than do members of other species. This has led in recent years to the rapid growth of research, including more than a few books, on human co-operation from a wide variety of perspectives. Fortunately, the breadth and diversity of the phenomenon of human co-operation means that virtually all of the biological, behavioural, and social sciences, including anthropology and archaeology, have something important to contribute to this endeavour.

How humans cooperate was written primarily by Richard E. Blanton, while Lane Fargher made contributions to four of its thirteen chapters. Arguing that anthropology has been ‘the missing voice in the conversation about cooperation’, this book is an attempt to use the ‘anthropological imagination’ (p. 52) to shed light on human co-operation. Among the book’s more valuable contributions is a focus on marketplaces not simply as sites for competition but rather as the locations for large-scale co-operation that eventually led to major societal changes: ‘[I]t was in the marketplaces that people began to imagine the possibility of more egalitarian forms of social intercourse, and new ways to understand what it means to be human, that challenged social asymmetry’ (p. 97). Also laudable is the authors’ rethinking of the origins of the state in light of collective action theory, which appears primarily in the four central chapters co-authored by Fargher. The authors bring to bear a qualitative and quantitative database from thirty societies from around the world and throughout human history that should be of interest to scholars working on the origin of the state.

Notwithstanding the strengths of the central aspects of the book, Blanton’s presentation of evolutionary approaches to co-operation is disappointing. Here he provides a rather simplistic version of something to which he refers at different times as the evolutionary psychological or biomathematical approach to co-operation. In so doing, he makes some errors that would have been easy to avoid. These include a conflation of kin selection with group selection, and the coining of a phrase I have never heard before: ‘inclusive selection’ (pp. 13-15). As near as I can tell, this is a sort of portmanteau of inclusive fitness and kin selection, and as such seems to reveal some lack of knowledge about the evolutionary approach. Additionally, Blanton claims that the hallmark of the biomathematical approach to human co-operation is a belief that, owing to a history of group selection, humans are innately altruistic. According to Blanton, this leads the biomathematicians to believe in ‘altruistic ubiquity’ (p. 285) and to dismiss the collective action dilemma in which conflicting interests hinder co-operation. If altruism were actually ubiquitous among humans, then the collective action dilemma really would be an unnecessary distraction. Very few people who work on the evolution of human co-operation actually believe this. In fact the biomathematical approach is one that is taken by only a small minority of scholars using evolutionary theory to study co-operation. Most of us, including many whom Blanton cites elsewhere in the book, do not advocate altruistic ubiquity and are fascinated by the collective action dilemma and the challenges it presents to human co-operation. However, you would not know that from reading this book. There is no reason why Blanton had to package his central arguments within a critique of evolutionary approaches to co-operation. The otherwise excellent core elements of this book could have stood quite solidly on their own.

In sum, readers will find value in the portions of this volume that concern topics with which Blanton and Fargher are most familiar. Anyone looking for more, particularly an understanding of evolutionary approaches to human co-operation, should look at the many references How humans cooperate itself provides and take up the challenge to read more widely within the field.

Lee Cronk Rutgers University


Those teaching courses in social and cultural anthropology at the introductory level, understood roughly as that of first-year undergraduate study, have a rich choice of textbooks from which to work. For those teaching the fundamentals of anthropology to audiences outside formal university-level courses – such as in pre-university and further education contexts in the United Kingdom, or community colleges in the United States – the choice is more limited. In both cases, teachers will mostly find that no single textbook fully meets the need. The second edition of David W. Haines’s An introduction to sociocultural anthropology aims to fill the gap between the need for an overall teaching text of manageable length and one that exposes students to original ethnographic material in the form of monographs, films, or original field projects. It is also, while this is not explicitly claimed, well suited for use in the non-university or pre-university teaching of anthropology.
Haines is Professor Emeritus at George Mason University and has written on the anthropology of policy, refugees and migration, and kinship in Vietnam. As his title signals, the book organizes the content of sociocultural anthropology around three large meta-themes: environmental adaptation, structures of social relations, and the creation and manipulation of meanings. The history of the discipline, while not ignored, is largely confined to short discussions of Tylor, Morgan, Boas, Radcliffe-Brown, and Malinowski in the opening chapter, ‘The anthropological vision’.

Within each meta-theme, parallel topics and core questions are in turn the basis for presenting the detailed case studies. For example, in the sections on ‘Adaptation’ and ‘Structure’, these topics address the variables of control, density, complexity, and mobility. Within ‘Adaptation’, the relations with the environment of foragers (hunter-gatherers), horticulturalists, agriculturalists, pastoralists, and industrialists are covered. ‘Structures’ encompasses kinship and household, descent and marriage, economics, politics, and religion. Under ‘Meanings’ are grouped cognition, language, expression, and action – including, under the latter, future-reaching comments on what the destiny of anthropology might be in the coming world order. Each chapter concludes with two case examples, many of which are drawn from contemporary life: a refreshing signal to the reader of anthropology’s power to illuminate human experience in the here and now. Particularly telling examples are a comparative study of social media postings, and the experience of Syrian refugees in the United States and Canada following the crisis of 2015.

Following each chapter, too, is an unusually detailed list of sources and helpful pointers to further reading. The material overall is clearly and presentationally neat, and teacher-friendly for its intended purpose. This rationality, however, has a price attached. At one level, as in any classification scheme, this one creates its own anomalies. Thus it is unclear why religion is placed under ‘Structures’ rather than ‘Meanings’, where arguably it could equally belong. At another level, the design’s effect is to present anthropological knowledge in a curiously ahistorical and ‘flat’ manner: one that barely makes visible the twists and turns of thought, or the controversies and key figures, that have constituted anthropology’s past and brought the world’s ‘anthropologies’ to where they sit today.

An introduction to sociocultural anthropology is unquestionably a valuable addition to the teaching toolkit, albeit one that – as the author may well agree – will serve at its best when used in conjunction with other approaches that have been used in explicating sociocultural anthropology at an introductory level.

HILARY CALLAN Royal Anthropological Institute


As someone who has published criticisms of ontologically inclined anthropology, I assumed I would dislike this book. Rarely have I been so pleasantly surprised. In The ontological turn, Martin Holbraad and Morten Axel Pedersen present their understanding of the ontological turn, the scholars who built its foundations, and the ways in which the perspectives of anthropologists both supportive of and opposed to the theoretical movement differ from their own. They accomplish the task with clear, compelling, and measured prose, and they make a welcome effort to leave space for other forms of anthropological thought.

Holbraad and Pedersen lay out the three methodological ingredients of any ontological investigation: reflexivity, conceptualization, and