l’expérience de ce dont il parle, cet ouvrage, bien appuyé sur les propos de membres de la communauté recueillis par l’entremise d’entrevues, présente un intérêt manifeste. S’il est désormais acquis qu’il faut critiquer la portée sociologique des noms de tribus apparaissant dans les sources historiques, que les collectivités autochtones sont souvent parvenues à contourner les politiques coloniales imposées et que les critères juridiques de reconnaissance ont présenté un décalage par rapport aux modalités d’appartenance effectives au sein des communautés, l’auteur adopte un angle original, celui des rapports de parenté, pour mettre en évidence la continuité là où les spécialistes ont souvent insisté sur les ruptures, et pour rappeler que les frontières sociales peuvent se situer en des endroits bien différents selon le point de vue adopté.

Claude Gélinas
Université de Sherbrooke


*Empires of Vision: A Reader* is a collection of twenty-one essays written by some of the most important scholars presently working at the intersection of visual culture and post-colonial studies. These essays, combined with masterly introductions by the editors, Sumathi Ramaswamy and Martin Jay, offer an exceptional initiation into thinking through the visual turn vis-à-vis modern European imperialism. As the editors point out, these two concerns have developed largely in isolation from one another. Visual studies scholars have tended to neglect colonialism, while colonial and post-colonial scholarship has paid scant attention to visual culture. Bringing these research areas into the same analytical field, the editors suggest, enables “new configurations and reordering of received knowledge” about both visuality and imperialism (p. 2).

This compilation emerged out of a 2009 workshop funded by the Social Science Research Council’s Dissertation Proposal Development Fellowship, which brought together doctoral students from a broad range of disciplines to work with Ramaswamy and Jay. The workshop’s purposes were to delineate the contours of existing scholarship located at the nexus of visuality and empire, as well as foster new developments in the field. The essays are excerpted from scholarship published, with one exception, since 2000 and covers spatial and temporal contexts spanning the globe over five centuries. The authors work from diverse disciplinary locations, including African-American Studies, Art History, Architecture, Anthropology, History, English, Spanish, and Women’s Studies. The collection’s breadth is matched by its depth; the essays are insightful, sophisticated, and most framed explicitly within continental philosophy, post-modern, and/or post-colonial theory. Although Latour and Bhabha loom largest,
Said, Fanon, W.J.T. Mitchell, Barthes, and Lacan are frequently cited, as is the work of influential figures like Anderson, Taussig, and Appadurai.

Fundamentally, the collection is an incitement to scholars to treat empire and vision as mutually constitutive and to foreground visual subjectivities’ implication in and entwinement with power/knowledge (p. 4). It is also a challenge to the Western canon’s “entrenched antivisualism” and a critique of post-colonial theory’s privileging of textuality (p. 5). In her introduction, Ramaswamy explains that the way forward requires a radical re-conceptualization of visual practices “as objects of knowledge in and of themselves, as world-making and world-disclosing, rather than merely world-mirroring” (p. 12). In the same vein, Christopher Pinney, in his essay “Creole Europe,” argues that scholars will need “to develop new languages which…articulate pathways that will allow objects and material practices to manifest their own primary role as instantiations of significance…, rather than being subjugated as the expression of some higher order of meaning whose primary form is located elsewhere” (p. 561). This epistemological shift and its promise of new insights are manifested impressively by the collection’s essays.

The first section, “Imperial Optic,” introduces scholarship that, taken together, traces out “the lineaments of an optical theory of colonial power” (p. 2). These essays ask how European empires were implicated in images’ production, consumption, dispersal, accumulation, and collation. They examine how image-making technologies, such as paintings, prints, maps, photographs, and films are transformed through their peregrinations between the metropole and colonies. The essays challenge the notion that these transformations simply produced tools of repression or of resistance. Rather, the life courses of imperial imagery reveal what Ramaswamy describes as “a messy business of mutual entanglements and imbrications, of collisions and compromises, and of desiring-while-disavowing and disavowing-while-desiring” (p. 4). The second section, “Postcolonial Looking,” is composed of scholarship that supplements Spivak’s epochal query “Can the subaltern speak?” with the question: “Does the empire not only speak and write back but also look back in unexpected ways, and at whom and with what effect?” (p. 3). In these essays, the colonial image-worker makes Europe the object of regard and turns the imperial eye back upon itself.

It is the strength of these essays’ epistemological and theoretical frameworks that most recommends the collection to Canadian historians. While none focus on Canada, nearly every one includes some creative interpretation of evidence or insight into the entanglements of people, objects, ocularity, and power, which could be applied to the Canadian context. Any historian interested in Canada as an outpost of empire—French, British, or, for that matter, American—and as a site of myriad and on-going colonial encounters, can find something useful here. Many of the essays have immediately apparent parallels within the Canadian context because the objects of study are not place-specific. For example, Serge Gruzinski’s analysis of religious iconography introduced by missionaries to the indigenous peoples of Mexico, which he describes as “walls of images,” could be useful in thinking through the colonial encounter in Canada as a process of substituting and supplementing indigenous peoples’ spiritual objects with Christian ones. Or, how
might David Ciarlo’s argument that imperialist imagery in advertising constituted German political and colonial power in ways that politicians and geopolitical economies could not, apply to Canada? Eric A. Stein’s interrogations of Javanese villagers’ unpredictable and subversive responses to the Rockefeller Foundation’s hygiene films raises interesting questions about how assumptions about “Indians” produced a particular form of address in didactic films directed at First Nations peoples, and about communities’ and individuals’ potentially counter-disciplinary responses. One also wonders how Christopher Pinney’s analysis of the photography of formerly colonized peoples in Africa and India as sites of visual decolonization and self-fashioning might be related to Jeffrey Thomas’s artistic and curatorial responses to imperialist visual ethnographies.

The collection’s principal contribution is that its evidence bears out the editors’ assertion that “no history of imperialism is complete without heeding the constitutive capacity of visuality, and correspondingly, no history of modern visuality can ignore the constitutive fact of empire” (pp. 11-12). By following the paths mapped out by the editors and adapting the approaches offered in the essays, historians will undoubtedly reveal innovative ways of thinking about, and looking at, empire and visual culture in Canada.

Carmen J. Nielson
Mount Royal University


C’est un superbe petit livre regroupant les réflexions d’un grand intellectuel français sur les commémorations de la Première Guerre mondiale que nous proposent les Editions du Seuil. L’ouvrage sorti de presse fin 2013, à un moment où l’on ne connaissait pas encore l’ensemble du dispositif commémoriel et encore moins la manière dont les citoyens se l’approprieraient, n’a pas pris une ride. Il reste intéressant de lire ce qu’un historien engagé dans les débats de son temps attendait de ces commémorations.

Le style très enlevé mais aussi le caractère fort personnel de l’ouvrage où l’auteur n’hésite pas à présenter et défendre ses propres positions sur un certain nombre de dossiers contemporains rendent sa lecture des plus passionnantes. L’originalité de l’analyse tient au fait que Jean-Noël Jeanneney n’est pas seulement un historien de haut vol, c’est un homme d’action à qui François Mitterrand confia, en 1989, l’organisation des commémorations du bicentenaire de la Révolution et de la Déclaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen. La comparaison avec 2014 n’en est que plus intéressante même si, comme le rappelle d’emblée l’auteur la nature des deux événements est bien différente : si la Révolution fut un moment de rupture dans la société française, le début de la guerre fut au contraire un grand moment d’union nationale. En outre, en 1989 des