Comparative Studies in Society and History 2007;49(3):742–746.
0010-4175/07 $15.00 © 2007 Society for Comparative Study of Society and History

CSSH NOTES

Adriana Petryna, Andrew Lakoff and Arthur Kleinman, eds., *Global Pharmaceuticals: Ethics, Markets, Practices.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2006, 301 pp., index.

DOI: 10.1017/S0010417507000692

Global Pharmaceuticals considers the plethora of medicines manufactured, tested, written about, distributed, marketed, advertised, prescribed, and purchased, which are swallowed, injected, and otherwise consumed throughout the contemporary world. While several contributors to this volume focus on particular pharmaceuticals and places—SSRIs (selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors) for the treatment of depression in Japan and Argentina, and ARVs (antiretrovirals) for the treatment of HIV-AIDS in Brazil and Uganda—their discussions are complemented by chapters on the ethics of international drug testing and human subject research, pharmaceutical treatments for addiction, and the interrelated concepts of self-medication and patient non-compliance. Together, they exemplify innovative ethnographic approaches in the study of multinational pharmaceutical companies' production and marketing practices.

How physicians and patients around the globe come to be convinced of the efficacy of these pharmaceutical products is part of a complex process, as the chapters on antidepressants make clear. First, there is the need to develop therapeutic categories, for which treatments with specific drugs are developed and tested in clinical trials of varying degrees of rigor. Then, the results of these studies—which may be reported in medical journals, at times by ghostwriters—are subsequently cited in advertisements aired in the media and in promotional materials given to doctors. Thus, widespread use of such pharmaceuticals may have to do less with illness and health and more with the power of the pharmaceutical industry to control these processes.

This power does not always go unchallenged, however. In the case of antiretroviral distributions, the intersecting roles of AIDS activists, nongovernmental organizations, and the state have contributed to the particular configurations of antiretroviral treatments that are available to certain citizens and not to others. An introduction presents the broad themes of the volume: the growth and economic power of the pharmaceutical industry over the past fifty years, global inequalities in drug availability and medical treatment, ethics of pharmaceutical research and medical practice, and global standards of drugs and their regulation. The contributors build upon earlier

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417507000692 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anthropological studies that focused on local interpretations of pharmaceuticals by examining the intricacies and implications of global pharmaceutical connections.

———Elisha P. Renne, University of Michigan

James Ferguson, *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2006, 272 pp.

DOI: 10.1017/S0010417507000709

What is the anthropologist (or those who read anthropology for scholarly purposes) to do without the concept of culture? And, if we are to do without this central but historically unstable concept, what are we to put in its place? In James Ferguson's latest book, the reader immediately is forced to confront these two difficult but necessarily conjoined questions. I would suggest that the author has something of an answer for the first but manages much less of a response for the second. This is hardly fatal in a text that offers the reader so much intellectual stimulation: questions about what constitutes "Africa" in the context of late modernity, the puzzling concatenation of political chaos and thriving oil economies on the continent, and cogent critiques of the ideas of civil society and development. However, it does point to a more general problem in social science theorizing. How are anthropologists and other social scientists to move beyond the deeply internal quality of our discourse and engage more directly with those outside its reach? This is a question that genuinely haunts James Ferguson and frames his text, but it is never answered by any part of that text, which becomes entangled in just the sort of abstractions that he argues persuasively hold a wider audience at bay.

Most of the chapters in *Global Shadows* were originally written as stand-alone pieces and published in scholarly journals and edited volumes, but Ferguson in his introduction does a good job of setting out their common themes. These have to do with Ferguson's abiding interest in moving beyond the ordinary anthropological fascination with the local, while offering what remains an anthropological—if not an ethnographic—vision of larger order institutions, hierarchies, and relationships, framed by what he recognizes is an equally fraught category: the global. Here is where the reader's trouble really begins, since to reach "the global" Ferguson feels that social science must move away from an isolated, localized notion of "culture." (My use of scare quotes here is only a sample of Ferguson's own, not always consistent usage throughout the text. Those who do not like this particular academic tic should prepare themselves before opening the book.) By the end of the text, Ferguson has settled on "the global society" or "global citizenship" to supplant the term culture. This helps us to categorize potential relationships within this larger order, but nowhere does he actually define what constitutes either of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417507000692 Published online by Cambridge University Press