

REPRESENTATION AND RIGHTS:
Recent Scholarship on Social Movements in Latin America

Shannan L. Mattiace
Allegheny College

STRUGGLES FOR SOCIAL RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA. Edited by Susan Eva Eckstein and Timothy P. Wickham-Crowley. (New York: Routledge, 2003. Pp. 346. \$24.95 paper.)

INDIANS, OIL, AND POLITICS: A RECENT HISTORY OF ECUADOR. By Allen Gerlach. (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2003. Pp. 286. \$65.00 cloth, \$23.95 paper.)

THE POLITICS OF ETHNICITY: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN LATIN AMERICAN STATES. Edited by David Maybury-Lewis. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University; David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, 2002. Pp. 386. \$24.95 paper.)

FROM PEASANT STRUGGLES TO INDIAN RESISTANCE: THE ECUADORIAN ANDES IN THE LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY. By Amalia Pallares. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002. Pp. 272. \$44.95 cloth.)

INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS, SELF-REPRESENTATION, AND THE STATE IN LATIN AMERICA. Edited by Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002. Pp. 294. \$50.00 cloth, \$22.95 paper.)

More than a decade ago in an edited volume on popular movements and political change in Mexico, Joe Foweraker argued that the social movement literature was dogged by definitional squabbles and overlooked the links between and among movements and state structure (Foweraker 1990, 3). While this was true of a previous generation of social movement scholarship, it cannot be said of the five works under review. These authors are centrally concerned with describing the interaction between and among movements and the state in the current context of neoliberalism and democracy in Latin America, leaving aside the definitional questions (e.g., old or new, class or identity-based) that preoccupied social movement scholars in the past. While dozens of countries across the continent formally made the transition to democracy and adopted neoliberal policy programs in the 1980s and 1990s, the quality of these democracies and the impact of the "reforms" differed

significantly from country to country and region to region. By examining social movements at a variety of levels (transnational, national, regional, and local), these authors challenge those who view "neoliberalism," "globalization," and "democracy" as undifferentiated and uniform phenomena. The works under review flesh out the different ways that "globalization" is shaping social movement activity. Examining these five books as a whole, two broad themes emerge: group choices about how to best represent themselves, and people's understanding of their rights.

All five of the works examine indigenous social movements and ethnic-based rights. Susan Eckstein and Timothy Wickham-Crowley's volume provides the broadest treatment of social movements and social rights, including chapters on subsistence, labor, gender, and ethnic and race-based rights. The other four works deal squarely with indigenous social movements. Both Amalia Pallares and Allen Gerlach focus exclusively on Ecuador. In David Maybury-Lewis's edited volume, authors examine indigenous movements throughout the continent, covering nine country cases in all. Kay Warren and Jean Jackson's volume includes chapters on Guatemala, Colombia, and Brazil.

Certainly, Indian movements are not the only social movements of import in the continent, but they have become an important catalyst for social movement activity, often unifying a range of organizations around common goals. The national Indian movement in Ecuador, represented by the Confederation of Indian Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE), is one of the best examples of this phenomenon. CONAIE was at the helm of nation-wide mobilizations in 1990, 1992, 1997, and 2000 that pressured the government to take action on a range of demands, including opposition to the privatization of public utilities, the increase in gasoline prices, and structural adjustment policies (e.g., dollarization of the economy in 2000). CONAIE's demands have struck a powerful chord among Indian and non-Indian progressive organizations in Ecuador. Similarly, in Mexico, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) has been at the forefront of that country's anti-globalization protests, providing a space where activists from different social movements (e.g., peasants, debtors, students, human rights activists, etc.) have come together in opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), plans for a Free Trade Agreement for the Americas (FTAA), as well as for transnational development projects, such as the Plan Puebla-Panamá.

