

der westlichen Dichotomisierung des Denkens (persönlich/unpersönlich; Materie/Geist)? Führt ihn gar "political correctness" und eine protektive Haltung gegenüber "seinen" Hawaiianern ("Seht, auch sie können durchaus wissenschaftlich argumentieren") zu solch einer Auffassung des mythischen Textes? Oder hat er Recht und die Geschichte der Entwicklung des abstrakten Denkens muss anhand des KL neu geschrieben werden?

Charlots Werk ist eine Einladung, dieser für einen wahrhaft *anthropologischen* Blick auf den Menschen so wichtigen Frage anhand hawaiianischer Texte auf umfassenderer Basis nachzugehen. Dem Anthropos-Institut sei dafür gedankt, dass es durch die Veröffentlichung von Charlots Werk die Grundlage dafür geschaffen hat. Und an Charlot sei die Bitte gerichtet, auch zum Rest des KL-Textes, Anmerkungen wie im vorliegenden Buch zu veröffentlichen.

Thomas Bargatzky

Córdoba, Lorena (ed.): *Dos suizos en la selva. Historias del auge cauchero en el Oriente boliviano*. Santa Cruz de la Sierra: Solidar, 2015. 406 pp. ISBN 978-99974-52-03-0.

Over the past few years, we have enjoyed an increase in the studies of the rubber boom in Bolivia. This book is a welcome addition to this literature, as it presents two of the most informative and entertaining first-person accounts of the boom in Spanish, translated from the original German.

The rubber boom occurred in the Amazon region during the latter half of the 19th century, when a rapidly industrializing world found the sap of two trees, *Castilla elastica* and *Hevea brasiliensis*, useful for all kinds of uses in machines and clothing, as well as tires for bicycles and later, automobiles. The boom ended abruptly in 1913, when the British plantations in Malaysia came on line from seeds that a British explorer had stolen from Brazil. The companies that exploited the wild trees in the Amazon forest could not compete with the plantations, where there were no natural predators or diseases and the plants could be planted and harvested in an industrial manner. The Bolivian boom started in the 1880s, later than in countries such as Brazil, because of the remoteness of the region. It reached its high point, exporting mainly down the Amazon through Brazil, in the first decade of the 20th century.

The book brings together two accounts of the rubber boom by two Swiss adventurers who spent time working in the tropical Beni region of Bolivia, at approximately the same time, from about 1906 to the end of the rubber boom in 1913. These accounts were published in German in Switzerland, Franz Ritz's "Kautschukjäger im Urwald" in 1934, and Ernst Leutenegger's "Menschen im Urwald. Ein Schweizer erlebt Bolivien" in 1940. Ritz worked for the French Braillard merchant house, whereas Leutenegger worked for the Bolivian rubber magnate, Nicolás Suárez. Although both returned to Switzerland after a number of years, they went back to Bolivia later on; on his return Leutenegger even married the daughter of Suárez and occupied important positions in his father-in-law's

company. However, in both instances the accounts only cover their first stay in the rubber regions and not their subsequent ones.

The accounts are valuable because they give us detailed narrations of foreign employees' experiences during the height of the rubber boom. They show that even European employees such as Ritz and Leutenegger earned very little money despite given managerial positions quite quickly. Although the stories are written in an entertaining fashion – travel literature during the early 20th century was a popular genre in Europe – they provide an almost ethnographic feel for the place and time. The travel literature genre had its own tropes about the benighted savages in what were considered the marginal regions of the world, but both authors, though with their own prejudices and perspectives, were pretty frank in their estimation of labor conditions in the region. Of course, first-hand information is best about the conditions for the Europeans in the tropics. Leutenegger, for example, shows that even white-collar employees lived pretty miserably, eating bad food and working all the time. Both also suffered from malaria and especially Leutenegger went into great detail about his almost fatal encounter with that disease.

Both Swiss authors also describe at length the living conditions of the native labor force. Ritz asserts that the indigenous population was not mistreated as, for example, Roger Casement claimed for the Putumayo region of Peru, but, in fact, he shows that the exploitation was great. Leutenegger instead focuses mainly on the indebtedness of the natives (and all employees), illustrating very well how that system tied all workers to the companies despite relatively high earnings. People saw credit as a benefit and most did not worry whether they could leave or not. There are also detailed descriptions of the procedures for making rubber, its sale, and the administration of the rubber enterprises.

The translation of the books is excellent. The editor, Lorena Córdoba, offers a very useful introduction, providing a good overview of the rubber boom and also a lot of biographical information on the authors. Leutenegger's section has hand-drawn illustrations that are not terribly illustrative; I assume they were copied from the original book. More useful are the more than almost two dozen photos in Ritz's account and the more than three dozen photographs appended after Leutenegger's section.

All in all, this book is very useful as a primary source on the rubber boom in Bolivia. The authors present compelling portraits of a crucial period of the rubber boom in tropical Bolivia that can serve as an entry into the living conditions of that era and are a welcome complement to the secondary literature on this important episode in the economic history of the Amazon. Their republication in Spanish makes their insights more widely available to scholars in the field.

