Editorial Foreword

LAW AND RELIGION. From classic philosophical traditions through Durkheim and Weber, the relationship between religious dogma and practice on the one hand, and the system of legal codes on the other, have been contrasted as the major countervailing forces. Since law tends to reduce custom to structure, religious thought and behavior have been regarded as either apart from or above the law. But looking at particular cases, we recognize the interplay as intricate and nonpredictive, and at times, the designs of competing actors and institutions create the opposite of their intent. John Ingham's analysis of Aztec human sacrifice examines the highly complex relationship among cosmology, ritual, and the ability to subjugate neighbors. This problem has baffled both Meso-American historians and ethnohistorians, as well as anthropologists who have taken extreme positions such as "you are what you eat" or who theorize cannibalism as "you are whom you eat." Ingham, who rejects the amino acid theory of human sacrifice, looks at how power is symbolically structured and how symbolic expression is constrained by the institution and practice of law. (Compare Nash and Peacock, 10:3; Deshan, 12:3; Clendinnen, 22:3; Wolf, 24:1; Roff, 25:2.) In a delicate analysis of British colonial policy and the structure of Buddhist monasteries in Sri Lanka, Steven Kemper argues that the British attempt to centralize control of the monasteries through law produced the opposite result—an unanticipated increase in local-level decentralization (see Derrett, 4:1; the Rudolphs and Stirling, 8:1; Galanter, Khare, and Pooley, 14:1; Gombrich, 17:2; Christelow, 24:1). Probably nothing warrants more interest relative to the understanding of religion and law as anthropological analysis of the Old Testament. Structural contradictions and religious ambiguities can be ethnographic tools for new understanding of old enigmas. Was Onan's crime only one type of offense, or was it a multifaceted event? How can we understand Onan's action within the structure of Old Testament society? Did Moses really need a sister? Did Lot's wife simply get a bad press? Leonard Mars's essay and the piece by Piotr Michalowski whet our appetites for such issues, suggesting others.

SPACE AND ETHNIC DISTINCTIONS. The composition and structure of ethnic groups are determined by both endogenous and exogenous forces (see, for example, Hechter, 21:1; Gourevitch, 21:3; Horowitz, 23:2), and history is marked with numerous cases in which societies stress their differences by borrowing from one another, which in turn leads to cultural inversion. Throughout time, cultures have maintained their uniqueness by utilizing space (see Ozouf, 17:3; Yang, 22:2), which in many cases is designed to form an emptiness or silence, a sense of openness in which conflicts can generate

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001041750001104X Published online by Cambridge University Press

themselves without violence. Charles Halperin's comparisons of four cases from medieval Europe reveal a common mode whereby resolution of tensions between reality and religious belief was promoted and maintained through an ideology of silence (but *cf.* Crumrine, 12:4; and Rigby, 23:1). Without jeopardizing religious commitment, this silence permitted mutualism and an unannounced peaceful pragmatism to grow, sustaining differences and a sense of religious tolerance which was never an issue of conflict as long as a balance of interests prevailed (Katzir, 24:2). This pattern of silence persisted in the Middle East in the millet system under the Ottomans, but in Europe the ideology of silence was eroded by forces of emerging nationalism (see Issawi, 22:4). Michael Taussig presents the case of a culture of terror (*cf.* Katz, 24:4; Melson, 24:3) based on and nourished by silence and myth—one in which the Other is forced either to understand and accept the hegemony of power or be destroyed by it. Thus to maintain existence of the state, civilization, or corporation, a victim must be created for purposes of constituting what truth is and what it means. In developing the Other, cultural qualities deemed evil or negative by the one society are attributed to those it seeks to capture or destroy. (Similar situations have been discussed by Bolland, by Wright, and by Graham, 23:4; by Marino, 24:2; by Wylie, 24:3; by Fewsmith and by Wesler, 24:4.) David Gerber elaborates the theme (also addressed by Sharot, 16:3; Lane, 17:2; Tessler, 20:3; and, in 25:2, Urry, Tentler, Finkler, and Peter) that exile is again the formation of a space and silence, but the estrangement between Lutheran communities could not be healed. The consequences of schism were escaped neither in America nor Australia, and the freedom that exile brought to the Old Lutherans contributed to their continued suffering.

FACETS OF COLONIALISM. In studying how colonial policy at the peak of Western imperialism varied over time and space, we seldom recognize the importance of colonial school textbooks in forming and expressing the colonial experience. In portraying the colonized and the articulation of the colonized with the metropole, the French texts embodied policies tailored to the particular colony (*cf.* Jefferson, 6:3; Jansen and Stone, 9:2; Connor, 17:3; Eikelman, 20:4). Gail Kelly contrasts the Indochinese experience with the West African. The texts heaped criticism on traditional Vietnamese society in order to demonstrate that Vietnamese culture, as compared to French, was fundamentally weak, the over-all intent being in Vietnam to break down the indigenous culture, while in West Africa the contrast emphasized was basically not cultural but racial. The recent literature has seen a surge of interest in the concept of internal colonialism (see Ekeh, 17:1; Hechter, 21:1; Sloan, 21:1; Adams, 26:1). As Robert Hind clarifies, the basis of internal colonialism varies in terms of its underlying logic, founded in the expression of racial differences (South Africa), or economics (England and Wales), or language (Quebec) (see Fenwick, 23:2). Hind's review of the literature (and his article in 26:1) should be cogent to historians. ———AAY

https://doi.org/10.1017/S001041750001104X Published online by Cambridge University Press