Bret Gustafson. ***New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia***. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009. Pp. 352. ISBN: 978-0-8223-4529-9 (cloth); 978-0-8223-4546-6 (paperback).

Among specialists on Latin America few topics are as widely discussed as indigenous resurgence. Bret Gustafson, Assistant Professor of Anthropology at the Washington University in St. Louis, joins the debate by offering an extensive portrait of Guarani struggles in Bolivia, the epicenter of political mobilizations and state transformation in Latin America, discussing indigenous politics, development discourses, and the Bolivian state by analyzing intercultural bilingual education (*educación intercultural bilingüe, EIB)*.

Established in 1994, EIB is a Bolivian state policy which has introduced indigenous languages to public elementary schools in areas populated by indigenous peoples. Yet, as Gustafson discusses throughout the book, EIB is an issue that extends far beyond language and schooling: heavily supported by international development agencies and promoted by indigenous activists, anthropologists and non-governmental organizations, EIB also incorporates a contested set of neoliberal policy reforms, development efforts and indigenous struggles for land. Gustafson shows that EIB programs are not totalizing, but subject to contention. When compared to the approaches of political scientists, development scholars or education specialists, the book offers the kind of nuanced view of EIB practices characteristic of anthropology.

Gustafson's book is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the implementation of UNICEF-funded EIB programs in Guarani schools from 1989 onwards, through which the indigenous political mobilization of the Bolivian lowlands was increasingly channeled: donor funds poured into Guarani communities, politically active youth received scholarships for teacher training, and indigenous language activists moved between positions in development projects and the Assembly of the Guarani People (the main indigenous movement for Guarani struggles over lands and territories). In the second part the author follows the journey of Guarani language activists: from their everyday struggles in their own communities to conflicts with state bureaucracy and development institutions in the capital La Paz.

Gustafson describes how EIB programs emerged as a contested field: critics saw EIB as legitimizing neoliberal reforms in the face of indigenous unrest, while for supporters it was a sign of indigenous agency. In the final part Gustafson returns to local Guarani activism that extended far beyond EIB. With the arrival of multinational oil companies in Guarani lands, and increased participation of indigenous peoples in municipal politics, indigenous claims for state transformation became stronger. This finally led to the decolonization of the state during the presidency of Evo Morales, Bolivia's first indigenous president. Gustafson's central thesis is that despite its contested nature, EIB has had a democratizing effect for Guarani peoples by creating intercultural spaces for the construction of new citizenship and state transformation.

Gustafson examines the Guarani language struggle across different sites and scales. This is, however, both a strength and weakness of his analysis. On the whole, he succeeds in providing a detailed ethnography of the EIB as a battlefield of the politics of knowledge.

Nevertheless, by presenting a lengthy history which moves from the Franciscan mission schools of the colonial and republican times to international development encounters in the present, I wonder whether the book aspires to cover too much ground for a consistent ethnographic account.

Gustafson aims at giving a nuanced understanding of EIB by situating it in a large number of theoretical frameworks: from intellectual debates of governmentality, interculturalism, and indigenous knowledge to debates over citizenship and social movements. I will examine two discussions here: the debates on governmentality and indigenous knowledge.

Since Ferguson's (1994) study of development in Lesotho, ethnographic challenges to Foucauldian governmentality as disciplinary techniques and self-government have been widely discussed (Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Li 2007; Ong 2006). Gustafson's material adds to the discussion by presenting two options for detailed ethnographic critique of governmentality: first, the historical description of education as a bio-political disciplining of Guarani indigenous groups in the making of the Bolivian nation-state; second, the analysis of EIB techniques and expertise as features of neoliberal governance aimed at producing self-governing, individual citizens amenable to free market ideology. Although Gustafson considers these two options, he hesitates to elaborate on them because they would 'lead to a pessimistic view of all knowledge politics' (p. 21).

Within development policy-making, the concept of 'indigenous knowledge' has become an important currency (Yarrow 2008). Gustafson defines it as 'a hybrid, networked form of sociopolitical and cultural practice that articulates with other forms of knowledge production and practices' (p. 23). With this definition in mind, I expected an analysis of interactions between Guarani cultural practice and technocratic knowledge production. By contrast, in the book culture and knowledge are one-sidedly equated with language and schooling. Gustafson himself recognizes that this is what happened in the process of introducing EIB to Guarani communities: the 'socially embedded Guarani knowledge practices (…) were undermined, or at least bypassed' (p. 129). With this in mind, it is all the more regrettable that Guarani local practices are bypassed in Gustafson's ethnographic research.

Most of these shortcomings relate to Gustafson' methodological choices and empirical data, which draw on fourteen years of engagement with Guarani communities. He sees himself as an EIB-activist, who is committed to engaged anthropology, which he hopes to be useful for 'projects of change' (p. 12). Without immediately disapproving of activist anthropology, I want to question whether this approach hinders the ethnographer's capacities to critically assess the specific contexts they are investigating. In the case of Gustafson's study, this danger emerges at two levels. First, if Gustafson had given us a detailed ethnographic analysis of Guarani knowledge production and practices, it would have shed light on the diversity, complex internal logics and power relations within Guarani life.

Yet the author hesitates to tackle conflicts within the Guarani communities and instead provides us with a fixed image of 'proud Guarani'. This is, in my opinion, problematic in an anthropological account because it shows us a romanticized view of indigenous peoples rather than reflecting empirical realities. Second, as an anthropologist engaged in the design and practice of EIB it is difficult to assess the internal functioning of the EIB

development programs without de-legitimizing one's own position in the field (see Mosse 2005). Considering these two pitfalls, the book challenges us to assess the role of engaged anthropologists in processes of change in Latin America and elsewhere.

These critical remarks notwithstanding, I recommend this book to those interested in EIB, education policies and the history of schooling in Latin America. Additionally, this book offers novel insights for anthropologists, political scientists and others working on indigenous resurgence. Given the worldwide gaze on Bolivia's current indigenous regime, it valuably reminds readers of the historical roots behind the struggles that made the Bolivian state representative for its indigenous majority. The book also reminds us that indigenous struggles are never purely local: instead, they are formed out of local resurgence, transnational development encounters, and national histories, crystallized in the politics of knowledge.

REFERENCES

Ferguson, James 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depolitization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Ferguson, James and Akhil Gupta 2002. Spatializing States: Towards an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality. *American Anthropologist* 29 (4): 981–1002.
Li, Tania Murray 2007. *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
Mosse, David 2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice.* London and Ann Arbor, M.I.: Pluto Press.
Ong, Aihwa 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
Yarrow, Thomas 2008. Negotiating Difference: Discourses of Indigenous Knowledge and Development in Ghana. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 31 (2): 224–242.

EIJA RANTA-OWUSU
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
eija.ranta-owusu@helsinki.fi

RUPERT STASCH. ***Society of Others: Kinship and Mourning in a West Papuan Place.*** Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2009. Pp. 336. ISBN: 978-0-520-25685-9 (hardback); 978-0-520-25686-6 (paperback).

Social relations are often depicted as being based on pure mutual identification, both by popular discourse as well as by anthropologists. Following Ferdinand Tönnies' contrast of *Gemeinschaft*, a community based on relations of pure identification, such as kinship, and *Gesellschaft*, relations based on calculating instrumentality, small scale or tribal societies have often been seen as a prototype of *Gemeinschaft*. According to this popular stereotype,