anderson 2011; Buggenhagen 2011; H. Weiss 2011b), or even neoliberalism (although, as a concept, it seemed to be everywhere, yet nowhere in particular). Alongside these alternate themes, there were also certain geographic trends that I am not sure what to make of, namely the disproportionate presence of Israel as a setting for ethnographic research (E. Cohen 2011; Hirsch 2011; Sosis and Handwerker 2011; E. Weiss 2011; H. Weiss 2011a, b). Lastly, there is insufficient space to adequately address the silences, such as those themes that occupied my predecessors (such as "security," "humanitarianism," and "natureculture") and were effectively absent from the journal publications I considered.

The 2011 year in anthropological publishing witnessed several prominent experiments in format, the expansion of venues for scholarly discourse, and the emergence of new venues altogether. One notable trend was the increased traffic between journals and blogs. For instance an early draft of Hirschkind's article "Is There a Secular Body?" appeared first

on the blog *The Immanent Frame*, as did an interview with Jean Comaroff that was later republished in *Cultural Anthropology* as "Anthropology, Theology, Critical Pedagogy" (Comaroff and Kim 2011). A number of journals also invested more resources into developing an online copresence. *Cultural Anthropology* stands out in this respect. With nearly each of its published articles, the journal has a dedicated "Essay Supple-Mental" site that contains photographs, videos, interviews with authors, teaching questions, relevant links, additional readings, and additional works by authors. The journal also launched in 2011 a "Hot Spots" forum (which has thus far included forums on the earthquake/tsunami/nuclear disaster in Japan and the debt crisis in Greece) as well as "playlists" (wherein members of the editorial board are asked to share the books they are currently reading). This joins a longer running online feature of "Virtual Issues" dedicated to selected themes, a feature that is now also offered by *American Anthropologist*. Finally, in these times of for-profit, private media consolidation, it is worth mentioning the launch of *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, an international peer-reviewed, open-access online journal that "aims to situate ethnography as the prime heuristic of anthropology, and return it to the forefront of conceptual developments in the discipline" (http://www.haujournal.org/index.php/hau).

The remarkable range of topics considered by cultural anthropologists in 2011 suggest that anthropology is well positioned to take on whatever comes its way in 2012—whether it be a prolonged "Arab Spring," a repositioned "Occupy Movement," or any number of less "timely" but all the more important topics that have long animated anthropological inquiry. Although anthropology's future as an intellectual enterprise appears secure, what of its future as a profession? With this question in mind, I want to conclude my review by drawing attention to an important report published last year in *American Anthropologist*, "Anthropology as White Public Space" (Brodkin et al. 2011). Concerned with the extent to which anthropology has been successful in becoming racially inclusive as a discipline, the report asks: "[H]as anthropology in fact decolonized its standard practices and internal culture?" Given anthropology's expertise in speaking about difference, and bearing witness to the violence of exclusions of various sorts, how well does it walk the walk? Based on an online survey of anthropology graduate students and faculty of color undertaken by the AAA Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology, the report concludes that the field has not done well. The problems are many: departmental labor is divided in ways that assign to faculty and graduate students of color responsibilities that have lower status and rewards than those of their white counterparts, the careers of graduate students and faculty of color continue to be marked by social and professional marginalization, practices of race avoidance are common in dealing with racial issues in departmental practice, a remarkable lack of reflexivity in matters concerning race pervade the discipline (such as the common presumption that one's training as an anthropologist inoculates one against racism),

and there remains a general hostility toward conceptual work that falls outside of a white-centered canon. These practices, among others, convey a message that "minority anthropologists are not full professionals" and make many anthropology departments feel like "white-owned social and intellectual spaces" (2011). As this report makes abundantly clear, despite some modest achievements, anthropology has a long way to go in its project of decolonization. Beyond providing perhaps another reason for anthropology's ambivalent relationship with Fanon's writings, this report puts before us difficult questions that demand serious attention and robust responses, responses that cannot, as Simpson warns, be limited to a "statistical premise" for historical remedy.

