

INDIGENOUS STRUGGLE

*Donna Lee Van Cott**

University of Tennessee

THE CHALLENGE OF DIVERSITY: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND REFORM OF THE STATE IN LATIN AMERICA (El reto de la diversidad: pueblos indígenas y reforma del estado en América Latina). Edited by Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar and André Hoekema. Translated by Rob Aitken and Paul Kersey Johnson. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Thela Thesis, 2000. Pp. 315. \$30.00 paper).

FROM TRIBAL VILLAGE TO GLOBAL VILLAGE: INDIAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA. By Alison Brysk. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000. Pp. 370. \$65.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.)

INDIGENOUS MESTIZOS: THE POLITICS OF RACE AND CULTURE IN CUZCO, PERU, 1919–1991. By Marisol de la Cadena. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000. Pp. 408. \$22.95 paper.)

INDIGENOUS STRUGGLE AT THE HEART OF BRAZIL: STATE POLICY, FRONTIER EXPANSION, AND THE XAVANTE INDIANS, 1937–1988. By Seth Garfield. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001. Pp. 316. \$19.95 paper.)

ETHNOPOLITICS IN ECUADOR: INDIGENOUS RIGHTS AND THE STRENGTHENING OF DEMOCRACY. By Melina Selverston-Scher. (Coral Gables, Fla.: North-South Center Press, 2001. Pp. 152. \$17.95 paper, \$35.00 cloth.)

ENDANGERED PEOPLES OF LATIN AMERICA: STRUGGLES TO SURVIVE AND THRIVE. Edited by Susan C. Stonich. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001. Pp. 232. \$45.00 cloth.)

ORGANIZACIÓN Y LIDERAZGO AYMARA, 1979–1996. By Esteban Ticona Alejo. (La Paz: Universidad de la Cordillera, AGRUCO, 2000. Pp. 213. n.p.)

Using a variety of disciplinary lenses, the books collected here explain how indigenous peoples in Latin America struggle toward a

*The author wishes to thank Jean E. Jackson and Joanne Rappaport for helpful comments on a previous draft.

myriad of goals: for the survival of their historically rooted yet constantly changing cultures; for title to and control over traditionally held territories; for the right to define themselves individually and collectively in relation to other groups in society; for the right to control images and representations of “the Indian” that are offered by non-indigenous intellectuals, the state, or others; for access to economic resources to maintain their preferred modes of economic production and to improve what are often miserable and unhealthy living standards; for the right to participate in public decision-making as individual citizens and as collectively recognized “peoples” or “nations”; and for the right to be indigenous *and* a full and equal citizen of a Latin American nation at the same time. The books include accounts by participants in or supporters of indigenous struggles (Selverston, Ticona, authors in the *Assies*, et al. book such as Orellana and Yrigoyen), academics native to and intimately connected to the national context of the struggles they analyze (de la Cadena, most of the *Assies*, et al. authors), and “outsider” scholars who bring greater cultural and professional distance to their work (*Assies*, Brysk, Garfield, Hoekema, Stonich and most of her authors, and Van der Haar).

This collection exemplifies two trends representative of the recent wave of studies of indigenous struggle that began in the early 1990s. First, indigenous struggles in the 1980s became more overtly political as indigenous movements were able to gain national and even international political space. In response, as Les Field observed in a 1994 review essay for *LARR*, anthropologists had by the early 1990s become increasingly focused on indigenous resistance to the nation-state. Political resistance, in fact, had become “the primary characteristic of Indian ethnicity” (Field 1994, 239). “More and more, the arena of the nation-state and the relationship between indigenous peoples and nation-states is the central one of analytic as well as political activity” for social scientists (*ibid.*, 248).

