

Second, Chatterjee's contrast between political and civil society is, contrary to his claim, not applicable to most of the world, and therefore his focus on "governmentality" cannot account for the contemporary situation in which three-fourths of humanity formulates its politics. In much of the postcolonial world about which Chatterjee writes, the major problem is not ubiquitous governmentality but, rather, the complete paucity of legitimate governing instances. The forms of subaltern activity in nondemocratic states, unconcerned with local political representation, do not resemble those in India. The vigorous assertion of tribal or religious identifications, true for rich and poor alike, is a pattern in much of central and sub-Saharan Africa, much of the Middle East, and parts of South and Southeast Asia. It follows directly from the lack of a meaningful relationship with the state. Populations in countries marked by postwar or post-civil war situations also have little access to either civil or political society. Even in countries with strong states, such as Egypt, Pakistan, or Peru, the state strengthens its militaries and police while largely retreating from the administration of justice, education, or welfare. Most people in these places simply do not count; there are no benefits from the government for them to obtain.

This said, there is something romantic about Chatterjee's recovery of the "politics of the governed," which others call "the weapons of the weak." Certainly these struggles have significance for those engaged in them, but to elevate them to the status of an effective "politics" seems largely the wish of theory. To make this claim, he needs a comparative analysis that would establish how the effects of the Dalit or Muslim struggles for representation in the Indian state distinguish themselves from other such struggles, such as indigenous Indians in Bolivia, or minority ethnoreligious and tribal representation in Lebanon or Egypt. The very specific hierarchies of caste, race, and tribe would then come to the fore, which might lead, in the Indian context, to more analysis of the Hindu claims of inclusion. Chatterjee is well aware of this point and has written astutely on it elsewhere. Here, in his analysis of the Dalit leader Ambedkar, he makes reference to how Gandhi insisted on keeping the "repressed classes" in the Hindu fold. But he directs our attention to "ambivalence" rather than to the violent hierarchies that are the terms of this inclusion.

Third, Chatterjee affirms "heterogeneous time" against Benedict Anderson's "homogeneous empty time" at the risk of ignoring the unifying processes that the nation tends to initiate. Anderson would surely agree that there are lived differences within the nation, but when are they significant? His point is not that the nation creates homogeneity but, instead, that it supersedes appeals to other posited "primordial" belongings and integrates people at a higher imaginative level, in a shared temporal journey, that nonetheless functions more like kinship than ideology. It seems as if the unifying claims of Hindutva in India (and among the many Indians in New Jersey, where I live) function much like national unifying processes and have had at least as much success in popular Indian politics as Dalit struggles for rep-

resentation. Given that the popular politics of Hindutva's followers belong to both political and civil society and that they are significant, I am puzzled that Chatterjee does not account for them in this same frame with Dalit struggles.

Demanding Accountability: Civil-Society Claims and the World Bank Inspection Panel. Dana Clark, Jonathan Fox, and Kay Treakle, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003. 311 pp.

PAUL E. LITTLE
University of Brasilia

Demanding Accountability is an important addition to the growing literature on global governance, transnational civil society, and multilateral lending agencies. Through an in-depth analysis of the first nine years of the World Bank Inspection Panel—from its establishment in late 1993 through 2002—it evaluates the effectiveness of this public accountability mechanism for projects financed by the World Bank. Nine case studies of claims brought to the panel are analyzed in separate chapters, involving four Asian countries—Nepal, Bangladesh, India, and China—and four Latin American countries—Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, and Chile.

The strengths of the book lie in its policy focus and its actor-based approach to analysis of the cases. An introduction by Jonathan Fox sets forth the thematic focus of the book, while the first chapter by Dana Clark presents the origins, creation, and evolution of the inspection panel. The first and the last claims presented—Arjun III Hydroelectric Project in Nepal and the China Western Poverty Reduction Project—are the most dramatic, because they led to the cancellation of World Bank financing for the projects. The other cases present more mixed results, ranging from partial project reform, the implementation of bank-devised action plans, compensation for some impacted groups, and rejection of the claim as ineligible.

Because the claims originate within civil society, the case analyses are generally presented from the point of view of the claimants. As an anthropologist, I would have liked a little more attention to the specific cultural politics that lie behind their claims against the projects, particularly given the diversity of civil-society claimants: Char island dwellers in Bangladesh; rubber tappers and landless peasants in Brazil; and Tibetan and Mongol peoples in China. The addition of one or two African cases would have enriched the empirical analysis.

The chapter by David Hunter, Cristián Opaso, and Marcos Orellano, on the Biobio Dam Project in Chile, is particularly strong. It explains how opposition to the dam project by the Pehuenche indigenous peoples was linked to their religious beliefs, cultural self-identity, and ties to the land, and it identifies the impacts of the claim process from international, national, and local perspectives. Maria Rodrigues's chapter on the Planaforo environmental project in Brazil critically analyzes the factors that led to the

empowerment of civil society groups, while indicating that they have not yet been able to structurally alter the balance of political forces in the state of Rondônia. In several chapters, interview material, presented in boxes, adds local voices to the analysis and reveals some of the divisions among the civil society claimants.

