

meaningful leisure as evidence leisure was government-led. However, these documents *echo* sentiments in company publications before the government finally picked up the refrain.

Leheny notes that “many Japanese authors” (p. 106) criticized Japan’s long working hours but does not think this influenced government initiatives. Media reports on “father absent” families (because fathers were always at work) or the labelling of fathers as *Nichiy bi no tomodachi* (Sunday friend) and court battles over *karoshi* (death by overwork) suggest it was the Japanese populace pressuring the government for more leisure time, not the other way around. The government, Leheny contends, orchestrated a 1987 campaign to promote overseas travel by Japanese, but the Japanese were already doing it. The “10 million” abroad campaign was not a promotion—it was a prediction, since this was the estimate of how many Japanese would travel overseas (p. 150). When other factors are considered, Leheny’s arguments that the government led the Japanese populace to engage in leisure, pleasure, entertainment, and travel seem shallow.

Millie Creighton
University of British Columbia

Language in Native Title. *John Henderson and David Nash*, eds. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2002, 328 pp. \$36.00, paper.

Australia has been the prime testing ground for a new kind of forensic linguistics that links claims to language with claims to land. Under provisions of “native title,” which gives limited legal recognition to preconquest and precolonial territorial interests, Australia is somewhat anarchically inventing a new set of precedents with potentially enormous impact on indigenous land rights, in the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition and perhaps beyond.

This uneven collection puts on record some of the major players in the new dialogue between Australian linguistics and the law. It contains three sorts of essays. The most interesting discuss the specifics of linguistic evidence presented in different land rights cases—narratives of how linguists were recruited, to what ends, with what materials they worked, and how their evidence was received. Second are programmatic essays on the nature of the evolving land rights procedures and how linguistics has been and ought to be relevant. Third are treatments of lexicostatistics, glottochronology, “linguistic stratigraphy,” and kinship semantics as tools for the specific sorts of historical reconstruction potentially relevant to Australian land rights cases, where historical records are scanty and where the issue is limited to demonstrating “continuity” to land-owning and cultural traditions during the two hundred years since European invasion of the continent.

In the first group, and for me the strongest chapter in the book, is Nick Evans’s thoughtful account of linguistic evidence in the Croker Sea claim. Evans, an

unusually polyglot linguist and an expert in semantics as well as grammar in a variety of Australian languages, discusses a wide range of linguistic evidence presented in this case about cultural and linguistic groupings, historical change as attested by phonological shifts and lexical borrowings, and the precise semantics of Aboriginal expressions of legal importance whose rendition into English was problematic. He argues persuasively that land tribunals must secure "better communication with Indigenous witnesses," especially in the face of the extreme multiplicity of tongues in cases like the one he worked on.

Three other informative chapters deal with linguistic evidence in specific land cases. Heather Bowe describes the Yorta Yorta case in which she and a linguist for the opposing side entered into direct, and somewhat vitriolic, conflict over the interpretation of limited historical records of a nearly extinct language. The issues include not only the number and relationships of the linguistic varieties, but also whether a moribund language is rescuable in any useful way and what role there might be for remaining linguistic knowledge and tradition. Tamsin Donaldson presents a slightly modified version of her original report, contracted and submitted in evidence, on the language of the Peak Hill people. It is an exemplary text, clearly written and nontechnical (and thus, presumably, suitable for a legal audience), and it shows the continuity of Donaldson's research to the present from periods long before there existed even the hint of land rights tribunals and the potential relevance of linguistic evidence. She describes how phonotactic canons of different languages can leave recognizable fingerprints on Anglicized toponyms. Greg McIntyre and Kim Doohan consider the problem of defining potential native-title claimant groups in the face of multiple and sometimes conflicting discourses about identity and membership, among anthropologists as well as Aborigines.

In the second group is an introductory chapter by John Henderson about the mutual effects of linguistic evidence on land rights law and of legal procedures on the practice of linguistics, taking linguistic knowledge as exemplary of a tradition of intellectual property whose continuity must be demonstrated under native-title legislation. Peter Sutton, one of the veterans, reflects with ambivalence about the role of the linguistic (or anthropological) "expert witness." Jeannie Bell talks about the eloquent self-defining testimony of owners of Queensland Aboriginal languages who may not be speakers. Michael Walsh chides, first, lawyers for not understanding the crucial distinction in Aboriginal ideology between "owning" languages and merely speaking them and, then, linguists for not informing themselves about the law, its requisites, and its (he thinks corrigible) mistakes.

Finally, David Nash provides an introduction to multidimensional scaling as applied to mapping language groups from scanty wordlists. Barry Alpher revisits (and fails to vindicate) glottochronology as applied to Australian lexicons. Patrick McConvell defends a traditional model of language change in addressing relationships in time and space among Australian languages, concentrating on ethnonyms of various types. And Barry Blake shows how subsection kin terminologies can appear to be identical between neighboring languages while masking important differences in usage.

I found useful the volume's direct report of experience on the interface between linguistics and law. I would have liked to know more than Henderson's tabular summary in the final chapter about the legal status of particular cases mentioned. Still, there are clear lessons to be extracted from these pioneering demonstrations that lawyers, and indeed linguists themselves, are often no better than other speakers at distinguishing words from things or at avoiding monoglot myths and the model of one language—one people.

John B. Haviland
CIESAS-Sureste and Reed College

Salvadorans in Costa Rica: Displaced Lives. *Bridget Hayden.* Tucson: Arizona University Press, 2003. \$37.50, cloth.

Most current research on immigration is focused on human movements from poor countries toward the United States and Europe. Similarly, research on Salvadoran migration is dominated by consideration of immigration to the United States. Little attention has been paid to migration where the home country and the host country show a wide range of similarities. A case in point is the emigration from El Salvador to Costa Rica, especially during the 1980s, when civil war in El Salvador displaced thousands of people. Bridget Hayden's *Salvadorans in Costa Rica: Displaced Lives* helps fill this gap.

It is estimated that one-fourth of the total population of El Salvador lives outside of that country. During the early 1980s, about twenty thousand Salvadorans arrived in Costa Rica as a consequence of violence. Most of Salvadorans requested and obtained refugee status. *Salvadorans in Costa Rica* is based on nineteen months of fieldwork in the Central Valley of Costa Rica between 1993 and 1995.

Hayden explores ways in which recent theories on migration and space are also pertinent to the study of refugee populations. Mainstream understanding of immigration distinguishes between "sojourners" and "settlers." The first go to another country for a brief period, while the second aim to remain in the country of destination. Recent research on immigration and space has challenged these and other dichotomies. Migrants maintain relations in and orient their actions toward two or more countries simultaneously. Space is not considered as an abstract and empty entity; rather, it is considered as socially produced within a framework of contingent agency.

The book is organized into six chapters. The first, "Two Histories," introduces a comparative historical background of El Salvador and Costa Rica. It is a remainder that comparative analysis is often missing in Central American social sciences. The second chapter, "Meanings of Refugee," explores the importance Salvadorans give to the ways in which Costa Ricans categorize them. There are amazing similarities between the images deployed to represent Salvadorans during the 1980s and those that I found were used to portray the Nicaraguan community