Erick D. Langer

Costa, David J. (ed.): *New Voices for Old Words. Algonquian Oral Literatures*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015. 546 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-6548-6. Price: £ 65.00

“New Voices for Old Words. Algonquian Oral Literatures” is a set of eight premodern Algonquian texts published alongside essays by linguists on how they chose to redact and present the texts for a contemporary audience. The publication of this book is a welcome addition to recent trends toward publishing more indigenous language materials. Most of the eight texts are stories, though one is a prayer and another a speech. The six languages represented are Arapaho, Gros Ventre, Meskwaki-Sauk, Munsee, Peoria, and Potawatomi, which make it a rich collection for all Algonquian language scholars and revitalizers.

The stories alone will interest a wide audience of scholars from those who study Native American literature, folklore, rhetoric, and history to the intended audience of the book, linguists. For instance, any one of the stories could be used alone in a class to talk about language change over time, variations in oral and written languages, or the messy business of translating. However, to teach these texts to a general audience would require a considerable amount of verbal guidance from the teacher to explain the structure of how the pages are structured and how to read the story through for meaning. Given the popularity of teaching Black Hawk’s writing in U.S. literature classes, Gordon Whittaker’s essay “The Words of Black Hawk. Restoring a Long-Ignored Bilingual” could potentially reach a wide audience, providing interesting linguistic context for analyzing Black Hawk’s writing more generally.

In the “Introduction” Costa makes it clear that he sees the publication of these texts as crucially valuable to indigenous language and cultural revitalization programs, which suggests to me that he hopes for a broad audience of indigenous community members and scholars. He writes that “[i]t is the responsibility of linguists not only to publish such materials in formats that are as coherent and accurate as possible, but also to help tribal linguists understand these same principles, so that they can make as much use of these materials as the general linguistic community can” (2). As a member of the Miami Nation of Indiana who teaches Myaamia, I applaud this sentiment. For me, these stories and essays are most valuable to the extent that they communicate the linguists’ work for a tribal audience.

To make the translation process as clear as possible, each text is presented in at least four lines: 1) the original transcription, 2) phonemicization (translating the historic written texts into the phonetic system used by present-day linguists), 3) glossing or translating of individual words, and 4) the translation of the phrase as a whole. This structure makes this book well suited to teaching the nuances of translating premodern Algonquian texts. However, to make the book particularly useful in this way, the authors had to assume that the audience has graduate level training in linguistics, which severely limits the audience of the individual stories and the book as whole.

The essays that accompany each text clearly lay out the challenges of translating the original transcript, what speakers and transcribers were involved in the process, changes in the language, and in-depth discussion of key passages. These essays will be fabulous resources for a

variety of scholars interested in historical Native American texts because they beautifully articulate the linguistic challenges of translating these texts into something that is easily read by present-day audiences. However, the essays are clearly geared towards linguists. They rely heavily on linguistic jargon, abbreviations, and values. Any reader would need advanced training in linguistics to read the essays on their own, which makes me wonder how the authors and editor imagine this book being useful to tribal-based language revitalization programs.

In addition to Costa’s introductory discussion of the responsibility of linguists to publish this material in a way that is coherent to tribal communities, nearly each author makes a similar claim. For instance in “Editing and Using Arapaho-Language Manuscript Sources: A Comparative Perspective,” Andrew Cowell writes: “The chapter is written in the context of efforts to retranscribe and retranslate the texts specifically for a reservation audience of either Arapaho speakers or Arapaho language learners, with the goal of disseminating the texts on the reservation rapidly and inexpensively” (90). I initially read this as a claim that the chapter was written for a reservation context, but what he and other authors mean is that the story translations were undertaken for a reservation audience, while the chapters were written for an academic audience.

Any scholar who works between community and scholarly contexts can appreciate the challenges of writing for two audiences at once; however, there are some fairly simple ways that this book and books like it could be made more accessible to community audiences. In the context of language revitalization, community revitalizers and linguists are strongly invested in accuracy in translation, but for slightly different reasons. Tribal language revitalizers may be keenly interested in the structure and changes in the language, while primarily valuing the epistemic and historical knowledge gained through the translation of the story. On the other hand, linguists may be interested in the meaning of the passage, but they are often most concerned with how the language is working to produce that meaning. In this book, this means that the essays are organized around linguistic arguments and values that could be seen as divorced from community concerns and uses of these texts.

To make this conversation more clear and relevant to tribal language revitalizers, linguists could include a sentence at the end of key paragraphs summarizing the point or stakes of their argument in plain language. For example, one summary sentence might reveal that the point here is to show and teach a broader audience why it matters whether the word is in the obviate form or not. How does obviation change the meaning of the story? What might the cultural stakes of that change be? How do you explain obviation without using terms like obviation? To do this sort of work well requires an extra level of review because making sure that the meaning is clearly presented for a non-linguist audience requires working with non-linguists to provide honest feedback on the readability of the text. Working with tribal members who are trained in linguistics is not the same as working with tribal language revitalizers who are doing this work without that

training. This level of community-review is not something that we currently expect of academics in general, but it is a process to which I would hope any community-engaged scholars are willing to submit themselves. Community review would allow the work to reach a wider audience, and it forces the academic to write more precisely. In other words, it makes the work better.