Christopher Dole *Department of Anthropology, Amherst College, Amherst, MA 01002*

NOTES

1. See the forum in the *Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy* entitled "Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth*, Fifty Years Later" (Drabinski 2011). For a relevant discussion of debates regarding "postcolonial studies" in France, see the special issue "Racial France" of *Public Culture* (Roitman 2011).
2. I feel compelled to note that 2011 was also the year that witnessed the passing of the poet, musician, and spoken word artist Gil Scott-Heron, who famously composed "The Revolution Will Not Be Televised."
3. Beyond the forum "Secularism" in *Cultural Anthropology*, the critical study of secularism would find several additional settings for further elaboration in 2011, namely in the publication of such texts as *Rethinking Secularism* (Calhoun, Juergensmeyer, and Vanantwerpen 2011) and *Secularism and Religion-Making* (Dressler and Mandair 2011), which followed on the heels of significant texts from 2010 such as Warner, VanAntwerpen, and Calhoun's *Varieties of Secularism in a Secular Age* (2010) and Cannell's review article "The Anthropology of Secularism" (2010).
4. Although not (yet) a theme that warrants its own section, here too we can identify a number of additional scholars writing in 2011 who developed related critiques of secularism through their engagement with a concept of "political theology." See, for instance, Singh's essay on the "political theology of the neighbor" (2011), which I discuss later, as well as the double panel "Political Theologies" held at the 2011 American Anthropological Association meetings in Montreal (organized by Singh and Stefania Pandolfo). Paul Kahn's *Political Theology: Four New Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, a book released in 2011 that received much critical attention on the SSRC blog *The Immanent Frame*, is of additional relevance here.

5. Hardt is not, of course, the first to raise such questions—about either love or its scales. Povinelli, in The Empire of Love, characterized her project as an attempt to "conceptualize a set of systematic relations between forms of love and forms of liberal governance in empire without reducing these relations to a singular kind of scale of power, to analogy, description, or rumor." Stoler (2002), among others, has in turn examined the ways that political rationalities of the modern state rely on a host of techniques for managing affect.

6. It is worth observing that these studies of affect rarely if ever acknowledge the history of anthropological interest in emotion (see Lutz and White 1986).

7. The continued salience of kinship in 2011 is also worthy of note here. See Sahlin's two-part, "Frazerian-style piece" that aims to "solve the 150-year-old problem of what kinship is" (2011b: 1–2, 2011a), Lambek's (2011) essay on kinship as "succession" rather than "reproduction"; Cannell's (2011) study of popular genealogy in East Anglia; Rapp and Ginsburg's (2011) essay on disability and the reimagining of kinship narratives; and Collard and Kashmeri's (2011) study of reconfiguring notions of siblingship within embryo-adoption programs.

8. Angela Garcia's (2010) study of heroin addiction in northern New Mexico—whose audience would grow substantially in 2011—comes to mind here, in that she writes persuasively about commensurability as "remaining in the face of one another's unshared vulnerabilities" (68).

9. Bielo's (2011) examination of the work of urban missional evangelicals in the United States to cultivate a sense of place could be read as expressing a similar desire for escape and emotional fulfillment: "Grounded in a cultural logic that seeks distance from suburban evangelicalism [embodied by the suburban 'megachurch'], the urban missional sense of place exists as a lived critique of modernity" (267).

10. Although not explicitly about the "environment" as a place-to-be-made, I want to mention here Ness's study of rock climbers in Yosemite National Park (2011). Similarly interested in the intersection of bodily experience, meaning-making, and place, Ness explores the ways that Yosemite's ideological construction (within America's national-environmental imaginary) relates to its place-making and experience by rock climbers.

REFERENCES CITED

Agrawal, Arun
  2005 Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Ahn, Junehui
  2011 "You're My Friend Today, But Not Tomorrow": Learning to Be Friends among Young U.S. Middle-Class Children. American Ethnologist 38(2):294–306.
Aiello, Leslie, and James Brooks, eds.
  2011 Corporate Lives: New Perspectives on the Social Life of the Corporate Form. Theme issue, Current Anthropology 52(S3).
Alexy, Allison
  2011 Intimate Dependence and its Risks in Neoliberal Japan. Anthropological Quarterly 84(4):895–918.