The documentation of numerous examples of Bank management stonewalling, subverting, or preempting the claims brought to the Inspection Panel offers a general critique of the World Bank, although the analysis of the second review and subsequent reform of the Inspection Panel in 1999 does indicate that there are dissident tendencies in the Bank that do indeed take public accountability seriously. The analyses here do not, however, confront the issue of whether the mechanisms of public accountability by multilateral lending agencies serve, in the long-run, to give legitimacy to environmentally destructive and socially unjust development projects, even though the World Bank and national governments are required to mitigate, or compensate, for the worst of these impacts. In this framework, some dialogue with the more radical critics of the World Bank—those that led the campaign “fifty (now sixty) years is enough” and call for the abolition of the World Bank—would have given the reader a fuller notion of the types of debates that are occurring within transnational civil society.

Closing chapters on “Lessons Learned” and “Concluding Propositions” by the editors present a good evaluative overview of the cases, including five excellent charts that document all of the 28 claims brought to the inspection panel during its first nine years of existence. One issue that could have been further developed in these concluding analyses is that of sovereignty. The appeal to the sanctity of sovereignty by receptor national governments as a means of blocking inspection panel claims, and the subsequent support they received by World Bank management, was often met by opposing alliances of industrial northern governments and southern civil-society actors. This fascinating material reveals some of the complexity of alliance building on an international scale between civil society and governmental actors and deserves to be critically and theoretically discussed.

These comments should not, however, detract from the strong points of this excellent book: a vast array of information about a host of development projects, combined with solid policy analysis concerning the pressing issue of accountability in the global governing sphere.

Blackfellas, Whitefellas and the Hidden Injuries of Race.
Gillian Cowlshaw. Williston, VT: Blackwell, 2004. 272 pp.

FRANCESCA C. MERLAN
The Australian National University

In Australia, from around the early 1970s, there was a shift in both formal and informal policies and practices of discrimination and repression toward Aborigines. After decades of efforts toward assimilation, there emerged a fed-

eral policy of self-determination, and the national government assumed powers to legislate with respect to Aboriginal affairs, sharing and negotiating them thenceforth with state governments.

Cowlshaw's book locates us squarely in contemporary, unsettled relationships subsequent to those shifts. Aborigines have been invited to be self-defining, but the idealized expectations that have come to underlie such a notion grant little recognition, understanding, or legitimacy to Aboriginal sociality as it exists in practice. A leitmotif of the book, framing beginning and end, is the “riot,” in which some significance is to be accorded to the qualifying quotation marks, which feature in quite a number of newspaper reports of such events.

In a number of Australian country towns and cities over the past fifteen years or so, street battles have taken place between Aborigines and (mainly) police. These have sometimes been called “riots”; the last one in Sydney's Redfern district occurred in February, 2004.

The book opens with the “riot,” which took place on the night of December 5, 1997, in Cowlshaw's field site, Bourke: a rural town of northern New South Wales, population 3,500. An earlier “riot” had occurred there in August 1986. Sydney newspapers reported that 150 drinkers attacked police with rocks and bottles and vandalized shops and offices. Among the resulting charges against 25 juveniles and adults were “assaulting police,” “affray,” and “violent disorder.” These were the more serious versions of the humorously named “trifecta” (a bet on three horses to place) of charges commonly laid against Aborigines: offensive language, resisting arrest, and assaulting police.

Cowlshaw relays a variety of perspectives on the Bourke events. One indigenous participant was bemused at accusations he had “started the riot” (p. xi). As he saw it, he had weighed into a “blue” (brawl) involving his nephew on the town square near the pub, called a policeman a “gutless bastard,” and then taken up the cop's invitation to “Hit me big man,” clocking him under the chin and knocking him out. “I can't see how I started the riot,” he concludes (p. xi). The word *riot*, despite all qualifications, is on everyone's lips, black and white.

Cowlshaw wants to “show the sense this riot makes as an element of the dynamic relationship between white and black citizens and as an expression of racial identities” (p. 247). She asks how it is possible, despite long-term interaction between whites and Murriss (Aborigines), that racial dichotomization retains its clarity and power. She examines the “cultures of complaint” (pp. xiv, 36–55, 194) that Murriss and whites levy against each other: destructiveness, drunkenness, idleness, and disreputable behavior on the one hand, versus charges of exclusionary, harassing, and victimizing behavior on the other. Bourke, like many similar towns and city areas, has a stigmatized reputation as a site of social tensions and marred relations. Pervasive national discourses of concern tend to cast Aborigines, past and present, as victims. The new era is one in which Australian society has explored and sought to recognize as never before what