Not only are indigenous movements at the forefront of social movement activity in many Latin American states, but, as several of the authors reviewed here point out, indigenous movement activity has stimulated a rethinking of the state in Latin America and the relationship between citizens and states, particularly in countries with

comparatively large indigenous populations (Maybury-Lewis, xxii). In their introductory chapter, Kay Warren and Jean Jackson argue that indigenous peoples' highly participatory norms for decision making "have the potential to help achieve democratization" (14).¹ Throughout the continent, Indian organizations have challenged states to move beyond formal democracy, insisting that political democracy be tied to economic and social policies that promote a more equal distribution of wealth. Additionally, Indian organizations have long supported the strengthening of local and regional governments and have promoted governmental decentralization.²

With the return to formal democracy in the 1980s and 1990s, political parties once again took center stage, partially displacing social movements. Yet, as these works point out, many of the demands that gave rise to the movements of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s remain unresolved, providing a continued *raison d'être* for social movement activism. Electoral politics have not replaced the politics of contention and disruption in the region, because the return to political democracy has not been accompanied by increased security, by political institutions that represent the interests of the majority, or by socio-economic improvements for average Latin Americans.³

Governmental support for multiculturalism has occurred at the same time that states have adopted neoliberalism and returned to formal democracy. Since 1990, thirteen Latin American states have ratified the International Labour Organisation's Convention 169, considered to be the world's most progressive legislation on indigenous rights.⁴ Most importantly, Convention 169 obliges signatory countries to consult with indigenous peoples on development projects affecting their lands. Departing from the language of minority rights used in previous legislation (Convention 109), Convention 169 recognizes indigenous peoples as "peoples," without conferring upon them the corresponding rights

1. Warren and Jackson base this assertion on observations made by Van Cott (2000) and Nash (2001) on Indian movements in Colombia and Mexico respectively.

2. While decentralization has often been billed as strengthening local government, the results have been mixed. In a concluding chapter on the internationalization of Indian rights in the Warren and Jackson volume, Alcida Ramos argues that Colombia's 1991 constitution dovetails with the decentralization of Colombian state, which places more responsibilities on Indians to manage themselves (264).

3. On that point, Richard Reed, in a chapter on indigenous peoples and the transition to democracy in Paraguay in the Maybury-Lewis volume, argues that indigenous peoples may have been better represented in the caudillo/patronage politics of the past than they are today in the country's electoral democracy.

4. As of 2002, thirteen Latin American countries had ratified Convention 169: Argentina (2000); Bolivia (1991); Brazil (2002); Colombia (1991); Costa Rica (1993); Dominican Republic (2002); Ecuador (1998); Guatemala (1996); Honduras (1995); Mexico (1990); Paraguay (1993); Peru (1994); and Venezuela (2002).

in international law. While some indigenous activists have successfully used Convention 169 to pressure their nation-states in the international arena (and indeed lobbied intensely for ratification), governments have been largely unwilling to enforce and implement its provisions. However, as international norms have changed—assimilationist policies are now considered outmoded—states have used the ratification of Convention 169 to demonstrate their respect for diversity. For example, María Clemencia Ramírez, in her chapter on the politics of identity and cultural difference in the Colombian Amazon in the Maybury-Lewis volume, points out that “the assertion of distinct traditions . . . as a political strategy to gain national political space has in effect been promoted by the Colombian state” (141). In 1990, Mexico became the second country in the world to become a signatory, and President Carlos Salinas pushed ratification through Congress in an effort to quiet activists gearing up for the 1992 Quincentenary counter-celebrations.

To differing degrees, the authors under review here address the intersection between the movements they study and the macro context of formal democracy, neoliberal economic policies, and multiculturalism. Yet they caution readers not to generalize about the effects of these broad trends, or the social movements’ responses to them. Across the continent there are wide variations in the relative strength of social movements, the extent to which countries have democratized, the effects of neoliberalism on particular regions and industries, and the ways that indigenous social movements have used the political opening toward multiculturalism. In other words, we need regional and local studies to flesh out the meaning and significance of these macro trends.⁵ As these authors explore the relationship between the macro and the micro through the lens of social movements, two themes consistently appear in their work: the question of representation (who speaks for indigenous peoples), and the question of rights (the relationship between the collective and the individual).⁶

REPRESENTATION: WILL THE “REAL” INDIANS PLEASE STAND UP?