Anand, Nikhil
  2011 Pressure: The PoliTechnics of Water Supply in Mumbai. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):542–564.
Anderson, Paul
  2011 "The Piety of the Gift": Selfhood and Sociality in the Egyptian Mosque Movement. Anthropological Theory 11(3):3–21.
Anjaria, Jonathan Shapiro
  2011 Ordinary States: Everyday Corruption and the Politics of Space in Mumbai. American Ethnologist 38(1):58–72.
Asad, Talal
  2011 Thinking about the Secular Body, Pain, and Liberal Politics. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):657–675.
Barlett, Peggy F.
  2011 Campus Sustainable Food Projects: Critique and Engagement. American Anthropologist 113(1):101–115.
Berlant, Lauren
  2011 A Properly Political Concept of Love: Three Approaches in Ten Pages. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):683–691.
Bessire, Lucas
  2011 Apocalyptic Futures: The Violent Transformation of Moral Human Life among Ayoreo-Speaking People of the Paraguayan Gran Chaco. American Ethnologist 38(4):743–757.
Bielo, James S.
  2011 Purity, Danger, and Redemption: Notes on Urban Missional Evangelicals. American Ethnologist 38(2):267–280.
Boeck, Filip De
  2011 Inhabiting Ocular Ground: Kinshasa's Future in the Light of Congo's Spectral Urban Politics. Cultural Anthropology 26(2):263–286.
Boellstorff, Tom
  2011 But Do Not Identify as Gay: A Proleptic Genealogy of the MSM Category. Cultural Anthropology 26(2):287–312.
Bonilla, Yarimar
  2011 The Past is Made by Walking: Labor Activism and Historical Production in Postcolonial Guadeloupe. Cultural Anthropology 26(3):313–339.
Brenner, Suzanne
  2011 Private Moralities in the Public Sphere: Democratization, Islam, and Gender in Indonesia. American Anthropologist 113(3):478–490.
Brodkin, Karen, Sandra Morgen, and Janis Hutchinson
  2011 Anthropology as White Public Space? American Anthropologist 113(4):545–556.
Buggenhagen, Beth
  2011 Are Births Just "Women's Business"? Gift exchange, Value, and Global Volatility in Muslim Senegal. American Ethnologist 38(4):714–732.
Calhoun, Craig, Mark Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan Vanantwerpen, eds.
  2011 Rethinking Secularism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cannell, Fenella
  2010 The Anthropology of Secularism. Annual Review of Anthropology 39:85–100.
  2011 English Ancestors: The Moral Possibilities of Popular Genealogy. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 17(3):462–480.

Casey, Edward

1996 How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena. *In* Senses of Place. K. Basso and S. Feld, eds. Pp. 13–52. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Cepek, Michael L.

2011 Foucault in the Forest: Questioning Environmentality in Amazonia. American Ethnologist 38(3):501–515.

Clifford, James, and George Marcus

1986 Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coe, Cati

2011 What Is the Impact of Transnational Migration on Family Life? Women's Comparisons of Internal and International Migration in a Small Town in Ghana. American Ethnologist 38(1):148–163.

Cohen, Einat Bar-On

2011 Events of Organicity: The State Abducts the War Machine. Anthropological Theory 11(3):259–282.

Collard, Chantal, and Shireen Kashmeri

2011 Embryo Adoption: Emergent Forms of Siblingship among Snowflake Families. American Ethnologist 38(2):307–322.

Comaroff, Jean, and David Kyuman Kim

2011 Anthropology, Theology, Critical Pedagogy: A Conversation with Jean Comaroff and David Kyuman Kim. Cultural Anthropology 26(2):158–178.

Connolly, William

2011 Some Theses on Secularism. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):648–656.

Croegaert, Ana

2011 Who Has Time for Ćejf? Postsocialist Migration and Slow Coffee in Neoliberal Chicago. American Anthropologist 113(3):463–477.

Dave, Naisargi

2011 Indian and Lesbian and What Came Next: Affect, Commensuration, and Queer Emergences. American Ethnologist 38(4):650–665.

Drabinski, John, ed.

2011 Frantz Fanon's Wretched of the Earth, Fifty Years Later. Theme issue, Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy 19(1).

Dressler, Markus, and Arvind Mandair, eds.

2011 Secularism and Religion-Making. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, Brad

2011 Utopian Virtues: Muslim Neighbors, Ritual Sociality, and the Politics of Convivència. American Ethnologist 38(1):114–131.

Fanon, Frantz

1961 Les damnés de la terre (*Wretched of the earth*). Paris: F. Maspero.

Fitz-Henry, Erin

2011 Distant Allies, Proximate Enemies: Rethinking the Scales of the Antibase Movement in Ecuador. American Ethnologist 38(2):323–337.

Gagné, Nana Okura

2011 Eating Local in a U.S. City: Reconstructing "Community"—a Third Place—in a Global Neoliberal Economy. American Ethnologist 38(2):281–293.