The increasingly *political* importance of indigenous social movements attracted the attention of political scientists. In the mid-late 1990s, political scientists studying Latin America—who mainly have ignored the topic of race or ethnicity—increasingly devoted attention to indigenous peoples as important political actors in their own right. They moved beyond the classist peasant studies of the 1960s–1980s to embrace more culturalist approaches that appreciate the ethnic and racial dimensions of indigenous political resistance. In addition, political scientists are studying indigenous political struggles as a means toward understanding the quality of democracy in Latin America (see Andolina 1999; Collins 2000; Mattiace n.d.; Van Cott 2000; Yashar 1998, 1999). While some anthropologists continue to focus mainly on cultural change and continuity and to produce rich ethnographic studies rooted in particu-

lar localities, many others have focused on the political nature of indigenous struggle within the larger geographic sphere of the region or the state, writing works that often differ little in approach from those of political scientists studying the same phenomenon. Meanwhile, political scientists probe the construction of meaning and identity as it shapes political action.¹ Even the traditional division between anthropologists and political scientists—between the search for meaning and the search for causes—is often blurred in the recent work of both disciplines.² This disciplinary convergence reflects the significant theoretical and conceptual overlap on the borders between contemporary political anthropology, history, sociology, and political science, all of which are influenced by post-modernist, multiculturalist, and new-leftist approaches.³ In sum, many new works in all disciplines are more consciously focused on the national political sphere and linked to the literature on democratization and citizenship in Latin America, on social movements, and on ethnic politics in other regions.

A second trend exemplified by this collection is that the new studies are geared toward a wider scholarly and popular audience than in the 1980s or early 1990s, when studies seemed more specialized and written for graduate students and academics. When the author began work in 1993 on an edited volume on the political status of indigenous peoples in Latin America (Van Cott 1994), there was little published on the topic in English for an undergraduate or policy/professional audience. That situation has changed dramatically in response to the greater interest in the topic among the general public. I attribute this greater interest to three events that have been covered extensively by the North American media: (1) the 1994 Chiapas uprising and its lingering effects; (2) the increasing political power of Ecuador's CONAIE, whose leaders have traveled throughout and spoken widely to audiences in the United States; and, to a lesser

1. See for example the work of anthropologists Xavier Albó (1991, 1994); Jean Jackson (1999); Jackson and Warren (2002); and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1992, 1996); and political scientists Shannan Mattiace (n.d.) and Rubin (1998).

2. I thank Joanne Rappaport for helping me to articulate this point (personal communication).

3. For example, a number of social scientists in the late 1980s and 1990s adopted Gramsci's concept of cultural hegemony to understand the origin and strategy of Latin American indigenous movements (see Field 1996, 100). Work by political theorists Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau was often cited by Latin American and North American scholars (see, e.g., Warren 1998b). These scholars adopted Gramsci's view that a traditional classist lens is insufficient for understanding the flexible nature of sub-altern collective identities and forms of organization and that cultural questions deserve a place alongside economic analyses. The multiculturalist perspective propagated by Canadian theorists, such as Will Kymlicka and James Tully are also popular among social scientists studying indigenous struggles in North and Latin America.

extent (3) the peace process in Guatemala, which culminated in the 1996 accord on the Identity and Rights of the Maya.

The edited volume by Susan Stonich illustrates this second trend. It is part of a global series that seeks to educate the public about the struggle for survival of the world's "endangered peoples," particularly their struggle against the destruction and contamination of the natural environment in which they live. The emphasis on the connection between threatened peoples and threatened landscapes is evident in the disciplinary strengths of the volume: The authors are mainly North Americans teaching in the United States. Eleven are anthropologists; they are joined by three experts in environmental studies and one geographer.⁴ The geographic focus of the book is skewed toward Meso-American peoples. Ten of the book's thirteen case studies represent Mexico or Central America, leaving only three on South America, two of which concentrate on Ecuador. A few chapters focus on non-indigenous peoples, such as English-speaking Bay Islanders of Honduras.

