

Rezensionen

Andolina, Robert, Nina Laurie, and Sarah A. Radcliffe: *Indigenous Development in the Andes. Culture, Power, and Transnationalism.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2009. 346 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-4540-4. Price: \$ 24.95

In chapter two of “Indigenous Development in the Andes,” Radcliffe, Laurie, and Andolina, spell out two “ethnodevelopment approaches,” two ways in which indigenous projects and professional careers in development came together in the 1990s and 2000s. Each represented a rejection of racist Andean stereotypes and each sought to build an alternative vision of economy and community. In one, indigenous groups, NGOs, and state agencies aim “to fill (perceived or actual) gulfs between indigenous social capital, on the one hand, and economic markets, on the other” (76). This approach represented a turn for international agencies, in particular, which stopped seeing indigenous culture as a liability, embraced native social institutions as potential assets, and supported cultural difference as a development goal.

The second approach “relies more on cross-cultural and multiethnic networks to foment political and economic empowerment” (76). Here multiethnic and translocal networks come into their own. Coalitions of indigenous and nonindigenous actors consolidate development initiatives and build the “intercultural character of indigenous economic activity” (77). If the authors see a greater downside of the first approach – risks of patriarchy, internal exploitation, and ethnoracial violence –, they recognize how both represent an accomplishment of the indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia. Development has rediscovered culture; indigenous people have reclaimed agency as authors and not just subjects of policy. In light of these changes, this book seeks to answer “how are development policy and practice reconfigured once ethnicity and cultural difference are inserted explicitly into development thinking?” (2).

In six chapters, the authors explore key concepts and institutions of professional development practice affecting the indigenous zones of the Andes. They interrogate well-worn ideas of globalization and neoliberal development such as transnational networks (chap. 1) and social capital (chap. 2). They also focus on iconic indigenous causes, including fighting for territorially-linked political authority (chap. 3) and mobilizing against the privatization of water (chap. 4). The final part of the book offers an innovative look at the professionalization of indigenous

development authorities (chap. 5) and the uncertain empowerment of indigenous women in ethnodevelopment policies (chap. 6). Taken together, these topics cohere as a valuable scholarly project that complements the extensive literature on the indigenous movement’s protests, politics, and organizations. As the authors note, “[m]ass mobilizations still matter, but the lines of struggle are drawn increasingly within agencies of power” (1) and their research offers a model of how to follow such lines across scales. Their analytical concern travels from a specific Ecuadorian project that entails auditing a native community’s social capital to a global movement of solidarity with millions of Bolivians who mobilized to fight water privatization. The authors succeed in mapping out the intellectual terrain in which such topics come together.

The book bogs down, though, in murky prose and at times important points slip away into a frustrating vagueness. In the introduction, for example, the authors coin the term “social neoliberalism” in order to highlight that “cultural difference, environmental protection, gender equality, and popular participation [are seen] as necessary ingredients in development and accordant with capitalist markets or self-help agency” (9). They assert that ethnodevelopment policies derive in part from social neoliberalism, but they also note that “indigenous movements are unstable dialogic partners with social neoliberalism” (11). Subsequent chapters never really resolve whether the indigenous development taking place in the Andes is an example of social neoliberalism or an alternative to it. Since others writing on this subject come to far more definitive conclusions about the links between indigenous development and neoliberalism, this ambiguity is a lost opportunity. The wider debate about how much indigenous activism has been a product of contemporary global capitalism never gets fully engaged.

Later, the discussion of place-making and indigenous political tactics can also be hard to follow. “Internetwork spaces emerged as different kinds of actors set joint agendas and negotiated differences; in some cases, such circuitry formed hybrid institutions, like planning and oversight committees for local development. This interaction created multiscale locales enveloped in complex distributions of sovereignty” (99), write the authors in reference to the politics unfolding in Andean *municipios*. Lost in these lines is the powerful point that comes at the end of the chapter: indigenous leaders use territorial jurisdictions – even those that they have only partial control over – “as

grounds for relating with others” (123). Native leaders spend time seeking to officialize indigenous conceptions of regional, cultural spaces – pueblos in Ecuador and *ayllus* in Bolivia – as “platforms for direct relations with other cultural groups” (101). The chapter could have pursued this idea with far more vigor and clarity than it did.

A central metaphor of the book also failed for me. The authors speak repeatedly of “reloaded boomerangs” as in, “Recent production of local spaces in highland Bolivia and Ecuador reveals the complex dynamics of ‘reloaded boomerangs’ and multiscale relations” (118). The metaphor is meant to express how, in struggles with the state, indigenous groups make appeals to powerful allies beyond their borders, groups who then help discipline national authorities, but who also remake indigenous aims in the process. Every time I read the phrase though, I wondered, “How do you load a boomerang?” “Wouldn’t a loaded boomerang just fall out of the sky?” The phrase distracts rather than clarifies.