Garcia, Angela

2010 The Pastoral Clinic: Addiction and Dispossession along the Rio Grande. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gershon, Ilana

2011 Un-Friend My Heart: Facebook, Promiscuity, and Heartbreak in a Neoliberal Age. Anthropological Quarterly 84(4):865–894.

Ghannam, Farha

2011 Mobility, Liminality, and Embodiment in Urban Egypt. American Ethnologist 38(4):790–800.

Han, Clara

2011 Symptoms of Another Life: Time, Possibility, and Domestic Relations in Chile's Credit Economy. Cultural Anthropology 26(1):7–32.

Hardt, Michael

2011 For Love or Money. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):676–682.

Hirsch, Dafna

2011 "Hummus Is Best When It Is Fresh and Made by Arabs": The Gourmetization of Hummus in Israel and the Return of the Repressed Arab. American Ethnologist 38(4):617–630.

Hirschkind, Charles

2011 Is There a Secular Body? Cultural Anthropology 26(4):633–647.

Inhorn, Marcia C., and Emily A. Wentzell

2011 Embodying Emergent Masculinities: Men Engaging with Reproductive and Sexual Health Technologies in the Middle East and Mexico. American Ethnologist 38(4):801–815.

Jackson, Deborah Davis

2011 Scents of Place: The Dysplacement of a First Nations Community in Canada. American Anthropologist 113(4):606–618.

Kahn, Paul

2011 Political Theology: Four New Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kaplan, Martha

2011 Lonely Drinking Fountains and Comforting Coolers: Paradoxes of Water Value and Ironies of Water Use. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):514–541.

Kendzior, Sarah

2011 Digital Distrust: Uzbek Cynicism and Solidarity in the Internet Age. American Ethnologist 38(3):559–575.

Lambek, Michael

2011 Kinship as Gift and Theft: Acts of Succession in Mayotte and Ancient Israel. American Ethnologist 38(1):2–16.

Low, Setha M.

2011 Claiming Space for an Engaged Anthropology: Spatial Inequality and Social Exclusion. American Anthropologist 113(3):389–407.

Lutz, Catherine, and Geoffrey White

1986 The Anthropology of Emotions. Annual Review of Anthropology 15:405–36.

Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer
  1986 Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
McCormack, Fiona
  2011 Levels of Indigeneity: The Maori and Neoliberalism. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 17:281–300.
Melly, Caroline M.
  2011 Titanic Tales of Missing Men: Reconfigurations of National Identity and Gendered Presence in Dakar, Senegal. American Ethnologist 38(2):361–376.
Meskell, Lynn
  2002 Negative Heritage and Past Mastering in Archaeology. Anthropological Quarterly 75(3):557–574.
Middleton, C. Townsend
  2011 Across the Interface of State Ethnography: Rethinking Ethnology and Its Subjects in Multicultural India. American Ethnologist 38(2):249–266.
Mitchell, Gregory
  2011 TurboConsumers^TM in Paradise: Tourism, Civil Rights, and Brazil's Gay Sex Industry. American Ethnologist 38(4):666–682.
Muehlebach, Andrea
  2011 On Affective Labor in Post-Fordist Italy. Cultural Anthropology 26(1):59–82.
Murphy, John
  2011 Protest or Riot?: Interpreting Collective Action in Contemporary France. Anthropological Quarterly 84(4):977–1010.
Murray, Wendi Field, Maria Nieves Zedeño, Kacy L. Hollenback, Calvin Grinnell, and Elgin Crows Breast
  2011 The Remaking of Lake Sakakawea: Locating Cultural Viability in Negative Heritage on the Missouri River. American Ethnologist 38(3):468–483.
Ness, Sally Ann
  2011 Bouldering in Yosemite: Emergent Signs of Place and Landscape. American Anthropologist 113(1):71–87.
Pardue, Derek
  2011 Place Markers: Tracking Spatiality in Brazilian Hip-Hop and Community Radio. American Ethnologist 38(1):102–113.
Pellow, Deborah
  2011 Internal Transmigrants: A Dagomba Diaspora. American Ethnologist 38(1):132–147.
Peutz, Nathalie
  2011 Bedouin "Abjection": World Heritage, Worldliness, and Worthiness at the Margins of Arabia. American Ethnologist 38(2):338–360.
Pollan, Michael
  2007 The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals. New York: Penguin.
Povinelli, Elizabeth
  2006 The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality. Durham: Duke University Press.
Rapp, Rayna, and Faye Ginsburg
  2011 Reverberations: Disability and the New Kinship Imaginary. Anthropological Quarterly 84(2):379–410.