Stonich follows in the tradition of Greg Urban and Joel Sherzer's 1991 landmark edited collection of anthropological approaches to indigenous-state relations, and the aforementioned 1994 Van Cott inter-disciplinary volume.⁵ Unlike those two works, the Stonich volume is geared specifically to undergraduates and general readers. Rather than presenting new research, the authors follow a common outline in which they provide a "cultural overview" and then summarize threats to their group's survival and the group's response to these threats. At the end of each chapter are questions for discussion, related websites and videos, and contacts for advocacy organizations. References to published scholarship are minimal and confined mainly to English-language sources. Thus, the book is an excellent textbook for undergraduate courses in anthropology, environmental studies, or Latin American studies. Those looking for a new, more scholarly, anthropological collection on the topic of indigenous political activism should consult new volumes edited by Jean Jackson and Kay Warren (2002) and David Maybury-Lewis (2002).

ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL WORKS

Indigenous peoples and their struggle to maintain their cultures and identities have been a central concern of Latin American anthropology

4. Space limitations prohibit a discussion of each contribution, but here are the authors: David Barton Bray, John R. Bort, Janet M. Chernela, Kate Cissna, Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, María L. Cruz-Torres, David J. Dodds, Paul H. Gelles, Peter H. Herlihy, James Howe, James Loucky, Scott S. Robinson, Susan C. Stonich, Jorge Varela Marquez, and Philip D. Young.

5. The Urban and Sherzer volume is discussed in the above-referenced essay by Field. The Van Cott collection is discussed in Adams (1997).

and history for generations. The works by de la Cadena and Garfield continue that rich tradition of nuanced interpretations of particular indigenous cultures or geographic spaces over time. Anthropologist Marisol de la Cadena provides a detailed ethnographic account spanning nearly a century of changing forms of identity construction and re-construction among diverse ethnic and social strata of the Cuzco area of Peru. She demonstrates how Peruvians in the southern highlands constructed a complex multi-layered view of race and race hierarchy. As part of a larger struggle of regional elites against Lima-based centralism, non-indigenous intellectuals in the 1920s and 1940s sought to bring attention and value to the Quechua culture and Incan history that made the Cuzco region unique. In the decades that followed, lower- and middle-class urban *cuzqueños* contested the interpretations of “Indianness” by outsiders and established themselves as the “authentic” carriers of this intellectual and cultural capital.

De la Cadena explains how Peruvians justify racism through its basis in acquirable intellectual and moral qualities—such as decency—rather than phenotypic traits (4). It is practiced not just by whites against those of darker skin and lower education, but also by “indigenous mestizos,” who raised their racial status through the attainment of higher education, the adoption of urban dress and manners, and the demonstration of cultural refinement by participating in folkloric dance and theatrical societies or the performance of ritual cargos: “This allows the perception of discriminatory behavior to be seen as legitimate and as integral to the rules of respect, which follow sharp hierarchies” (305). Through this process of de-Indianization, “working-class *cuzqueños* have both reproduced and contested racism” (6). De la Cadena shows how the development of “Indian,” “mestizo,” and “peasant” identities in the Peruvian highlands between the 1920s and 1970s and the evolution of Peru’s unique brand of racism help to explain a mystery that has befuddled anthropologists and political scientists studying the wave of indigenous social-movement organizing that happened virtually everywhere else during the 1970s–90s: why have contemporary Peruvian indigenous social movement organizations been slower to form and organizationally weaker than in other countries?⁶ She shows how in the political and social context of the Peruvian sierra, “avoiding self-

6. Scholars have identified additional reasons for this difference, including the policy of the Shining Path during the 1980s and early 1990s to assassinate all rival leaders of sub-altern groups; the partial success of land reform in the 1970s; a legal system that treated highland “campesinos” and lowland “natives” separately; and heavy migration to the cities during the 1980s and 1990s, taking campesinos out of areas that were traditional indigenous territories—the centerpiece of indigenous mobilization elsewhere. See Degregori (1993, 1998).

reference as Indians" (311) was more empowering and more effective in mobilizing the indigenous population than the strategy of selectively emphasizing and mobilizing around indigenous cultural identities used so effectively elsewhere in Latin America.