As states and international organizations have formally recognized Indian rights and as resources have become available to fund projects

5. Even within the same country, neoliberal policies have different effects. For example, Jaime Ros and Nora Lustig (Eckstein and Wickham-Crowley 2003), in a chapter on economic liberalization in Mexico in the late 1980s and early 1990s, argue that economic indicators in the north and the south of the country differed significantly. For example, in Chiapas, Guerrero, and Oaxaca (all heavily indigenous states in southern Mexico) poverty rates increased from 17 to 34 percent in the 1984–1994 period. In the rest of the country, moderate and extreme poverty declined or remained unchanged (139).

6. Three of the five books under review are edited volumes; for reasons of space I have selected two or three chapters from each volume to discuss in detail.

for “indigenous peoples,” the question of who speaks for them has become an increasingly contentious and politicized one. This question is at the heart of the Warren and Jackson volume. Of the five books under review, it is most focused on how indigenous communities and organizations represent themselves. As the editors point out, “the state remains a crucial focus of indigenous activism,” and the authors in this volume examine the different ways that indigenous activists and movements shape and are shaped by their interactions with one another and with national and international organizational officials, agencies, and programs.

Closely tied to the question of representation is that of culture. Indians have organized around cultural difference, and national and international funding agencies have identified cultural difference as a chief marker in distinguishing Indians from other subordinate groups. The chapters in Warren and Jackson’s rich and detailed volume examine different understandings of culture at local, regional, national, and international levels. These differences occur not only between governmental officials and indigenous peoples, or between international non-governmental organizations and their indigenous “clients,” but also between and among indigenous organizations themselves. As David Gow and Joanne Rappaport assert, “we cannot speak simply of a bipolar struggle between the dominant society and the indigenous movement; nor can we focus exclusively on how a monolithic movement represents itself to the dominant society. We must examine the complex internal dialogue within organizations, between organizations, and between organizations and communities which is framed by the struggle of the movement with the state” (51).

Jean Jackson addresses the question of who speaks for indigenous peoples in Colombia. Her chapter examines a series of building takeovers by indigenous organizations during the summer of 1996.⁷ In the negotiations that occurred between indigenous leaders and state officials subsequent to the takeovers, Jackson argues that state officials privileged the voices of traditional local leaders over regional and national-level ones in hopes of gaining rights to mining and oil exploration (95). Rifts between traditional and regional/national-level organization leaders are based not only on the tension generated by state favoritism but on genuine differences among these leaders in terms of how they “perform cultural difference” (84–85). The 1991 constitution awarded significant power to “indigenous authorities” and raised the stakes over who defines Indian-ness in Colombia (107); the question of

7. The title of Jean Jackson’s chapter in the Kay Warren and Jean Jackson volume is “Contested Discourses of Authority in Colombian National Indigenous Politics: The 1996 Summer Takeovers.”

who the legitimate “indigenous authorities” are continues to be hotly contested.

State officials, even within the same country, do not uniformly privilege local, or “traditional” leaders. Writing about the Putumayo department of Colombia in the Maybury-Lewis volume, Ramírez argues that governmental officials ignore community voices that appear less “native” in favor of an indigenous elite, who tend to be younger than traditional authorities and speak better Spanish. For Ramírez, this elite cadre of “legitimate” indigenous leaders has fortified and reproduced undesirable national political practices, such as centralized decision making. A chief concern expressed by the authors of all three chapters on Colombia is that the peoples deemed not native or authentic enough will not be recognized by the state and thus will be unable to take advantage of the current political opening toward indigenous peoples.⁸

Laura Graham’s fascinating chapter on Brazil, also in the Jackson and Warren volume, addresses the importance of language in indigenous self-representation. What choices do indigenous activists make in terms of language when they present their demands to Western audiences? Graham argues that Indian languages immediately authenticate the speakers; within the global public sphere, language is a principal defining feature of indigenous identity. Those Indians whose forms of cultural expression do not meet outsiders’ standards of what is deemed to be “Indian,” Graham argues, may be politically disadvantaged (210). The notion of authenticity has little meaning for indigenous performance, which she describes as “decontextualized, reinvented, and hybrid” (215), a point that is echoed by Terence Turner in his chapter on the Kayapó Video Project in Brazil’s Amazonian region. In his essay, Turner seeks “to demonstrate the vacuousness of the notion of authenticity as a critical standard in discussions of hybrid cultural forms” (229).

