

visible ... words do not exist independently of the thing they name; rather their utterance *is* the thing” (231). Por otro lado, tampoco se establecería una separación entre estas entidades y los runa, ni entre estos y los lugares que habitan (101). En suma, a pesar de que la autora afirma que esta diferencia radical no es sino una condición relacional que emerge cuando las partes involucradas en la representación de la realidad se equivocan acerca de lo que está siendo representado (275), la negación de estas y otras distinciones recuerda las críticas elaboradas contra el “fundamentalismo” que varios autores han encontrado en el “giro ontológico”.

La posibilidad de esta crítica al libro podría, quizá, relacionarse con la ausencia de una definición explícita de uno de sus conceptos claves: “the in-ayllu world” (116). Sabemos que, “en su prosa”, no se distingue entre narración y evento, y que este último bien puede ser ahistórico. Y, como adjetivo, “in-ayllu” es usado para describir prácticamente todos los elementos del mundo andino: “in-ayllu land was mountains, rivers, and lakes – the tirakuna that together with animals, plants, and runakuna composed the place that they all were and still are” (97). Pero no parece del todo claro cuáles son, en concreto, esas “ahistorical in-ayllu practices” que reúnen “diferentes mundos onto-epistémicos” (150).

A lo que sí hace referencia el libro, de manera recurrente, es a la incapacidad del estado peruano, para “reconocer” estas conexiones que permiten aquellas prácticas por medio de las cuales los Turpo producen realidades como los “earth-beings” o “tirakuna”. Esta incapacidad radicaría en lo que la autora llama “the epistemic grain of the state” (186), la ontología histórica del conocimiento moderno que, al mismo tiempo que permite ciertas preguntas, respuestas y entendimientos, inhabilita como innecesarias o irreales aquellas que caen fuera de su alcance o que la exceden: “runakuna engage in political practices that ... the state cannot recognize ... because ... it would require its transformation, even its undoing” (14). Cabe notar también que la constancia de esta comparación entre las prácticas de los Turpo y las del estado peruano, contrasta con la casi ausencia de contrastes con las etnografías de otras regiones andinas fuera del Cuzco.

Finalmente, pues, este denso e interesante libro nos brinda una imagen bastante intensa de lo que, desde fines de los noventa del siglo pasado, se ha llamado “cosmopolitismo” andino. Mariano y Nazario Turpo recuerdan – aunque no sean del todo adeptos al vocabulario política y ecológicamente correctos – al activista yanomami Davi Kopenawa. Como él, los Turpo buscaron el reconocimiento de sus prójimos, por medio de un libro (10–15), cuyo protagonismo quizá habrían apreciado si no hubiese llegado después de sus muertes.

Juan Javier Rivera Andía

**Finke, Peter:** *Variations on Uzbek Identity. Strategic Choices, Cognitive Schemas, and Political Constraints in Identification Processes.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2014. 271 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-238-6. (Integration and Conflict Studies, 7) Price: \$ 95.00

In “Variations on Uzbek Identity,” Peter Finke describes and analyzes the range of ways “Uzbekness” is understood and lived out in contemporary Uzbekistan. As the title aptly demonstrates, Finke’s primary concern is to convey variation and, in this way, he builds off the classic literature on ethnicity and identity, which approaches collective forms of belonging as constantly shifting processes. Finke aims to understand how this variation is connected to structural differences in things like climate and geography, or historical migration and political upheaval. He is likewise keen to ferret out patterns in all this variation. Despite the numerous ways Uzbekness is understood, Finke argues, an essential element is collective residence and socialization (x). He thus understands Uzbekness, at its base, to be a “territorial concept of identification” (x). It is “attractive” to Central Asians and sometimes taken up by them, he contends, precisely because it is not a genealogical model. It can therefore be more easily adopted when it is in the strategic interest of its actors.

The book is straightforwardly structured. It begins by reviewing the theoretical approaches on the topics of ethnicity, nationality, and identity and then presents an extensive “historical sketch of the Uzbeks” that starts off in the 6th millennium B.C. This history aims to trace what the chapter title describes as a move from “Nomadic Conquerors to Post-Socialist Farmers” (29). The subsequent chapters examine Uzbekness in four field sites across Uzbekistan – Bukhara, Khorezm, the Ferghana Valley, and Qashqadaryo. It closes with a conclusion in which Finke compares the four cases and gives a tentative answer to the question of “What Then Is an Uzbek?” (237).

The book is based on fieldwork that utilized cognitive tests, among other methods like interviews and participant observation. Interdisciplinary work especially at the intersections of psychology, cognitive sciences, and anthropology may fruitfully display and tease out the complex ways “nature” and “nurture” are forever intertwined, and how the two remain always political, however Finke’s use of these methods needed to be more thoroughly and rigorously conceived and worked out. We gain little insight into how the tests were performed, how they were interpreted or how they informed the analyses in his book. Moreover, his use of these methods lacks a critical and thorough engagement with the history and legacy of physical anthropology and race studies in (post)colonial settings, an absolute necessity for any study of this kind.

