shows how the records of death (and birth) both served the immediate needs of the Egyptian state and gave imperial consulates a chance to pose as necessary mediators—or eager undertakers.

Dying and death, in her treatment, then become at once moments of imperial taxonomy and sites of imperial competition. At times, it was only in death that somebody's existence was revealed to the consulate that would go on to claim that particular corpse. Jessie Brown, for example, eluding the attention of the British consulate in life, was "rendered legible within a matrix of colonial governance and communal boundaries that mandated categorizations" upon her passing in 1906 (p. 126). European consulates used the bodies of Brown and other "imperial subjects" like her both materially and performatively. For reasons that can be intuitively grasped but that Minkin could have dug deeper, corpses could neither be shipped nor cremated but had to be interred right away. Thus, consulates rushed to bury the dead as both acts of necessity and statements about belonging. In hospitals, funerals, graveyards, and paperwork, consulates commandeered death to push back against each other's influence and space within Alexandria.

By embracing the intervention and performance in matters funereal of both the British and the French consulates in Alexandria, Minkin approaches imperialism flexibly. First, she shows that Britain's occupation of Egypt in 1882 was not a watershed concerning the bureaucracy and maintenance of the dead. Then, she convincingly addresses France's "non-territorial imperialism" in Egypt and the "various strands of French community" in Alexandria (p. 99; p. 120). Thereby, she demonstrates that the British—even after 1882—were never the sole power in Egypt and that the French never relinquished their claim to imperial space even in the absence of territorial control. Third, Minkin goes beyond the revisitation of Franco-British interimperial rivalry in Egypt to explore the relationship between the British and the French on the one hand and the Egyptian state on the other. She finds that both imperial powers were ultimately beholden to the Egyptian governmental authority, with whom the final word on the necessary resources and lands rested. The exact mechanisms of death governance within the Egyptian administration remain elusive; nonetheless Minkin's claim rings clear: death was a "building block of empire" (p. 128) as well as a not-to-be-buried hatchet wrenched by imperial competitors and local authorities alike. Finally, her notion of empire operates on multiple scales. Not only does she wrap up a myriad of individual ends of life, but she also unveils the "tentacles of empire": the bureaucratic logic necessitating the collection of data and the construction of an imperial community (p. 120). Her treatment confirms preexisting theories of empire as something stratified on the military and diplomatic levels as well as on the ground, where imperial subjects perished and consulates acted as key in-between facilitators.

From six feet under the surface, then, Minkin persuasively revisits the history of Alexandria, Egypt, and empire. She also incorporates a welcome reflection on her archival sources, their riches, as well as their omissions. She succeeds in animating numbers and providing a lively rendition of potentially deadly silent data. Her writing displays some truly hilarious passages ("his friends were surprised that he fell over and insisted he was sober" since he "had drunk only six or seven beers that evening," p. 124) and presents theoretical debates in an accessible way, making this book suitable for upper undergraduate readers. Even if Minkin follows individuals through sickness, memorialization, and burial, hers is not a morbid or gloomy account. The author compellingly reframes death as an interimperial and local affair, while also disinterring the underground connection of both imperial and Egyptian governance to matters of dying and death.

doi:10.1017/S0020743821000234

Empire and Tribe in the Afghan Frontier Region: Custom, Conflict and British Strategy in Waziristan until 1947. Hugh Beattie, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2019). Pp. 308. $115.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781848858961

Reviewed by Elisabeth Leake, School of History, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK (e.leake@leeds.ac.uk)

In *Empire and Tribe in the Afghan Frontier Region*, Hugh Beattie offers a new exploration of British colonial policy towards Waziristan, a border region at the intersection between Afghanistan and Pakistan that

has retained a large degree of autonomy despite the shift from a world of empires to a world of nation-states. *Empire and Tribe* contributes to a recent wave of scholarship that rethinks British approaches to and conceptualizations of this region, and the text's strengths lie in its careful detail on British military encounters in Waziristan and deep research into local British colonial frontier policy.

Beattie takes a largely chronological approach in his text, narrating developments in British policy towards Waziristan and its population from the mid-1800s until 1947, with a brief coda exploring the region's history under independent Pakistan. As such, the text builds on his earlier work, *Imperial Frontier: Tribe and State in Waziristan* (London: Routledge, 2002), moving his exploration of British policy into the 20th century. By taking this longer historical approach, Beattie highlights the inconsistencies of British colonial policy towards this region while reinforcing conceptions of Waziristan as a highly militarized space, due in large part to the nature of British engagement, which was often armed and brutal. Beattie links these inconsistencies not only to developments within Waziristan but also to the British relationship with Afghanistan and concerns regarding Russian encroachment. Beattie thus reveals the extent to which Waziristan remained a point of contestation between British and Afghan officials and an area where both governments tried to assert their influence even after the demarcation of the Durand Line in 1893.

Without question, the greatest strength of Beattie's text is its level of historical detail. Beattie explores and unpicks the minutiae of British policy towards Waziristan and particularly its Mehsud Pashtun population. He reveals with great care how British policy seesawed back and forth between efforts to actively subdue this region and, at other times, efforts to mold this area as a buffer to the British colonial project, a space not entirely incorporated. He pays particular attention to the various iterations of the "forward" and "closed border" policy debates that repeated themselves time and again up until the British withdrawal from South Asia. Beattie explores at length various instances where locals resisted British encroachment only for the Government of India to retaliate with widescale violence.