Taken as a whole, the Jackson and Warren volume is a fascinating account of the internal diversity and heterogeneity of the myriad organizations that form the Indian movements of Guatemala, Colombia, and Brazil and the variety of ways that indigenous peoples speak. There is some suggestive tension in the volume, however, over the question of essentialism. Jackson, for example, urges readers not to reify indigenous culture and cautions against generalizing across Indian

8. A volume edited by Rachel Sieder (2002) pays especial attention to the question of who gets defined as indigenous. In a chapter on water rights in Bolivia, Nina Laurie, Robert Andolina, and Sarah Radcliffe note that in disputes over land the Bolivian state privileged those they defined as living in rural Indian communities, while those defined as *campesinos*, even if they were very similar to “Indians” in surrounding communities, were denied these rights. Those marginalized were rural-urban migrants, peri-urban dwellers, and semi-nomadic groups in lowland regions.

movements. On the other hand, in a chapter on Guatemala's pan-Maya movement, Mayanist Victor Montejo defends the essentialism that some Indian organizations in Guatemala have used to revitalize Maya culture, and argues that the assertion and validation of the Mayan heritage involves an essentialist approach to Mayan identity. Montejo insists on the importance of linking the contemporary Maya to ancient Mayan culture, arguing that this link is crucial for Maya as they write their own history and as they represent themselves from their own indigenous perspectives. In this chapter, Montejo challenges anthropologists who have dismissed essentialism out of hand, or have rushed to define it as strategic.⁹

For Amalia Pallares, there was nothing inevitable about the development of a national Indian movement in Ecuador or even of indigenous peoples' mobilizing as Indians. In her book, Pallares addresses the question of how Indians in Ecuador began to mobilize around racial discrimination beginning in the late 1970s and 1980s to create, by the 1990s, the strongest national Indian movement in Latin America. In a richly detailed narrative, Pallares points to the complicated and multiple tensions among indigenous organizations at local and regional levels (particularly between lowland and highland regions) as the movement built momentum during the 1970s and 1980s. Pallares argues that the development of a national Indian movement in Ecuador was accompanied by shifts in political identity, which she explains by analyzing the interaction between macro-structural changes and consciousness formation within organizations and communities. Pallares is particularly interested in the second of these two influences—consciousness formation—and she examines two very different indigenous communities in the Ecuadorian highlands: Cacha and Cotacachi. Both communities struggled against racism, eventually mobilized around racial discrimination, and today form part of the national Indian movement, although they have very different trajectories and histories. Indians in Cacha distanced themselves from neighboring mestizos in the 1970s to pursue separatist development, even while they cooperated extensively with national government officials. Indians in Cotacachi, on the other hand, were active in peasant organizations for years and built multiethnic alliances with mestizos who shared their demands for rural development and agricultural credit.

Pallares situates the development of the Indian movement and Indian consciousness in Ecuador within a history of anti-colonial struggles in the lowlands and peasant (class-based) struggles in the highlands. With respect to the latter, she argues that indigenous organizations

9. See Warren (1998) for an extensive discussion of indigenous organizations' use of essentialism in Guatemala.

focused on questions of respect and anti-discrimination, which peasant organizations had long ignored. However, she insists that class identity and organization should not be set against were complexly intertwined with racial and ethnic identity, and she argues that Indians in the highlands pursued *campesinista* and *indianista* politics at the same time, exhibiting a “double consciousness,” a term she borrows from W. E. B. DuBois. At the heart of Pallares’s book is the assertion that there was no simple transition from peasant to Indian political identity (181). The new indigenous organizations in Ecuador have not dropped older peasant demands for land, credit, and access to markets, but have rearticulated and integrated them into the *indianista* agenda: “Instead of disappearing, the politics of the material is undergoing a metamorphosis, as former class demands are rearticulated and reconstructed in new ideological frames and become the basis for new and renewed political struggles” (226).

