BOOK REVIEWS


Unnatural Emotions is a valuable work, contributing insights into Micronesian life and American culture. It sets new standards for ethnopsychology, the effort by anthropologists, especially students of Pacific societies, to appreciate the meaningful world of peoples in part through those peoples’ understandings of psychology.

The title is ironic: Ifaluk emotions are unnatural only from the Western view that emotions are somehow natural and universal. Lutz sets out to
deconstruct both academic and folk models that lead Americans to treat emotions as irrational and precultural. The ethnography of Ifaluk emotional life is presented not just for its own sake, but with a critical aim. (Such an aim may always underlie ethnography. Lutz is clear about her intentions and diligent in researching American culture along with Ifaluk.)

Lutz begins by introducing her project and Ifaluk together. She summarizes past and present ties between Ifaluk and the outside world well. She goes on to show how Ifaluk ideas shaped her role as a female ethnographer and hence shaped her research.

Next, broad cultural “views of emotion and self” are identified. The major chapter on Western ideas—dealing above all with the dominant culture in the United States—is a lucid account of views of emotions in relation to nature, rationality, control, physical being, subjectivity, gender, and value.

In the next chapter, Lutz defines and exemplifies Ifaluk notions of personhood and emotion/thought/desire. She shows that Ifaluk notions divide up the realm of psychological processes in a way quite distinct from American notions. Ifaluk concepts allot a role to human will in all psychological processes. They provide clearer indications of the social orientation of psychological states and processes than comparable American notions do.

At the heart of the book are deft analyses of the ideas, actions, and relationships in which fago ‘compassion’, song ‘justifiable anger’, and metagu ‘fear’ arise. Elucidating the Ifaluk understanding of song as a moral capacity, Lutz contrasts this view with American notions of anger, frustration, and control. (Pacific Islanders may find this chapter helpful as an account of Americans’ ambivalence and overreactions concerning anger.)

Ifaluk is known to anthropologists largely for Melford Spiro’s psychodynamic account of fear of ghosts. Spiro argued that inevitable anxieties that Ifaluk minimize and hostile feelings they seek to banish find an outlet in expectations of aggression by ghosts against humans. In this account, anxiety and anger are outside human reach.

Lutz in contrast seeks to learn what sort of dangers Ifaluk recognize, the various ways fear arises in Ifaluk lives, the communicative functions of fear, and the moral discourse fear supports. She accepts a functional analysis—fear of spirits and outsiders and drunks dramatizes the dangers of violence in a small community and wards against such violence. However, the emphasis is on the moral sense that fear makes, not on latent functions.

Lutz’s account is complex. One strand of the analysis is the relation between fear and justifiable anger. Superiors are appropriately angry when relatives of lower rank overstep normal bounds of decorum. Inferiors are appropriately fearful both when such anger is expressed and when it is likely to arise: “To the Ifaluk way of thinking, fear is what keeps people good.” Fear is a product of learning, an index of relationship, and a sign that a person accepts norms, not just a repressed by-product of earlier experience.

Spiro’s fear and Lutz’s fear differ even more than the two scholars’ explanations do. Lutz takes care not to
treat either American or Ifaluk concepts as underlying entities. Basically, she argues that her explanation is richer, not that Spiro’s is necessarily wrong.

Lutz goes on to distinguish among several varieties of emotion theories. These concluding remarks make explicit what the preceding anecdotes and analysis made vivid: theories of emotions as things separate from human moral activity presuppose alienation of the individual or the body from experience and relatedness. Lutz argues that emotional activity and talk illuminate social life in both Ifaluk and American worlds, so academic emotion theory must be considered a product of Western ideas, rather than a reflection of experience.

Lutz has largely succeeded in presenting Ifaluk lives and discourse as having meaning apart from Western preconceptions of them. She has identified ways in which Americans are apt to reduce others’ communications to natural behaviors or drives and procedures to resist such reduction. She provides a model of self-conscious and other-respecting ethnography that, I devoutly hope, will be followed and amended by anthropologists in the next few years.

JOHN KIRKPATRICK
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Few works of scholarship, especially those resulting, as this does, from the multiple endeavors of a large team of researchers over many years, have about them so refreshing a sense of humility as this useful volume. It is the publicly available fruit of a project that began in 1974 under the auspices of the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) program initiated by UNESCO in 1971. It draws together the most important aspects of research on the islands of Lomaiviti and Lau in eastern Fiji that were previously published in a difficult-to-obtain series of project working papers, island reports, and general reports (obtainable from the Australian National University).

The distillation benefits, however, from a return visit to eastern Fiji in 1983 by the chief investigators and their decision to write a book “about what has happened in Eastern Fiji, and what this might add to the sum of knowledge about the colonial and post-colonial experience of the developing world” (xv). It also benefits from their conclusion, as a result of the military coups of 1987, that their analysis had been more culturally conditioned than they had realized. “Even when a real effort is made to ‘understand’ the minds of a people being studied,” the editor writes, “social scientists inevitably find themselves asking questions which derive from their own disciplinary systems of theory, and moreover reasoning from the norms of their own society” (10). The team was fascinated by young people who had experienced the