examinations of power and legitimacy, still in the dark as to whether Max Müller did misunderstand Vedic grammar or whether urban sanitary practices were crucial to epidemics, and unconvinced by the author's assurance that such questions are "irrelevant" [p. 98].) This attempt to let diverse voices speak for themselves is on the whole successful in conveying a sense of the multitude of representations of science and of the battles for authority being fought between their lines.

But important aspects of science's history in colonial India are compressed or neglected in *Another Reason*'s story. In the first place, colonial policies and actions are too often reduced to abstractions such as "colonial discourse," "colonial power," or simply "colonialism," whose behavior is described rather waggishly: in "colonialism's necessary failure to resolve its paradoxes" (p. 48), its "discourse was compelled to authorize the language of science in idioms of . . . difference" (p. 71), its "governmentality was obliged to develop in violation of the liberal conception [of government]" (p. 126), etc. This creature Colonialism, thus constrained by its nature in a way reminiscent of some colonial essentializations of "the Indian character" or "the native mind," is for Prakash the central figure in Indian perspectives on science.

As a result, the "hybridization" of Western science and Indian traditions that he describes is largely deracinated, cut off from the richness of sources that fed its development. For example, the complex problem of translating scientific works is considered only as a "renegotiation of the unequal relationship between Western and indigenous languages" (p. 50) that "reveals the emergence of the indigenous elite's counterhegemonic aspirations" (p. 52), not at all in its relation to the continuing tradition of technical translation originating centuries earlier in Sanskrit/Persian intercourse. And when noting that "in late-nineteenth-century British India . . . the Hindu intelligentsia began to identify a body of scientific knowledge in particular Indian texts and traditions" whose authority and autonomy became "a key nationalist belief" (p. 86), Prakash never mentions its indebtedness to similar identifications in the earlier work of Orientalists such as Colebrooke, Whish, Burgess, and Thibaut. (It is also surprising to find no mention of the immense support provided to this belief by B. G. Tilak or, in a different way, by Bāpudeva Śāstrī and Sudhākara Dvivedī.) Nor does he note the false dichotomy between the "fables" of the Puranas and the "science" of the *siddhants*, whose relationship to revealed scripture is in fact much more complex. Similarly, Yashoda Devi's 1924 book on household management is examined for what it implies about "the nature of governance aimed at women" and "the reconstitution of gender relations" (pp. 148–49), but not as a reflection of traditional treatises on *strīdharma* (female conduct). Finally, there are very few references to Muslims, and none at all to the influence of Indian Islamic scientific traditions, in this presentation of "Hindu science."

On these and many similar omissions depends much of the coherence of Prakash's image of science as a sign of Indian modernity. *Another Reason* powerfully evokes what Prakash (quoting Nietzsche) calls "a past *a posteriori* from which we might spring, as against that from which we do spring" (p. 237); but it does not do justice to the history of science in British India.

KIM PLOFKER
Brown University

Pastoral Politics: Shepherds, Bureaucrats, and Conservation in the Western Himalaya. By VASANT K. SABERWAL. Studies in Social Ecology and

https://doi.org/10.2307/2659002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Environmental History. Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha, eds. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999. xviii, 246 pp. Rs. 620.00 (cloth).

The writing of historical works about the forest regions of South Asia has developed rapidly during the last decade-and-a-half. In retrospect, the debates have reflected both the increasing concerns about the social dynamics of environmental changes, specifically the man-made transformations, and the economic and political logic of state intervention into forest areas and into the lives of people who gained their livelihood from forest resources. Within the field of environmental history, different works have pointed to such diverse phenomena as the social and environmental disastrous effects of colonial expansion as well as to the environmental concerns of the colonial administrators influenced by European liberal and utilitarian ideals for efficient resource use. Lately, the discussions have moved to focusing regional and local contexts as well as conflicts within the state administration to explain policy formulation and implementation. Vasant K. Saberwal's work is located within this emerging field in political ecology.

Saberwal's study aligns with the growing number of critical assessments of the earlier analyses in environmental history. Best known among the earliest works are the studies from the 1980s by Ramachandra Guha, in which the colonial state is treated as the one aggressive actor *versus* a subordinate, indigenous population and the colonial project is understood to have created a disastrous "watershed" in the management of forest resources in India. Saberwal argues for a history of conflict, but mostly limits his conclusions to the specific, regional situation of Himachal Pradesh in the western Himalayas where he collected his empirical data and to the conflicts between the different departments of the colonial administration.