Like de la Cadena, Seth Garfield deftly straddles the boundary between history and anthropology. A historian, Garfield seeks to show how Brazil's Xavante adapted to the physical intrusion of the state and non-indigenous neighbors during the period between sustained contact in 1937 and the writing of Brazil's new constitution in 1988. Garfield shows how the Xavante mobilized that identity politically to contest the nation- and state-building projects of the modern Brazilian state. He probes

the violent and convoluted process whereby the Xavante, stripped of autonomy, *learned* and articulated that their ethnicity was a political marker that restricted or accorded them rights and obligations as indigenous peoples and Brazilian citizens. For just as state formation hinders, it enables, with capitalist political and cultural forms restricting certain capacities while developing others. (16)

As state contact intensified in the twentieth century we see the Xavante "selectively adapting." Pressured or shamed into abandoning old cultural markers, they adopted clothing and Western hairstyles, developed a passion for soccer, and learned to farm using modern agricultural methods, with mostly poor results. At the same time they preserved valued rituals and political structures, steadfastly maintained their organizational autonomy, and rejected the tutelage of missionaries and state agents. In the 1970s, after a sector of male Xavante society had developed a basic understanding of the Portuguese language and the concept of Brazilian citizenship, the Xavante manipulated and mobilized indigenous cultural markers in a successful series of actions that pressured and shamed centralized-military and federal-civilian governments alike into adapting to Xavante demands, i.e., the expansion of officially recognized Xavante territories and the expulsion of non-Xavante from these reserves and their environs.

The Xavante learned that their culture contained rituals that were not only considered beautiful, but which had political content (134). Xavante leaders blended images of the Indian from Brazil's cultural lexicon with the national myth of racial democracy and patriotic rhetoric in order to demand rights as Brazilian citizens and as "Brazilindians," the unique bearers of the nation's cultural origin. After the thaw in political repression of the 1970s, emerging indigenous organizations gained support from a flourishing and rebellious civil society, particularly from the Catholic Church, rural labor unions, leftist parties, and "new social movements" led by lawyers, students, academics, environmentalists, and human rights groups. By 1979 the Xavante had increased the size

of their Amazonian reserves “nearly tenfold” (183) and Brazil’s indigenous peoples had become “icons of resistance to authoritarian rule” (200). When appeals to conscience and the “performance” of Xavante rituals in Brasilia and on the international stage were not effective, the Xavante consistently resorted to their oldest weapon against the domination of the Brazilian state—violence. But the deployment of violence was carefully calibrated to achieve the desired effect without provoking a violent response against which the Xavante understood they could not survive.

Garfield’s account of the struggle of the Xavante rejects common notions of the vulnerability of Amazonian peoples.

[F]rom the outset of contact, the Xavante skillfully negotiated the intricacies of state power. The Indians challenged policies aimed at socioeconomic reorganization and subordination, even as they accepted Brazilian commodities, social welfare, and political intervention. While upholding the legitimacy of the Brazilian state, they pushed for the reconceptualization of indigenous territory, tested distributional capacities, and clamored for cultural respect. (214)

Given their lack of financial resources, geographic isolation, and their minuscule size relative to the Brazilian population, the Xavante are intriguing as a “least-likely case” of indigenous political success.