CONAIE’s vision of a pluricultural Ecuador links cultural reproduction and survival to concrete material demands. While some Ecuadorian state officials have also publicly embraced pluriculturalism, it is a pluriculturalism more narrowly focused on bilingual programs and based on a supra-structural definition of culture. The gap between indigenous organizations’ and state officials’ views of pluriculturalism can be observed throughout Latin America as nation-states rush to ratify Convention 169 and tout their “multi-cultural” credentials while, at the same time, ending or sharply reducing land distribution, which make it difficult if not impossible for rural producers to survive. As many authors point out, it is much easier for politicians to fund bilingual education programs than to enact redistributive policies that challenge the current neoliberal economic model or that respond to demands for political autonomy. Indian organizations in Ecuador have used both formal and informal political channels to get their demands met as they pursue their vision of pluriculturalism. Pallares’s work is the best book-length treatment on Ecuador’s Indian movement in English, and I highly recommend it.

Also writing about Ecuador is Allen Gerlach. At the center of this book is the role Indians played in the mobilizations that accompanied the ouster of two Ecuadorian presidents: Abdalá Bucaram in 1997 and Jamil Mahuad in 2000. Gerlach seeks to describe and explain the events of 1997 and 2000 by placing them “in the perspective of 30 years of dynamic change and transformation launched in 1967 by the discovery of oil in the Amazon” (xiv). The book begins with a chapter on the colonial period and marches through the post-Independence and modern eras in textbook-like fashion. After this general historical introduction, Gerlach intersperses chapters on Ecuadorian executives (i.e., Bucaram, Arteaga, Alarcón, and Mahuad), with chapters on oil and on the Indian

movement. Chapter 7 (in my view the book's best chapter) weaves together material from several sources (mostly national and international newspapers) to provide a useful narrative of the unprecedented events of January 2000 when Indians formed part of a triumvirate that governed the country for two days. Gerlach paints in broad strokes; unlike Pallares, he focuses very little on local and regional cases, and most of the book describes national-level events.

As the title of the book suggests, Gerlach is particularly interested in linking Ecuador's Indians and the country's oil wealth, which in his view has generated a boom-bust mentality among the country's citizens and has caused untold environmental degradation and destruction in the Amazonian region. Since Ecuador's oil reserves are found in the country's lowland region, Gerlach's focus is almost exclusively on lowland indigenous peoples and organizations. He spends far less time examining highland organizations, which played a major role in the development of the national Indian movement. While Pallares spends pages on the debates between highland and lowland organizations, the movement's antecedents in peasant leagues, and the use of race and racial discrimination as a way of unifying Indians across the country, Gerlach says simply: "Years of discussions among the regional groups followed; the terms and objectives of a national indigenous movement were debated and clarified" (54). In sum, *Indians, Oil, and Politics* is a largely descriptive book that provides a general overview of major themes in Ecuador's political history.

SOCIAL RIGHTS: TRANSCENDING THE INDIVIDUAL-COLLECTIVE DIVIDE?

As indigenous movements throughout the continent have grown in strength, public debate over the relationship between individual and collective rights has heated up. Critics of Indian rights portray indigenous organizations as advocating policies that violate individual human rights. Indian organizations have responded by claiming that Indian rights are human rights, and have insisted that there is no inherent conflict between individual and collective rights. Indeed, indigenous movements throughout the continent have pressed states to recognize both individual and collective rights. Thus the protection and enforcement of collective rights has been particularly contentious. Across the continent over the last two decades, the foundation of indigenous community life has weakened as states have scrapped land reform programs and slashed agricultural subsidies.