In the final substantive chapter before the conclusion, though, the analysis of gender empowerment receives a more direct and concise discussion than other key topics in the book. The authors list features that characterize spaces that strengthen women’s authority: “the expression and pursuit of difference and equality issues in a structured and transparent way; the recognition and incorporation of context-specific intersections of gender, race, culture, and nationality; the acknowledgement of indigenous women’s mobility across space (and between scales) and the support to facilitate such mobility; and indigenous women’s meaningful participation vis-à-vis men (indigenous and not) and non indigenous women” (220). They distill these elements through both a critical reading gender and development policy, on the one hand, and the work of Ecuador’s Indigenous and Afro Ecuadorian People’s Development Project, on the other hand. Having identified the factors leading to better outcomes for women, the chapter concludes by noting the difficulty of holding these features together.

“Indigenous Development in the Andes” is an important book for those interested in native movements, the transformation of rural societies, and contemporary development practice. The authors are at their best pursuing professional linkages among indigenous activists, development specialists, and state actors. As Andean peoples work to overcome the racism of the region, defend their economic security, and live according to the ideals of their diverse communities, they build and restrict relations with powerful institutions. Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe lay out in an innovative way to understand the conditions, possibilities, and costs of such connections.

Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld

Beach, Hugh, Dmitri Funk, and Lennard Sillanpää (eds.): *Post-Soviet Transformations. Politics of Ethnicity and Resource Use in Russia*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2009. 260 pp. 1 DVD Film. ISBN 978-91-554-7530-7. (Uppsala Studies in Cultural Anthropology, 46). Price: skr 277.00

Der vorliegende Band enthält eine Anzahl sorgfältig editierter Beiträge von einer bulgarisch-schwedischen sowie von 10 russischen Autorinnen und Autoren. Sie untersuchen, wie in Russland seit Perestrojka bisherige “Soviet structures remain in new garb, old and new economic relations mix and merge into unique transformations, and ethnicities mobilize their efforts for recognition and special resource rights” (8).

In der Einleitung hebt Hugh Beach hervor, dass “[t]his publication helps fill the vacuum of anthropological material about Russian [?] indigenous peoples presented in English by a team composed largely of Russians”, wobei “the voices of these Russian anthropological colleagues have still been little heard in the West” (17f.). Das läge daran, weil man bislang meinte, “western science is best” und man somit keine Notwendigkeit sähe, russische Wissenschaftler zu russischen Themen zu Rate zu ziehen (17). Das ist nun allerdings eine recht problematische pauschalisierende Aussage, zumal es gerade immer auch das Selbstverständnis der sowjetischen Wissenschaft war, die Welt besser zu erklären. Man möchte darauf hinweisen, mit welchen enormen internationalen und (bis heute) besonderen finanziellen Bemühungen jedoch gerade russische Nachwuchswissenschaftler seit Anfang der 1990er Jahre in die regelmäßigen ICASS-Konferenzen mit einbezogen worden sind, da der westlichen Wissenschaft gerade an russischen Sichtweisen zur Diskussion postsowjetischer Entwicklungen gelegen war und ist. Nicht unerwähnt bleiben sollten auch die Konferenzen des Max-Planck-Instituts für ethnologische Forschung in Halle unmittelbar nach dessen Gründung im Jahre 1999 (http://www.kulturstiftung-sibirien.de/ver_43.html). Dabei ging es vor allem um den Dialog zwischen westlicher und postsowjetischer ethnologischer Forschung, wie er auch in der Zusammensetzung der Beiträge in den daraus entstandenen Sammelbänden zum Ausdruck kommt. In vielen Fällen sind jene Artikel nach gemeinsamen Feldforschungen zusammen von russischen und westlichen Autoren verfasst und das Ergebnis eines zunächst oft schwierigen, aber letztlich erhellenden und produktiven Austauschs über Stärken und Schwächen sowohl westlicher wie auch sowjetischer Forschungstraditionen und Methoden – mit schließlicher Revidierung von oben genannten Vorurteilen auf beiden Seiten. Dass in dem vorliegenden Buch explizit gerade auf diesen so außerordentlich wichtigen westlich-russischen Dialog zu diesen Fragen verzichtet wird, mag der Leser befremdlich und bedauerlich finden, zumal nirgendwo ausgeführt und in den Ergebnissen nicht ersichtlich wird, worin die wiederholt betonte “Kooperation” in diesem Projekt tatsächlich bestanden hat.

Die Beiträge selber versöhnen einen aber schnell – nach der etwas unglücklichen Einleitung – durch deren hervorragende Qualität, wobei sie eine gekonnte Verflechtung vor allem sowjetisch geprägter historisch-statistischer Traditionen und westlicher Feldforschungsmethoden erkennen lassen.

Nach vorab sehr hilfreichen Erklärungen zur besonderen rechtlichen Definition des Status von indigenen Bevölkerungen in Russland und des früheren sowjetischen