In contrast, Esteban Ticona Alejo, an Aymara intellectual trained as a sociologist and anthropologist, analyzes the failure of a “most-likely case” of indigenous political struggle. While Brazilian and Peruvian Indians were waiting for the full enfranchisement as citizens—literacy barriers existed until 1985 and 1979, respectively—Bolivian Indians were founding their own political parties. Ticona analyzes the rise of an independent Aymara intellectual and political movement in Bolivia’s highlands between 1979 and 1996. He focuses explicitly on the political implications of the movement and the relationship between Aymara politics and Bolivian political institutions. The work is reminiscent of Kay Warren’s study of Guatemala’s Pan-Mayan movement, *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics* (1998a), which also focuses on urban-based indigenous intellectuals and their struggle to mobilize a national political movement around a revitalized, emancipatory definition of indigenous identity.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Bolivian *campesino* leaders rejected long-standing subordinate, clientelist relations with the military and non-indigenous populist and leftist parties and formed their own *campesino* unions and political parties. The movements were originally led by a new generation of educated, urbanized Aymara who maintained ties to rural communities. These Aymara leaders, and the non-indigenous intellectuals that influenced them, devised two competing political ideologies—Katarismo and Indianismo—that continue to compete, mostly unsuccessfully, for the support of the indigenous majority

and its sympathizers.⁷ In one chapter Ticona uses personal histories of three of the most important Aymara political leaders (Jenaro Flores, Juan de la Cruz Villca, and Paulino Guarachi) to illuminate the main themes, challenges, and achievements of Bolivian indigenous struggles. The personal histories straddle two spheres of political action—*campesino* unions and electoral politics—that are inextricably linked, often in self-defeating ways. The most important independent *campesino* organization, the Confederación Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia (CSUTCB), with which all three leaders have been associated, is examined in a separate chapter.

Ticona's study of Aymara political leadership illuminates the difficulties of indigenous struggle even in a country with a majority indigenous population that has been enfranchised and politically mobilized since the 1950s. Like Warren's pan-Mayanist intellectuals, Aymara leaders failed to turn a politically self-conscious indigenous majority into a coherent movement for social and political change. In Bolivia, efforts to form social movement organizations and political parties completely independent of non-indigenous parties, development organizations, intellectuals, and the state repeatedly have foundered. Ticona attributes these disappointments to institutional barriers (such as fines that disqualified indigenous parties unable to garner more than three percent of the vote, and the under-registration of the indigenous electorate); the lack of financial resources; the superior political experience of non-indigenous politicians; and the extreme fractionalization of the Aymara political class. Nevertheless, as in Guatemala, the Aymara movement did succeed in placing many of its themes on the national political agenda, where they have been adopted by nearly all major non-indigenous political parties.

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND MULTIDISCIPLINARY "INSTITUTIONALIST" WORKS

Compared to Bolivia's, Ecuador's indigenous movement has demonstrated greater political coherence and national influence. Although Ecuador's movement is among the most studied in Latin America by North American scholars, there are few English-language book-length

7. Both ideologies invoke Tupaj Katari, the *nom de guerre* of Aymara Julian Apaza, who led a rebellion against the Spanish crown and was executed in 1781. Indianismo, the more radical ideology, is more overtly anti-Western and anti-white; it emphasizes an ethnic and racial analysis of indigenous domination. Indianists reject the syndical model of peasant organization as a western imposition and reject (at least publicly) alliances with non-indigenous groups. In contrast, Katarismo blends class and ethnic consciousness. Kataristas sought alliances with non-indigenous social movements and leftist and populist political parties.

treatments of the topic. Melina Selverston fills this gap. Like the Stonich volume, Selverston's brief account is relatively free of social science jargon and well-suited to undergraduate classrooms and non-specialist policymakers. Her work falls within the social movement approach, which dominated the study of sub-altern movements in the 1990s. Like most scholars in the late 1990s, she blends both "strategy" and "identity" approaches within this literature (Oxhorn 2001, 164; see also Foweraker 1995), but her main focus is on the use of collective identity as a strategic resource. Selverston describes the development of the Confederación de las Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE) during the early 1990s, a critical period flanked by 1990's nationwide uprising and 1994's protests against the government's proposed agrarian reform law. During this period CONAIE was transformed from a marginal social movement into a national political actor. As an advisor and translator for the movement in the early 1990s, Selverston offers an insider's view of the movement's development. She shows how CONAIE used a repertoire of social movement strategies to achieve substantive policy gains and a dramatic increase in political representation, becoming one of the region's most successful social movements. With few material resources, CONAIE developed an alternative model of national identity and economic development and broke up the elite monopoly on political representation.