Beattie's text reinforces the primacy of armed force and violence in shaping relations between the Raj and Waziristan. It thus complements, and in many ways parallels, arguments presented recently by Benjamin Hopkins in *Ruling the Savage Periphery: Frontier Governance and the Making of the Modern State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020). Where Hopkins explores how British imperialists used the rule of law to institutionalize violent practices, Beattie explores how the colonial armed forces were the main tool for carrying out this writ. Taken collectively, these recent works demonstrate how violence and the threat of violence informed and often dictated frontier governance, particularly in Waziristan.

Empire and Tribe is at its strongest in detailing British approaches to Waziristan and the local colonial decision-making that underpinned the frequently punitive expeditions into the region. Beattie is perhaps less successful in his attempts to "read against the grain" (p. 4) in relation to local Waziristanis. Beattie usefully provides an introductory chapter that provides background on the political and social modes that organized Pashtuns inhabiting Waziristan into "tribes" (less is said about the increasingly pejorative way that British officials used the idea of the "tribe"). However, tribal agency is generally notable in this text for its absence, which raises two key questions.

Firstly, while the reader gets a sense of change over time in terms of British policy towards Waziristan, locals' responses read rather statically. Beattie makes clear throughout that "anti-British" sentiment drove many instances of local attacks on British encampments or responses to imperial encroachment. But what were other potential motivating forces, and how might local reactions and impetuses have evolved? While Waziristanis might have been stateless in the 19th century, as Beattie argues, surely their conceptions of statehood and governance shifted as their encounters with both British and Afghan state representatives increased. Beattie introduces one tantalizing vignette where, in 1922, an Afghan envoy claimed to lead a "tribal Government" in Waziristan, drawing links between Waziristan and the Muslim world and criticizing the British government's ready turn to punitive violence (p. 109). This instance demonstrates how locals could reframe their own politics and sense of political belonging by using the language of rights, international law, and governance, but it is not explored in the book in these terms. Further reflection on Waziristani agency as more than just "anti-British" might have provided additional explanations for the failures of British policy, as well as highlighting the evolution of the region's own population and its ability to evade colonial rule.

Secondly, an expanded sense of tribal agency and motivations might have clarified a central issue running throughout the book—the issue of control. British policies towards Waziristan, whether in terms of the forward or closed border policy or the "peaceful penetration" pursued during the interwar years, were all intended to assert British influence over this region. But what did "control" actually look like? Was it merely a matter of pacifying local populations and maintaining a buffer zone between Afghanistan and colonial India? Or did British officials hope to incorporate the region and its population? While the book documents the decision-making taking place among British civilian and military officials on the ground, what is not always clear is how choices to send in troops or conduct aerial bombardments fit into broader imperial strategy or aspirations. How the British ultimately envisioned Waziristan fitting into colonial India, the greater British Empire, or, in the era of decolonization, a world increasingly dominated by nation-states remains vague. Perhaps this reflects the nature of British policy towards the region or the Raj's ambivalent relationship with Waziristan's population, but this point would have benefited from further explanation in the text. Likewise, contextualizing British policy towards Waziristan in terms of colonial approaches to other areas along the Indo-Afghan frontier would have helped emphasize the region's significance and potential uniqueness.

Empire and Tribe does not particularly break new ground in terms of its analytical findings regarding British policy towards Waziristan. Instead its value lies in the painstaking detail Beattie offers in describing how British policy evolved over a century as well as in its chronological approach, which allows the reader to easily follow the shifts in British relations with Waziristan. It will be of particular use to students and scholars newly arriving to the study of the colonial Indo-Afghan frontier and serves to reemphasize how violence became an institutionalized part of state rule towards this border region.

doi:10.1017/S0020743821000246

Walter Armbrust, Martyrs & Tricksters: An Ethnography of the Egyptian Revolution, Princeton Studies in Muslim Politics (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019). Pp. 344. $99.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780691162638

Reviewed by Sherine Hamdy, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Irvine, CA (shamdy@uci.edu)

This book was a dizzying read, leaving me with almost as many complicated and contradictory emotions as did the Egyptian revolution itself. I was excited to see a scholar of modern Egyptian popular culture take on the task of explaining how "Egyptians moved from unprecedented exhilaration to confusion and massacre" (*backmatter*). I was hopeful that Armbrust set out to "write about the revolution directly," and in a way that "can be read equally well from any disciplinary perspective" (p. 12). Yet Armbrust also begins his book with some trepidation, stating that anthropologists are not trained to study political events; and that "Revolution is not necessarily easy to frame anthropologically" (p. 11).

This brought to mind Orin Starn's now famous 1991 essay "Missing the Revolution" (*Cultural Anthropology* 6, no.1: 63–91), in which he critiques Andeanist anthropologists for being too busy detailing highland ceremonial to apprehend the rage that was fomenting among Peru's marginalized indigenous communities, which became manifest in the terror of the Shining Path. Andean Anthropologists were utterly ill-equipped to anticipate the ensuing guerilla-government war that claimed 15,000 lives in the 1980s. Starn offers fellow anthropologists a clear prescription for this problem: stop obsessing about the continuities to Andeans' pre-colonial past; quit Othering them; and engage politically to support them in their quest for human rights.

Writing nearly three decades after Starn's piece, Armbrust's vision of anthropology is one that has shifted away from the insular fetishization of timeless Others. Armbrust even stresses that anthropology