but these sorts of challenges can still arise. This procedure may seem like an excess of caution, but in court a lawyer can create doubts in the minds of the jury even when no realistic danger of contamination existed. I also found the discussion about possible traumatic after-effects on the fieldworkers and mortuary staff rather cursory. Such effects can occur and require expert (and experienced) counseling in addition to standard debriefing procedures. The authors are clearly aware of these issues but could have said more about them, especially in light of their more thorough discussions of how to anticipate and cope with the emotional problems of survivors and victims' relatives.

The protocols for archaeological recovery of evidence are matched by a detailed review of criteria and procedures in processing human remains through the use of forensic anthropology. This approach serves as a tool for class identification that can narrow the parameters of the identification by estimating biological sex, age at death, stature, ancestry, physical trauma, and pathology. These can then be compared with dental, DNA, and sometimes fingerprint evidence that can provide specific victim identification. All of these protocols are post-mortem procedures that rely upon comparisons with ante-mortem data from the affected population. I found it odd that the review of ante-mortem data-collection procedures came at the end of the book and seemed somewhat disconnected from the earlier presentation of mortuary operations. In reality, ante- and post-mortem data collection often take place simultaneously and, ideally, produce a progressive effort at cross-checking until a credible and convincing match is achieved. The essential ante-mortem procedures could have been included with the review of mortuary operations to make it easier to relate to the overall victim-identification process.

All protocols and standard operating procedures in fields related to criminal investigation and emergency services are "moving targets" that require constant revision in the light of new scientific methods, technical improvements, and unexpected applications during actual emergencies. While pointing out the importance of standardized, scientifically-grounded procedures, the authors also note that, "...flexibility of application is paramount" (p. 18). There is no easy way to ensure that one does not become a prisoner of one's own protocols. Human-rights investigators will always have to exercise judgement when it comes to choosing and applying the different methods and expertise available to them. This volume is not a cookbook of recipes to be followed exactly under all conditions. It offers, instead, a comprehensive menu of options that have been carefully rationalized in relation to foreseeable medico-legal realities. The investigator is still, however, challenged to make intelligent and humane choices according to the proven methods and acceptable medico-legal standards presented here. I expect to see this book used widely as a reference by anthropologists, archaeologists, and other forensic practitioners in a variety of situations that call for investigators to establish the physical facts of a criminal activity or a disaster event in a credible and convincing manner. This is tough work, and the people who do it need all the clear guidance and good science they can get. Bravo on an excellent book!

Richard A. Gould

Department of Anthropology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912 U.S.A.

in J-STAGE (www.jstage.jst.go.jp) DOI: 10.1537/ase.08br02

© 2008 The Anthropological Society of Nippon

Ethnic Identity and Religion in the India-Bangladesh Borderlands.

By Antu Saha. The Edwin Mellen Press, Ceredigion and Lewiston, NY, 2007. ISBN 978-0-7734-5260-1. xxii + 203 pp. \$109.95 (cloth).

Sparing as much as two thirds of the volume (126 out of 182 pages) for the introduction, theories, methodology, history and preliminary information on the study field aside from the glossary, bibliography and index, this book reminds me of university lectures where I learned, as an undergraduate student with a major in South Asian area studies, how British India finally fragmented into three nation states, i.e., India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. The basic, but sometimes controversial, concepts of the social sciences such as nation, nation state, ethnicity and the like which are here included in the analytical framework, together with the recently highlighted concept of border, were also frequently discussed and critiqued in my postgraduate period. The main attraction of this book seems to be the ethnographic description of six months' survey on the borderlands both in India and in Bangladesh with associated analysis and discussion, but I can hardly hear the "voices" of the villagers with whom the author must have interacted and taken interviews. Ultimately, he reaches the conclusion that, "I have found myself in a difficult situation while defining Indo-Bangla border identities" (p. 179).

This book deals with border identity in Bengali speaking people. The author identifies language with culture. Linguistic identity as a Bengali native speaker is treated as identical with cultural/ethnic identity as Bengali. The author utilizes the dichotomy of state identity (Indian vs. Bangladeshi) and religious identity (Hindu vs. Muslim) to combine with the single ethnic identity (Bengali). Thus, his discussion can be said to examine a multidimensional Bengali identity having different state and religious identities with special reference to the border people between Bangladesh and West Bengal in India. In fact, Bangladesh, the former East Bengal, means "the state of Bengali" and Bangladeshi denotes the citizens of this state. There is thus no need to mention West Bengal.

The author assumes that the "Indo-Bangla border is a unique case study, which has substantive cultural and political dimensions to understand the border identities in a broader sense" (p. 177). Yet, whatever dimensions are exhibited in the Indo-Bangla borderland, they cannot be exactly alleged as substantive or unique from this particular case study if we look at other borderlands in the world today. As Anderson and O'Dowd (1999, p. 594) write, "every state border, every border region, is unique", and therefore, "local

particularities ... can only be understood in terms of wider conceptualization."