Finke presents his research within the frame of studies on ethnicity and identity. In the introduction, he describes the literature as having primarily two trends – primordialist and instrumentalist (or situationalist) approaches. He understands the former as too rigid, unable to account for the flexibility, mutability, and ambiguity of actual lived identities. The later approach, however, can lead to the possibility of endless variation, is unable to connect the construction of identity to “historical reality” (14), and insufficiently shows the power of affect and cognition in process of identification, he argues. Finke, therefore, proposes to combine these approaches with rational choice models and insights from cognitive anthropology to cre-

ate a more well rounded approach that considers the mutability *and* stability of identities as well as “the political and cognitive factors that account for the way people position themselves in respect to others” (22).

Throughout the book, Finke explicitly emphasizes the variations that being Uzbek take across the territory of Uzbekistan. This is the strength of his work and makes a valuable contribution to Central Asian studies. He is able to show that “being Uzbek” means different things to different actors across Uzbekistan. For those living in the oasis of Bukhara, for example, Finke speaks of a completely bilingual environment and an Uzbek-Tajik ethnic amalgam, in which families and villages can, over generations, switch from one to the other and back. For those living in the Ferghana Valley, however, Finke describes an environment with a stronger normative preference for Uzbek above other ethnicities and in which change of ethnicity moves one way – “almost always from Tajik or Kyrgyz to Uzbek, and not easily reversible” (190). Yet unlike Khorezm, and similar to Bukhara, the ethnicity of a child in the Ferghana Valley is not necessarily assumed to be the same as his or her father or parents. In the Ferghana Valley, paternity might be trumped by circumstance or the influence of the neighborhood community in these decisions. Ultimately, Finke asserts that “[w]hat unites the Uzbeks” (227) is their mutual recognition of one another as Uzbeks and the fact that “becom[ing] Uzbek has been, over the centuries, an attractive option to members of other groups” (227).

Finke’s insight on marriage patterns is fascinating and he succeeds in convincing the reader of the regional variability of Uzbekness. He likewise shows why in particular spatio-temporal locations, becoming or being Uzbek might have been an attractive option. His argument would have been more convincing however, if he would have provided a deeper and more sustained engagement with the recent anthropological literature on belonging and the making or doing of particular subject positions, including those referencing “the nation.” Moreover, his work would have been more persuasive in style, and analysis, had he taken his own critiques of the literature on ethnic identity to heart. Finke rightly argues that “[g]roups are not merely voluntary associations pursuing interests, but communities bounded by emotional attachments and sometimes forced upon its members by others” (22). Yet the emotion of his interlocutors and the texture of their lives and struggles do not sufficiently come through in his text. They too often become nameless “Uzbeks,” “Tajiks,” “Kazaks,” or “Karakalpaks” who marry off their children or choose schools for individual, calculated reasons. Understandably, Finke’s research and the way he wrote up his material were limited due to the strict controls of the Uzbek government and his need to protect the men and women with whom he spoke. But his authorial voice is too distant for the reader to feel an affective connection with his interlocutors and the emotional attachments and struggles of their lives.

Julie McBrien

**Ford, Anabel, and Ronald Nigh:** *The Maya Forest Garden. Eight Millennia of Sustainable Cultivation of the Tropical Woodlands.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2015. 260 pp. ISBN 978-1-61132-998-8. Price: \$ 34.95

In the archaeology of the ancient tropics and subtropics a major theme is to detail the relationships between these environments and the different trajectories along which human cultures have developed. Over the last couple of decades, much of this research has not solely addressed research problems particular to the specific culture’s historical context but, either explicitly or indirectly, addressed key issues pertaining to the broader sustainability discourse. Such issues include, for instance, the long- and short-term impacts of resource management on ecosystems and cultural and social responses to climate change. Within tropical and subtropical archaeology the study of socio-ecological sustainability, resilience, and vulnerability has become perhaps particularly prolific in the investigation of the pre-Columbian Maya lowlands. Owing to several quite dramatic episodes of social change over millennia of the pre-Columbian trajectory of Maya cultures and societies, researchers have particularly taken an interest in understanding processes of collapse and reorganization, investigating, for instance, processes of deforestation, top-soil erosion, food and water insecurity, sunk cost investments, political instability, and conflict as interrelated factors undermining resilience.

Archaeologists interested in issues of sustainability often tend to focus on social change and disruption and, therefore, to identify and explain how sustainability “failed,” but there are also factors that build resilience, that contribute to the longevity of social institutions. Perhaps seemingly paradoxical, in the Maya lowlands it is viable to study both factors that made societies vulnerable and those that built resilience. In this monograph, Anabel Ford and Ronald Nigh are focusing on the latter. Despite fundamental changes in the pre-Columbian Maya past, there is also evidence of considerable continuity through millennia of social change. Ford’s and Nigh’s main argument is that Maya farmers for millennia practiced, and still continue to do so, a form of agriculture that the authors label “the Maya forest garden.” Their central argument is that Maya farmers practiced a cyclic form of carefully managed swidden cultivation that, although focused on maize, at any one time maintained a series of plots, each in a particular phase of cultivation and regeneration that brought together and provided a diverse set of useful plants. They argue that this agroecosystem was strongly productive and did not only provide sustenance for the farmers themselves but also produced sufficient surplus to finance the development and maintenance of complex Maya societies. Following an introduction, this central idea is empirically substantiated by supporting archaeological, ethnographic, and botanic evidence over the book’s six chapters. The scope and point of their case is returned to throughout the book, reminding the reader where the argument is going and consistently situating each section in the overall argument.

Their historical ecological perspective internalizes the forest environment in an anthropocentric fabric of rela-