Saberwal problematizes the complexity and uncertainty of the processes of environmental degradation. He contrasts his argument to what he calls the official narrative of degradation, a discourse embraced by the Forest Department (FD), where large-scale deforestation and soil erosion leading both to floods and droughts are explained by a growing, local population and their unregulated grazing of cattle in this fragile environment. While stressing such an "alarmist" argument, the FD has striven to curb "unscientific" resource use by the herders through regulations and ascertain control over forest lands and resources. However, the author questions this notion of a disaster caused by herders and he aims at finding out its origin and the reasons for its sustained enforcement.

In contrast to several earlier works in which the power and strength of the FD to enforce their management policies is highlighted, the author sees the reason for the alarmist discourse prevailing in the FD to be the result of its weakness. His discussion about the conflicts of control and influence between the Revenue Department (RD, where forests were administered since the establishment of the colonial administration) and the FD (established in 1864) is particularly interesting. While the RD, together with local communities, accused the FD of oppressive policies and of the deterioration of local rights, the FD claimed to have the superior, scientific expertise of forest management required to save the forests from destruction. As a result of this conflict, together with the political influence of the herders and their resistance through noncooperation in submitting to restrictive policies, the FD's capacity to enforce their conservation policies was limited. Further, Saberwal argues that the resistance that the FD faced, together with the uncertainty of the complex ecological conditions in the Himalaya, worked to enforce its alarmist rhetoric in order to legitimize the

https://doi.org/10.2307/2659002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

department's authority. Thus, the discourse was basically a political and not a scientific one. To prove his points, the author combines quantitative data over a longer time-period, such as that of livestock numbers and timber extraction, with qualitative oral and written material revealing the local-level institutions of the herding communities where herder access to grazing resources were regulated.

One of Saberwal's main contributions lies in bringing out the political interplay within and between state and local institutions in their struggle to attain control over forest resources and lands. However, there is a slight methodological contradiction in his emphasis on the inherent difficulty in attributing causality to complex ecological processes while at the same time arguing for strong causality in the social processes of the political logic of power and influence. It is an intriguing argument that Saberwal pursues, where one gets the impression that the FD is either a victim of its own uninformed management policy or a cunning administration of shrewd power politics. It would be interesting to see the author follow up his statement that "a critical factor that has resulted in the FD's policy focus . . . is a cultural stereotype that depicts the herding societies as inherently lazy and unproductive . . . " (p. 165). While he shows that there were no scientific bases for claiming the pastoral economy to be unproductive, it can be further investigated whether there existed different and conflicting definitions of what was to be considered a productive economy: one, of the colonial or independent state of India, and another, of the herders in the western Himalayas. This is especially important, since Saberwal's data show that the official logic which confronted communal ownership with arguments about private property resulting in good stewardship does not easily correspond with the constant striving of increased government control by both the FD and RD.

GUNNEL CEDERLÖF
Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences

The Kādambarīnāṭaka of Narasiṃha: A Dramatic Version of Bāṇa's Classic Kādambarī. By HIDEAKI SATO. Foreword by A. K. Warder. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 1997. xvi, 299 pp. Rs. 600 (cloth).

As if drunk on the strong wine
Of Kādambarī,
I am an addled creature
Who does not fear
To compose the conclusion
In my own
Dry, colorless words.

With that modest announcement, Bāṇa's son, Bhūṣaṇa, introduces his completion of his father's masterpiece, the seventh-century Sanskrit prose narrative, *Kādambarī.* And ever since, various poets, playwrights, and translators have duly paid homage to a composition so influential that in two languages, Marathi and Kannada, its eponymous title, from the heroine *Kādambarī*, literally means "novel or work of fiction." (Even so, *Kādambarī* has received only two English translations—C. M. Ridding's in 1896, and that of this reviewer in 1991 [N.Y.: Garland Publishing], from which the above quotation is taken.) It may be said that *every* translator is drunk on the strong wine of her or his chosen project. In the case of Narasiṃha's *Kādambarīnāṭaka*, a fourteenth-century dramatic version of Bāṇa's opus, clearly the

https://doi.org/10.2307/2659002 Published online by Cambridge University Press