Within the social movement approach, a sub-set of scholars has focused on the construction and activation of "transnational advocacy networks" (see, in particular, Keck and Sikkink 1998). Alison Brysk's new book describes the construction of an international "Indian rights" movement by activist anthropologists in the early 1970s. By the end of that decade national-level indigenous rights movements throughout the Americas achieved a sufficient level of organizational maturity and access to resources to project their struggle into the sphere of international human rights and link themselves to transnational networks of pro-indigenous scholars and civil society organizations. In the 1980s Latin American indigenous organizations formed their own transnational organizations, like the Quito-based COICA (Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica, 1984), and joined North American-sponsored indigenous rights organizations, such as the World Council of Indigenous Peoples. Through three decades of regular interactions among indigenous representatives in international fora, local and national movements have developed a strikingly consistent "frame" for their common struggle in distinct national political contexts, a frame rooted in the intimate knowledge of the international human rights regime (59).

Brysk weaves international relations theory around case studies of movements in Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, and Nicaragua. In all

five countries indigenous movements have launched dramatic and substantively effective rights campaigns, notwithstanding the great variety among the cases in terms of the relative proportion of the indigenous population; the nature of the government (democratic, semi-democratic, military-authoritarian, Marxist); the level of government-sponsored repression; and the level of economic development and global market insertion. Like Garfield and de la Cadena, Brysk shows how Indians construct and manipulate their “traditional” identities, and blend these with carefully selected contemporary technologies and ideologies, as they adapt to processes of modernization and globalization, constructing a repertoire of identities that are simultaneously local, national, pan-indigenous and transnational. Latin American indigenous movements are excellent examples of Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) “boomerang effect,” in which relatively weak local national social movements use international allies and fora to pressure national government officials. Covering such a wide variety of countries and indigenous peoples enables Brysk to make interesting comparisons across cases.

Contact with international allies knowledgeable about international human rights law and constitutional reforms in other regions assisted indigenous movements in many Latin America countries in the struggle to alter the institutional environment of indigenous-state relations. Many successfully presented proposals to formally redefine national identity as articulated in the most symbolically and legally important political document—the national political constitution. Most Latin American countries in the 1990s adopted constitutional language recognizing the ethnic and cultural diversity of the nation—an important symbolic goal. More substantive institutional reforms also were made, such as recognition of the public authority of customary law, protection of collective indigenous land rights, and the right to bilingual education (see Van Cott 2000, chapter 9). Municipal decentralization has been particularly important for indigenous peoples, as it provides a structural framework for the exercise of indigenous movements’ key demand—the right to autonomous self-government.

Institutional approaches to indigenous struggle examine the meaning and impact of these new developments. Although rooted in the political scientist’s concern with the state, they tend to be multidisciplinary in nature, drawing from the fields of political science, anthropology, and law. Most studies—many produced by graduate students or international development professionals—are monographic, single-case studies with a policy orientation. The volume edited by Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema is an exception to this rule (other comparative institutionalist works include Gonzalez Casanova and Roitman Rosenmann 1996; Sieder 2002; Van Cott 2000). Taken together the chapters provide an empirically and

theoretically rich compendium of information on indigenous peoples and state reform in the 1990s.

