

Moroccan Jews', including émigrés', "unconditional loyalty" to Morocco's powerful royal family (p. 189). This is not simply a question of national-state loyalty but of power as a guarantor of pluralist "tolerance." One thinks of the French rules

guiding "Rummy Couples" as well as Jews' nostalgia for the relative security of colonial protection. Tolerance requires coexistence, but it is antidemocratic, being conditioned by submission to an absolute, and absolutely foreign, sovereign.

## Becoming Salmon: Aquaculture and the Domestication of a Fish by Marianne Elisabeth Lien

Oakland: University of California Press, 2015. 232 pp.

DOI: 10.1111/aman.12648

**Glenn Davis Stone**

*Washington University in St. Louis*

The 20th century brought us factorified production of cattle, pigs, and chickens. Each industry has its own distinct history, technologies, political economy, and problems, and each brings humans into a new set of relations with the farmed creatures. But all of those the creatures were "domesticated" long before industrial production was even a concept. Not so with salmon. This fish has a remarkable life cycle that involves spawning and early growth in freshwater streams, followed by a changeover in body chemistry and migration to the distant feeding grounds in the open sea, and finally navigating back to the same stretch of the same stream to spawn and die. Although humans have been manipulating salmon populations for centuries, it was not until the 1950s that Norwegians managed to keep the fish confined throughout its life cycle. By the 1960s, they had developed the system of freshwater hatcheries, smolt factories, and saltwater grow-out pens that form the basis of modern salmon farming. Industrializing this life form is quite a feat, and Marianne Lien offers a multilayered investigation of, and meditation on, how the process works in several facilities in Norway.

Lien's frame of reference is material semiotics, her main touchstones being John Law, Annemarie Mol, and Donna Haraway. Her particular focus is on the boundaries—physical and conceptual, fixed and transgressed—that structure what salmon and humans are up to in this fascinating set of interactions.

Humans are apart from fish in their underwater grow-out pens but not from eggs in the hatchery (p. 110). The underwater netting is like, but also unlike, a farm fence (p. 59). The fish are mostly unseen, yet the farm is held together by information that makes the assemblage legible and visible as a manageable entity (p. 79). As escapees from their "natural" lifecycle, the farmed fish are alien to the rivers from which they evolved, although opinions differ on whether they are actually a different species from their nonfarmed kin.

The form of the narrative itself transgresses boundaries. Lien terms the study a "more than human ethnography"

(p. 15), and it is only partly ethnographic; only a handful of humans drift into the narrative, and we learn about the culture of salmon farmers only in passing. It is partly what some would call a technography, although her term is "productive entanglements." It is also a first-person account of an inquisitive outsider, a trope common in science journalism today, with Lien detailing her experiences and reactions to participant-observing at salmon facilities, learning to throw feed pellets, count sea lice, operate a siphon tube in the hatchery, and getting her daughter off to school.

The productive entanglements described here are not between fish and humans in general or industrial capitalism at large but, rather, a distinctive encounter between salmon and Norwegians. Norway is notable for its policies aimed at long-term salmon management; this is unlike management in many other places—Chile, for instance, went for the quick unsustainable buck and ended up dumping in tons of antibiotics to fight off diseases. Quite unlike the United States, and even going beyond EU policies, Norway has an animal welfare law that recognizes salmon sentience; so the electric stunner Lien inspects at the slaughterhouse is mandated as a humane measure. Norwegian fishfarm workers are even required to attend regular fish welfare courses. (But Lien also recounts a half-tankful of undersized juveniles, selected out by the vaccination machine, being asphyxiated and ground up to feed mink.)

When asked why farmed salmon are now deemed sentient, Lien enigmatically refers to the fact that they are being domesticated. But this would have been an opportunity to "mobilize comparisons" as the book promises early on. After all, highly domesticated and clearly sentient land animals are raised in torturous concentrated feeding operations in the United States, but that country provides fewer protections for the animals than for the owners who are accused of cruelty. As well as this book conveys what Norwegian salmon farming is like, it does not explain why Norwegians conceive of salmon as they do.