The fieldwork presented in this book was conducted in 2002 and 2003. Already more than 10 years have passed since the USSR collapsed into lots of newly independent states in Central Asia, creating many state borders in between. The author cannot assert any more the uniqueness of his case study, nor of the border he studied by discussing illegal trading, economic backwardness, the tendency of emigration to the center, free flow of the mass media, and extended community straddling of both territories of India and Bangladesh through cross-border marriage. His statement that the "Indo-Bangla border is new in its creation" (p. 177) is nothing but obsolete.

How could this book develop a more up-to-date discussion? Let me set aside the figures and facts collected by the author, and make comments solely on his theoretical settings, historical understanding, and stance as a fieldworker.

1) Since the author mentioned the global Islamization process and its impact on Bangladeshi Muslims (p. 136), it would be fruitful if he, instead of accepting the concept of secularism as well as the nation state, citizen and citizenship produced by Europeans in their own historical context, went as far as to raise the question of the validity of a European discipline (i.e., an Anthropology of Secularism) to apply to the Indian subcontinent, and to reconsider the differences between the secularism in South Asia and that of Europe.

To investigate and analyze multidimensional identities with religion, language and state in South Asia, it might be necessary to discover another framework and/or approaches than so called disciplines, as is suggested by the works of Talal Asad on the secular and secularism. The secularism of the European Modern, and the religion conceptualized by it, can be no more useful than it was before.

2) As for the "historical backdrop of [the] problem", the author should have referred to the 'The Nation Theory' advocated in 1940 by M.A. Jinnah to build a Muslim Pakistan (not an Islamic Pakistan at that time). Frankly speaking, I cannot understand why the author failed to mention this theory, although he spends several lines to narrate the partition of Bengal imposed by the British twice in 1905 and 1911 (p. 108, p. 116). Neither can I agree with his view that "why Jinnah suddenly shifted his stand from recognizing Pakistan as a theocratic state to [a] secular state is still a mystery" (p. 115). Even if the author's identity as an academic is not a historian but an anthropologist, he should at least have known the work by Ayesha Jalal (1985) focusing on the process of the formation of Pakistan.

3) Instead of manipulating plausible terminology such as border identity and border culture (p. 14), of which the definitions are not clear enough for discussion, it would have been more worthy to record the voices of local villagers in detail together with the observations of the interviewer. What impressed me the most are the last two sentences in Chapter 2. The author applies, as a running headline, "field experiences and constraints" to the concluding paragraphs, where he discloses his sentiments. "The sweet memories of my fieldwork tempted me to pay a visit to the place once again. Even now I cannot forget those days, which I have spent with border people" (p. 68). I could notice the similar

attachment of the author to the interviewees when I read the book entitled "The Other Side of Silence" by Urvashi Butalia (1998), in which Punjabis, another people divided into two political entities, emerge vividly in front of the reader. Why did Butalia succeed in making these people reappear?

How an author represents another's voice, where he/she demarcates "we" from "others" and in which manner, may be a sort of answer to this question. Although both authors are in a similar position with respect to the interviewees, their perception to the broader world beyond their own could have differed enough to make the qualitative gap. As is indicated by their name, Bengalis in Bangladesh are free from the confrontation with other ethnic groups. On the other hand, Bengalis in India occupy a more delicate position in Indian politics. In spite of his living in a non-Bengali speaking area like Delhi, the author seems to be unaware of the different implications of being a Bengali in an Indian context than in a Bangladeshi one. While in Bangladesh it is the overwhelmingly dominant language, Bengali is one of the major minority linguistic groups in North India, sometimes regarded as an equivalent to Tamil in South India. In India, Bengalis, as well as Tamils, are powerful enough to have once been against Hindi as an official language introduced by the Delhi government, but are unable to dominate even West Bengal province by allowing the Nepali language officially approved as an Indian language in the constitution. Thus, the political implication of being Bengali in India is not same as that in Bangladesh. What does it mean to be Bengali in the Indian context? How about in Bangladesh? This should have been taken into consideration in this book besides the significance of being Indian or Bangladeshi and Hindu or Muslim.

The author of this book is a Bengali Hindu living in Delhi as a Bangladeshi citizen, and this is the reason he admits that "this book is in effect also a story of my search into my own identity crisis" (p. 5). In the end, I could hear "the voice" of the author, not of the villagers in the borderlands. I hope that the author would be able to write another book on this very same subject by employing a more indigenous and innovative framework.

References

- Anderson J. and O'Dowd L. (1999) Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance. *Regional Studies*, 33(7): 593–604.
- Asad T. (2003) *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Butalia U. (1998) *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*. Viking Penguin India, Delhi.
- Jalal A. (1985) *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mayumi Yamamoto

Faculty of Humanities, Yamaguchi University, 1677-1 Yoshida, Yamaguchi 753-8540, Japan.

in J-STAGE (www.jstage.jst.go.jp) DOI: 10.1537/ase.08br03

© 2008 The Anthropological Society of Nippon