The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America presents eleven Latin American case studies, with particular attention to reforms in Bolivia, Colombia and Mexico, where significant changes in indigenous (and sometimes black) constitutional rights were made or attempted in the 1990s (chapters also focus on Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Peru). The geographically focused case studies are tied together by three comparative chapters addressing the book's major themes: "the relation between policies of administrative decentralization and the recognition of indigenous authorities, the scope and limitations of the institutionalization and regulation of legal pluralism and the question of territoriality" (ix). Two introductory chapters and a conclusion provide a theoretical framework for making sense of the rich and varied experience of constitutional reform documented here. The thorough review of the literature is an outstanding introduction for readers new to the topic. Contributors include experts in anthropology, law, environmental studies and geography, political science, and sociology. In contrast to the Stonich volume, most are Latin Americans writing about their own country (María Fernanda Espinosa [Ecuador]; Moisés Franco Mendoza, José Eduardo Zárate Hernández, and María Cristina Velásquez Cepeda [Mexico]; Ricardo Calla and René Orellana Halkyer [Bolivia]; José Mauricio Andion Arruti [Brazil]; Esther Sánchez Botero [Colombia]; and María Luisa Acosta [Nicaragua]). In addition, Peruvian Raquel Yrigoyen Fajardo provides a comparative analysis of efforts to implement legal pluralism in the Andes, and Peruvian Patricia Urteaga Crovetto takes on the topic of territorial rights with references to developments in Peru, Mexico, and Nicaragua. The remaining chapters are written by the Dutch editors and three additional European scholars (Roger Plant, Odile Hoffman, and Yvette Nelen).

The authors analyze the varied processes through which state reforms that recognize ethnic diversity were made or proposed: peace processes in Guatemala; exclusionary, elite-dominated processes in Bolivia and Mexico; and constituent assemblies with (Colombia and Ecuador) or without (Brazil) the direct participation of indigenous delegates. They also probe the impact of those processes on indigenous and black collective identities and, in the earlier cases, the progress of implementation of constitutional reforms. The authors demonstrate how the multicultural reforms resulted not solely from effective mobilization of indigenous movements but, rather, from "confrontations and confluences" among diverse elite and popular, social and political actors. Like de la Cadena, Garfield, and Selverston, the authors show how the multicultural reforms imply a critique of dominant nation- and state-building models and elite "notions of democracy and citizenship" (ix).

Throughout the volume a tight relationship is presented between recognizing ethnic diversity and improving the legitimacy and representativity of democracy. As Yashar argues (1999, 78), the failure of Latin American democracies to deliver on the promise of citizenship in the 1980s led to the presentation by indigenous movements of rights claims in the 1990s. To varying degrees, the reforms enacted address both indigenous demands for recognition of difference as well as popular and elite demands for democratic reform. For example, recognizing legal pluralism in Bolivia and Colombia satisfied indigenous demands for legal autonomy while reducing the backlog of cases in the national judicial system and extending the rule of public law to rural areas (Sánchez and Yrigoyen chapters), and municipal decentralization in Bolivia facilitated the greater (albeit still limited) participation of indigenous community authorities *qua* ethnic authorities in public decision-making (Calla, Orellana, and Hoekema and Assies chapters). As the editors argue in their conclusion,

With or without indigenous peoples, the reform and reconfiguration of the Latin American states is an ongoing process driven by, among other things, the requirements of adjustment to a changing global order and the need for relegitimation of the state through processes of democratization and the search for a new social pact. While the outcomes of the process can not simply be predicted, the reconfiguration clearly implies an important departure from the accustomed model of the nation-state. (312)

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

As Assies concludes in his introduction to the volume, indigenous movements have successfully promoted a political agenda based on their distinct place as “originary” members of society. However, the future of indigenous struggles—and of democracy in the multiethnic states of Latin America—may rely on their ability to constitute part of a larger popular movement that envisions an alternative, inclusive, multicultural “political imaginary of contemporary democracy” (19). The struggle to achieve a balance between the indigenous struggle for legal and geographical distinctness, on the one hand, and social and political incorporation, on the other, is a theme that permeates the works collected here and the literature they represent.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, RICHARD N.
1997 “Works on Latin American Ethnicity, Emigration, and Indian Resistance and Survival.” *Latin American Research Review* 32(2): 257–74.
- ALBÓ, XAVIER
1991 “El Retorno del Indio.” *Revista andina* 1(2): 299–345.

