

comments, “without any assurances from the nation-state [Russia or China], transborder activities are very dangerous” (158).

The book is generally accessible to a larger public but is occasionally marred by arcane jargon. Nonetheless, it is a good starting point for analysis of this understudied and fascinating region. Morris Rossabi

Lee, Doreen: *Activist Archives. Youth Culture and the Political Past in Indonesia.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2016. 278 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-6171-8. Price: \$ 24.95

Doreen Lee’s rich work, “Activist Archives. Youth Culture and the Political Past in Indonesia,” is a detailed look at both historical and more current youth demonstrations in Indonesia. Indonesia’s 20th-century history is checkered with activist movements and student involvement and Lee’s book is a fresh and unique look at the inner workings and dynamics of this activity. Doreen Lee’s book situates student demonstrations squarely within the sociological and anthropological literature on activism, collective memory, performance, and resistance to power. Her work is more theoretically enriched than some earlier work on the student movement in Indonesia, for example, E. Aspinall’s 1993 work (“Student Dissent in Indonesia in the 1980s”) and Arief Budiman’s 1978 article. A closer comparison might be to Tyrell Haberkorn’s 2011 work on Thailand (“Revolution Interrupted. Farmers, Students, Law, and Violence in Northern Thailand”).

Doreen Lee’s book is an ethnographic accounting of how students live, organize, connect with the past, and frame their lives and activism. She participates in protests (demo), spends time in student living quarters and where they camp out and stage their work, and enmeshes herself in the pamphlets, paraphernalia, and historiographies of student or youth (*pemuda*) “fever” (Lee’s term). The result is a new perspective on the legacy and role of activism in a more democratic Indonesia. Current student activism builds on, but is quite different from past movements. The 1966 student federation, KAMI, was anti-Communist in its orientation and it was mobilized and backed by factions of the military led by soon-to-be president Suharto. The students provoked conflict and opened the door to greater opportunities for Suharto to take steps to consolidate his own power and oust the Indonesian founder, Sukarno. In this incarnation, students were not autonomous actors, they were clearly a political tool being used by the military to serve Suharto’s political ambitions. In the 1970s, student activism took a different turn and began to confront Suharto’s New Order policies and neoliberal agenda. In 1972 and again in 1978, students organized on campus and then poured into the streets to protest against cronyism and the power of business elites in perceived collusion with foreign capital. These demonstrations of push back against Suharto’s developmentalist agenda were met with repression and violence from the powerful state apparatus. Leaders were arrested, imprisoned, sometimes tortured and killed. While Suharto saw the students as being critical of his regime

(because they were), the students themselves viewed their actions as nationalistic, moral, and not political.

Pemuda activism was about being the conscious of the nation. Since the anti-Communist activity and terror of the late 1960s, it was highly risky to engage in political activism, which could be framed as leftist in nature. So, any critique of Suharto’s liberal economic policies needed to be cast in ways that would make it hard to brand the students as pro-Communist or pro-Socialist. So, students focused on criticizing corruption, and pushing for cleaner government and more nationalistic economic policies. After the repression of the movement in 1978 there was a lull in student activism. Suharto seemed to allow a slight thaw in societal organization and activity in the late 1980s and youth activism re-emerged. It is possible that the limited tolerance of student organization also reflected growing divisions within elite circles at the top of the political and military hierarchy. This point brings me to the strengths and perhaps shortcomings of Lee’s work. The strength of the book is to give detailed credit to the persistence, organization, culture, and symbolic forms of student demos and of the power of resistance and opposition which helped bring down Suharto in the spring of 1998. Her work gives primacy and agency to student activists.

Political scientists, this author included, tend to discount the role of protests in regime change. Instead, most of the political science literature on the end of authoritarian rule (by scholars such as Schmitter, O’Donnell, Huntington) looks at the role of elites; both elites in power and elites in the opposition. If students are mentioned at all, it is usually in the context of how mass mobilization can play into the hand of reformers, moderates, or hard-liners. Then, it is the interplay among these groups of elites that determine the persistence of authoritarian rule or the breakdown of it. In these models, Suharto resigned once his inner circle of power (business cronies, and military backers) indicated that they no longer had confidence in him and that they could not restore order with him in power. So, why do we not see Suharto resign in the face of 1996 protests, or those that occur throughout 1997 – spring of 1998? Because it is not until the spring that he loses the support of his closest allies. This sort of analysis discounts the power of the masses and the students. Gene Sharp’s recipe for nonviolent revolution and the successful uprisings in the Arab Spring have brought activism and the role of students and youth back to the forefront of how we can understand regime change. Doreen Lee’s book provides us with much more detail on who the students are, the conditions under which they organize, live, demonstrate, connect with the past and with the masses, the “*rakyat*.” “Activist Archives” fills in our understanding of the institutions and structure which helped drive the reform era (*refomasi*). In the decades after the reform, youth activism faded. In chap. 4 on “Violence” and chap. 6 on “Democracy,” Lee looks at how student protests were recast as unlawful disorder rather than natural expressions of civil discontent. While not as violent as earlier efforts at repression, the UNAS Tragedy of 2008 saw 100 students arrested and hundreds of injuries as police reacted violently to protests against fuel price hikes.