The other lacuna in this superb book is the lack of serious discussion of the impact of farming on salmon genetics, which is central to the ongoing discussions of salmon domestication. Lien notes that salmon wildness is reckoned on the genetic level but says little about how farming changes salmon genetically. But some now claim that salmon are

“domesticated” in a single generation; that farmed salmon have 700 genetic differences from wild; that stress in crowded pens induces important epigenetic changes; that *Salmo domesticus* should be recognized as a distinct

species. How the fish is being changed genetically and epigenetically—especially given the ongoing change in feeding practices, monitoring technologies, and welfare policies—are key parts of the story.

## Religious Difference in a Secular Age: A Minority Report by Saba Mahmood

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016. 248 pp.

DOI: 10.1111/aman.12610

**Akbar Ahmed**

American University

Responding to her introduction at a Cornell University lecture as a “Pakistani anthropologist,” Saba Mahmood said that she did not know “how many Pakistani anthropologists are there in the world, I’d like to know myself” (Mahmood 2010). I would like to address and inform her that a Department of Anthropology at the Quaid-i-Azam University in Islamabad was established decades ago. There are many “Pakistani anthropologists” out there, including myself (PhD, University of London, 1978) and Dr. Amineh Hoti (PhD, University of Cambridge, 2004).

Mahmood’s book *Religious Difference in a Secular Age: A Minority Report* is a complex and ambitious intellectual tour de force. She is examining issues of minorities living in our “secular” age both in Europe and Muslim nations. As if this was not ambitious enough, she is also interested in issues of the Sharia, gender, and piety. Her ethnographic focus is on the Copt and Bahai minorities in Egypt.

For Mahmood, secularism promised neutrality and the equality of all citizens by forcing the expressions of religious difference into the private realm. Yet Mahmood makes a convincing case that secularism has not only failed minorities both in the West and in Muslim societies but also has exacerbated problems for them. Mahmood’s entire fifth chapter, for example, is about the Coptic backlash to *Azazeel*, a novel by a secular Egyptian Muslim scholar. The novel, dealing with the early Christian theological and eschatological debates about the nature of Jesus, insulted and infuriated the Coptic community to such an extent that Mahmood compared the controversy to that of Salman Rushdie, the Danish Cartoons, *Charlie Hebdo*, and others. Such controversies confirm that there are increasing numbers of people prepared to act outside the confines of the rational, legal, and secular framework of the modern state and not in the reasoned intellectual manner that Mahmood may want or envision.

There is ample evidence that minorities in the Muslim world are having a tough time of it. Even before the

psychopathic and violent obsession of ISIS against minorities, other militant groups like the Taliban, Al-Shabab, and Boko Haram were targeting minorities. In secular Europe, we have seen the recent dramatic backlash against religious minorities as a result of the massive refugee influx and the involvement of immigrants in the massacres in Paris and Brussels and the sexual assaults on New Year’s Eve in Cologne and elsewhere. Mosques, women in hijab, and “Middle East-looking men” have been attacked with alarming frequency across the continent. We have seen a similar trend in the United States with the Muslim minority as the target. Presidential candidates have declared that if they came to power they would close mosques, register Muslims, contemplate internment, and ban all Muslims from entering the United States.

The problem I have is with Mahmood’s use of the notoriously slippery concept of *secular*. How do we define it? Is it a rejection of religion altogether à la Karl Marx? Or is it the usage in the United States, where commentators often describe the country as “secular” and yet the president and other leading figures openly express that their favorite book is the Bible and are able to cite verses from it and the country’s officially accepted motto remains “In God We Trust.” Or perhaps it is the ideal that will resolve the problems around minorities, as Mahmood hopes for and speculates (p. 212).

Mahmood is perceptive enough to be aware of the contradictions in the Muslim world. Because the concept of the “secular” is such an ambiguous one, we find its application to Muslim societies problematic. While Egypt itself has been ruled after the Second World War by military officers declaring themselves as “secular” and targeting Muslim political parties, the presidents have not been shy of having themselves photographed in pious postures in the mosque. What do we make of the brutal, sadistic, genocidal despot Saddam Hussein of Iraq who prided himself on being secular in the Soviet mold but ended up by projecting himself as a Muslim leader and had the Islamic cry “*Allah-o-Akbar*” [God is great] sewn on the official flag. Then there are the other important Muslim nations like Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, and the largest of them all, Indonesia, who consider their societies primarily as Muslim. The treatment of minorities in these Muslim societies is often contrary to their own