- 1994 "And from Kataristas to MNRistas? The Surprising and Bold Alliance between Aymaras and Neoliberals in Bolivia." In *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by Donna Lee Van Cott, 55–81. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- ANDOLINA, ROBERT
 1999 "Colonial Legacies and Plurinational Imaginaries: Indigenous Movement Politics in Ecuador and Bolivia." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota.
- COLLINS, JENNIFER
 2000 "Una transición desde las elites hacia una democracia participativa: apuntes sobre el papel emergente de los movimientos sociales en el Ecuador." In *Los movimientos sociales en las democracias andinas*, edited by Julie Massal and Marcelo Bonilla, 55–71. Quito: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) and Institut Français d'Etudes Andines (IFEA).
- DEGREGORI, CARLOS IVÁN
 1998 "Movimientos étnicos, democracia y nación en Perú y Bolivia." In *La construcción de la nación y la representación ciudadana en México, Guatemala, Perú, Ecuador y Bolivia*, edited by Claudia Dary, 159–225. Guatemala: FLACSO.
- 1993 "Identidad étnica. Movimientos sociales y participación política en el Perú." In *Democracia, etnicidad y violencia política en los países andinos*, by Alberto Adrianzén et al. Lima: IEP, IFEA, 113–33.
- FIELD, LES
 1994 "Who are the Indians? Conceptualizing Indigenous Identity, Resistance, and the Role of Social Science in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* 29(3): 237–249.
- 1996 "State, anti-state and indigenous entities." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 1, 2 (spring): 98–119.
- FLOWERAKER, JOE
 1995 *Theorizing Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- GONZALEZ CASANOVA, PABLO, AND MARCOS ROITMAN ROSENMAN, EDs.
 1996 *Democracia y estado multiétnico en América Latina*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), La Jornada.
- JACKSON, JEAN E.
 1999 "The politics of ethnographic practice in the Colombian Vaupés." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 6 (2–3): 271–317.
- JACKSON, JEAN E., AND KAY V. WARREN, EDs.
 2002 *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation and the State in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- KECK, MARGARET E., AND KATHRYN SIKKINK
 1998 *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- MATTIACE, SHANNAN
 n.d. *To See With Two Eyes: Peasant and Indian in Chiapas, Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- MAYBURY-LEWIS, DAVID, ED.
 2002 *Identities in Conflict: Indigenous Peoples and the State in Latin America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- OXHORN, PHILIP
 2001 "From Human Rights to Citizenship Rights? Recent Trends in the Study of Latin American Social Movements." *Latin American Research Review* 36(3): 163–82.
- RUBIN, JEFFREY
 1998 "Ambiguity and Contradiction in a Radical Popular Movement." In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, 141–64. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- SIEDER, RACHEL, ED.
 2002 *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*. Houndsmills, Eng.: Palgrave Press.

STAVENHAGEN, RODOLFO

1992 "Challenging the Nation-State in Latin America." *Journal of International Affairs* 34, 2 (winter): 421–40.

1996 "Indigenous rights: Some Conceptual Problems." In *Constructing Democracy: Human Rights, Citizenship, and Society in Latin America*, edited by Elizabeth Jelin and Eric Hershberg. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

URBAN, GREG, AND JOEL SHERZER, EDS.

1991 *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

VAN COTT, DONNA LEE, ED.

1994 *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

2000 *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

WARREN, KAY

1998a *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1998b "Indigenous movements as a Challenge to the Unified Social Movement Paradigm for Guatemala." In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by Sonia E. Alvarez, et al, 165–95. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

YASHAR, DEBORAH J.

1998 "Contesting Citizenship: Indigenous Movements and Democracy in Latin America." *Comparative Politics* 31, 1 (October): 23–42

1999 "Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America." *World Politics* 52(1): 76–104.