Some of the essays in this book are better written for a broad audience. For instance Amy Dahlstrom's essay, "Highlighting Rhetorical Structure through Syntactic Analysis: An Illustrated Meskwaki Text by Alfred Kiyana," and Lucy Thomason's essay, "On Editing Bill Leaf's Meskwaki Texts," are written in clear language and provide the sort of cultural context that make their essays more accessible to a broader audience. On the other hand, Ives Goddard writes precisely for an academic context.

On the whole, this is a great addition to the publication of premodern Algonquian texts and the discussion of how to redact and translate such texts. I believe that these authors sincerely want to make their work accessible and meaningful to the language revitalization communities with whom they work, but there is more work to be done to figure out how to incorporate such collaborations into the actual writing. For linguists who want to work in this direction: expand your collaborative networks, bring your collaborators into the writing process, interview community members who are reading the texts you are translating, and bring their voices into the work as well.

Ashley Glassburn Falzetti

Delamaza, Gonzalo: Enhancing Democracy. Public Policies and Citizen Participation in Chile. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015. 296 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-546-2. (CLAS, 104). Price: \$ 99.00

This book is a welcome addition to the already abundant literature on the Chilean transition, not so much because it provides news facts or chronicles of the years after the return of democracy and the governing *Concertación*'s policies and achievements, but because it applies a new and enlightening lens. It broadens the view with which we can analyze and evaluate the qualities of the democracy that Chile in the end achieved. It does so through focusing on "the construction of democracy" (4), bringing in participation and citizenship as key features, beyond the "electoral political regime" (7). This focus on the effects of "public policy ... [as] ... key to implementing options to expand democracy or restrict it" (8) does indeed provide important insights in how civil society's role in the regained democracy was curtailed in important respects.

The book has five chapters, and an introduction and conclusion. In the "Introduction," Delamaza presents his approach (focusing on "new links ... between the state and society in the context of Chilean democratization," 15) and gives the outline of the book. In chap. 1, the ways (some new and some older) concepts will be used is explained, and in particular the need for a contextualized approach to this idea of "construction of democracy" is highlighted. Turning to the conditions under which this

took place in Chile, chap. 2 addresses the "subordinate interrelationship Chilean civil society shares with the dominant state" (63). Starting with a historical reconstruction, the chapter argues that, continually, "despite the political impact of organized social participation and the presence of popular interests, the lead role in the twentieth-century matrix of relations was played by the parties and the political system generally" (67), and that in spite of moments of civil society's apparent autonomous manifestations during the dictatorship, the transition to democracy ended up being dominated by institutionalized political actors and the state again, because "governance [was] being increasingly understood as stability" (87).

In chap. 3, social policy agendas are under scrutiny, and varying strategies analyzed. In the end, both the lack of institutionalized channels for participation and tendencies towards depoliticization of "the poverty question" appear as constants in Chile's recent history. Chapter 4 delves into the issue of Chile's civil society makeup to explain why civil society efforts to "penetrate" the world of politics and policies largely failed. Both socioeconomic inequality leading to fragmentation and the lack of institutionalized vehicles to influence and connect to the designers of public social policies account for this "relatively low impact" (205), in spite of the fact that initiatives are there and are strong. Chapter 5, finally, studies the people that were supposed to be the intermediaries, and depicts how relations between the polity and civil society are tight but mainly top down, and, moreover, highlights the technocratic predominance of the social policies being premeditated and implemented. As a consequence (and because of people's swaps between NGOs and government), NGOs "began to regard themselves only as the executors of public programmes and no more" (quote from a person who moved from an NGO to the government, 239). In such a setting, "possibilities for transforming the way of governing to increase participation seem[ed] scarce" (246). The "Conclusion" reaffirms such findings: the governments' loyalty to the market-economy model, the technocratic approach, elitism, and a "highly restrictive conception of participation" (253), in the end prevented a political translation of and protection for civil society actors that attempted to break the spell of a controlled and chained transition.

Qualities of the book are the thorough, well-documented accounts of these various dimensions of a managed democratization that ended up in a failed inclusion of Chile's disadvantaged sectors. But, on the other hand, it must be noted that the book is not an easy read. It has a stodgy style, often unilluminating headings and subheadings of the [sub]chapters, and hardly any recapitulations of the main finding at the end of the chapters; nor can much differentiation between main and secondary arguments be detected. The reader needs to find his or her own way through a dense and arduous text. But the reward is an enlightening insight in why Chile's farewell to dictatorship disillusioned so many believers in a reawakened fervent Chilean civil society.

Ton Salman