Additional demonstrations erupted out of sympathy for the victims. Lee tells us the students' story of being portrayed as "*provokators*" as part of the justification by the state for the harsh crack down.

What "Activist Archives" does not do well enough is acknowledge and detail the degree to which students and other protestors have been used as a tool by the state or by military factions, or explain how the students interviewed view this complicated legacy. Whether it was KAMI being used in 1966 by Suharto to maneuver himself into power, or the rented crowds assembled by Suharto during New Order displays of manufactured political support (for Golkar), or opposition to Megawati or others, or the ability of Islamist groups like FPI (the Islamic Defenders Front) in the post-*reformasi* period to turn crowds out in the streets; political mobilization is often not autonomous or spontaneous. Most of these displays are not organic, they are manufactured by elites for very specific purposes. Lee might have used her book to explain how the youth movement sees itself in contrast to these manipulated behaviors. However, her task is really to do the opposite, to give agency to the young people who follow their passions and advocate for those who do not have a seat at the tables and halls of power. For that reason, Doreen Lee's book is well worth the read.

Amy L. Freedman

Lipset, David, and Eric K. Silverman (eds.): *Mortuary Dialogues. Death Ritual and the Reproduction of Moral Community in Pacific Modernities*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2016. 244 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-171-8. (ASAO Studies in Pacific Anthropology, 7) Price: \$ 110.00

Across the Pacific as elsewhere, rituals surrounding death and mourning typically play a central role in processes of social reproduction, no less in post-contact circumstances than in earlier indigenous contexts. The contributions to this book take aim at the classic, century-old formulations of this connection between mortuary practice and moral community traced back to Hertz (i.e., parallel fates of deceased's body, spirit, and survivors), Van Gennep (i.e., rites of passage), and the *Année Sociologique* school led by Durkheim. The general conclusion is that the characteristic restoration of social order in the aftermath of the death achieved by mortuary rites in the past has been variously compromised in response to the vicissitudes of modernity – mainly the influences of commoditization, Christian missionization, and absorption in powerful but indifferent nation-states. Following Mikhail Bakhtin, this articulation is framed in terms of "mortuary dialogues," the talk and practices involving "many shifting and contradictory voices that privilege no authoritative position, single voice, or set of meanings" (234).

Aside from an informative "Foreword" by Shirley Lindenbaum and the editors' orienting "Introduction" and "Afterword," the substantive chapters illustrating the historical transformation of Oceanic death rites comprise one example from Polynesia (Māori), another from Micronesia (Enewetak), and seven from Melanesia (Kewa, Murik, Lihir, Misima, Manam, Kayan, Iatmul, I'ai). Among the

latter group of case studies, the Sepik region from Papua New Guinea is particularly well represented. One of the more noteworthy of the book's features is the great diversity in the content of the dialogues separately reported and the range of theoretical perspectives adopted to account for them within the dialogue rubric. Nonetheless, the editors have grouped the chapters into two sections more or less along the lines (uncited) of Marshall Sahlins's distinction between "develop-man" and "development." In the former instances, transformed mortuary practices in dialogue with factors of modernity have largely, and perhaps paradoxically, come to perpetuate or even enhance traditional values. With the remainder, death rituals have undergone changes exhibiting qualities more closely approximating exogenous Western values of personhood, family, community, and relations with the dead and other spirits. The book's overall conclusion roughly follows this division – on the one hand, that the restorative function classically attributed to mortuary rituals by the *Année Sociologique* school is "alive and well" in the Pacific; but on the other, in contexts of modernity, that function has become significantly complicated and compromised, with persons and communities partially failing to achieve closure and social unity. Pacific Islanders, therefore, have been left in various degrees of ambivalence about themselves, their traditions, and their experiences of outside worlds.

Laurence M. Carucci outlines the changes in kin and clan reckoning and attitudes towards spirits and chiefs among Marshallese Enewetak islanders following, first, missionization and the forced replacement of sea burial with burial on land and, second, forced relocation after WWII to allow for American nuclear weapons testing. Nancy C. Lutkehaus, in accord with Annette Weiner's model of "reproduction," traces out the changes in mortuary practice following from Manam islanders' similarly forced migration in the aftermath of a volcanic eruption, severing the people's consubstantial attachments to ancestral lands and, thereby, frustrating their ability to reproduce their own relations. Che Wilson and Karen Sinclair describe the pronounced plurality of simultaneous and discrepant voices expressed in contemporary *tangi* mortuary rites of Ngāti Rangī Māori people of Whanganui on New Zealand/Aotearoa's North Island. Understandings held by young and old, Catholic clergy and laity, Government and Māori, Pakeha and Māori, etc. persist despite their fundamental divergences. Nicholas A. Bainton and Martha Macintyre compare the different outcomes of industrialized mining among Lihir and Misima islanders. Lihirians channelled the material dividends of mineral extraction into a "glut" of hyper-traditional but destabilizing mortuary feasting. Misimans did so as well until the closure of their mine left them unable to repay the debts accumulated during the mining era and pondering the necessity of doing so. I'ai villagers as described by Joshua A. Bell experienced yet another outcome of the "structural violence" conditioned by commoditization and large-scale resource extraction (logging, natural gas, hydro projects); mortuary rituals have been significantly abridged, and the new practice of homestead buri-