Rapport, Nigel
  2011 The Liberal Treatment of Difference: An Untimely Meditation on Culture and Civilization. Current Anthropology 52(5):687–710.
Reichman, Daniel
  2011 Migration and Paraethnography in Honduras. American Ethnologist 38(3):548–558.
Reno, Joshua
  2011a Motivated Markets: Instruments and Ideologies of Clean Energy in the United Kingdom. Cultural Anthropology 26(3):389–413.
  2011b Beyond Risk: Emplacement and the Production of Environmental Evidence. American Ethnologist 38(3):516–530.
Roitman, Janet, ed.
  2011 Racial France. Theme issue, Public Culture 23(1).
Rosenblatt, Daniel
  2011 Indigenizing the City and the Future of Maori Culture: The Construction of Community in Auckland as Representation, Experience, and Self-Making. American Ethnologist 38(3):411–429.
Rudnyckyj, Daromir
  2011 Circulating Tears and Managing Hearts: Governing Through Affect in an Indonesian Steel Factory. Anthropological Theory 11(1):63–87.
Sahlins, Marshall
  2011a What Kinship Is (Part One). Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 17:2–19.
  2011b What Kinship Is (Part Two). Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 17:227–242.
Scherer, Matthew
  2011 Landmarks in the Critical Study of Secularism. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):621–632.
Scott, David, and Charles Hirschkind
  2006 Powers of the Secular Modern: Talal Asad and His Interlocutors. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Simpson, Audra
  2011 Settlement's Secret. Cultural Anthropology 26(2):205–217.
Singh, Bhrigupati
  2011 Agonistic Intimacy and Moral Aspiration in Popular Hinduism: A Study in the Political Theology of the Neighbor. American Ethnologist 38(3):430–450.
Smith, James H.
  2011 Tantalus in the Digital Age: Coltan Ore, Temporal Dispossession, and "Movement" in the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. American Ethnologist 38(1):17–35.
Sosis, Richard, and W. Penn Handwerker
  2011 Psalms and Coping with Uncertainty: Religious Israeli Women's Responses to the 2006 Lebanon War. American Anthropologist 113(1):40–55.
Starn, Orin
  2011 Here Come the Anthros (Again): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America. Cultural Anthropology 26(2):179–204.
Stoler, Ann
  2002 Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the

Intimate in Colonial Rule. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Susser, Ida
 2011 Organic Intellectuals, Crossing Scales, and the Emergence of Social Movements with Respect to AIDS in South Africa. American Ethnologist 38(4):733–742.

Tambar, Kabir
 2011 Iterations of Lament: Anachronism and Affect in a Shi'i Islamic Revival in Turkey. American Ethnologist 38(3):484–500.

Venkatesan, Soumhya
 2011 The Social Life of a "Free" Gift. American Ethnologist 38(1):47–57.

Vora, Neha
 2011 From Golden Frontier to Global City: Shifting Forms of Belonging, "Freedom," and Governance among Indian Businessmen in Dubai. American Anthropologist 113(2):306–318.

Warner, Michael, Jonathan VanAntwerpen, and Craig Calhoun, eds.
 2010 Varieties of Secularism in a Secular Age. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weiss, Brad
 2011 Making Pigs Local: Discerning the Sensory Character of Place. Cultural Anthropology 26(3):438–461.

Weiss, Erica
 2011 The Interrupted Sacrifice: Hegemony and Moral Crisis among Israeli Conscientious Objectors. American Ethnologist 38(3):576–588.

Weiss, Hadas
 2011a On Value and Values in a West Bank Settlement. American Ethnologist 38(1):36–46.
 2011b Gift and Value in Jerusalem's Third Sector. American Anthropologist 113(4):594–605.

Willow, Anna J.
 2011 Conceiving Kakipitatapitmok: The Political Landscape of Anishinaabe Anticlearcutting Activism. American Anthropologist 113(2):262–276.

Witsoe, Jeffrey
 2011a Corruption as Power: Caste and the Political Imagination of the Postcolonial State. American Ethnologist 38(1):73–85.
 2011b Rethinking Postcolonial Democracy: An Examination of the Politics of Lower-Caste Empowerment in North India. American Anthropologist 113(4):619–631.

Zlolniski, Christian
 2011 Water Flowing North of the Border: Export Agriculture and Water Politics in a Rural Community in Baja California. Cultural Anthropology 26(4):565–588.