In their edited volume, Susan Eckstein and Timothy Wickham-Crowley sidestep the debate over individual and collective rights by focusing on social rights. In this volume, Indian rights are included within the broader framework of social rights to subsistence, to labor,

and to gender and sexual equality. At the center of each chapter is a deceptively simple question: How do Latin Americans understand social rights? In the volume's introductory essay, the editors argue that while people's experiences of and struggles over social rights are influenced and greatly affected by macro/global processes, they experience them locally. The various authors deliberately situate the individuals and groups studied within larger macro contexts, without losing sight of local particularities and circumstances. No single analytical perspective binds the chapters together, yet all of the authors focus on "the institutional patterning of social rights, cultural repertoires that shape conceptions of rights, and responses to perceived rights violations" (8). In doing so, the chapters "provide a window through which to unravel the relationship between structure and agency" (8).

In a chapter on environmental justice in Mexico's largest protected tropical ecosystem, the Calakmul Biosphere Reserve in Tabasco, Nora Haenn highlights the conflict between community members and non-local conservationists over community rights. Haenn argues that the residents of Calakmul have opposed conservation because they view it as a challenge to their demands for land distribution and economic development. Yet, Haenn does not romanticize the Calakmul community; she argues that local governance structures are highly personalized and combine authoritarian and democratic practices. She describes in detail the complex factional politics within the *cjidos* located on the reserve. Despite these internal divisions, however, peasants in Calakmul have united around the idea that they should not have to risk their subsistence in order to receive aid from international NGOs and the national government. Conversely, the conservation community insists on the importance of setting community standards and regulating the community's use of natural resources, downplaying peasant demands for land reform and credit, which are no longer in vogue in international development circles.

Conflicts between local communities and global actors and activists are also at the heart of Mark Anner's chapter on labor organizing in Central American export-processing plants. While local and international actors both seek to improve living standards on the ground in the *maquila* garment industry, they disagree over the strategies to employ: International activists lobby textile multinationals to agree to industry-wide standards, and local activists organize for stronger labor unions. Looking at several case studies, Anner observes a "disconnect" between the goals of international campaigns for labor rights and those of local activists and workers, and he warns that unless global activists pay attention to the needs of local workers, the results of international campaigns will be limited.¹⁰

10. It is not clear from Mark Anner's chapter that the differences between the global and the local in the case studies he examines break down over disputes between

Alejandro Portes and Patricia Fernández-Kelly transcend the local-global divide in their chapter on transnational communities, which are relatively new actors in the global arena. For Portes and Fernández-Kelly, these communities, made up of bilingual people who move easily between different cultures and who frequently maintain residence in two countries, are “incipient but powerful forces that oppose the more visible manifestations of globalization, including the growing imbalance between capital and labor” (168). Some of these transnational communities have become active in their local communities as entrepreneurs, providing needed social services for residents. Their optimism notwithstanding, Portes and Fernández-Kelly are aware of the potential risks of transnational community activism. They argue that although these communities can be “a powerful mechanism to combat certain kinds of inequalities,” they can also “exacerbate imbalances in the distribution of resources at the local level” (181).¹¹

As Portes and Fernández-Kelly point out, globalization and neoliberalism can generate social movements and energize activists. This current context also poses some significant challenges for social movements. In a chapter on the politics of gender and democratization in Guatemala, Susan Berger argues that the return to formal democracy in Guatemala has served not only to strengthen and consolidate the women’s movement, but also to contain and regulate it. In increasing numbers, women’s organizations have drawn from their ranks to fill governmental positions, frequently in lieu of engaging in the informal politics of grassroots activism. Once in these positions, Berger argues, women’s organizations have found themselves helping the government implement neoliberal reforms. Other women’s organizations financed by international NGOs have taken over work previously done by the state (198). The relationship between women’s organizations and institutional politics has given rise to serious debate among Guatemaltecas, as organizations continue to weigh the costs and benefits of shifting strategies in the current context of democratization and neoliberalism.¹²

individual and collective rights. Anner’s observations do, however, point to a disjunction between international activism around the independent monitoring of corporate codes of conduct and local demands for justice.

11. A recent work that explores the rich diversity of cross-border activism is David Brooks and Jonathan Fox (2002) who point out that the success and intensity of these cross-border linkages vary from sector to sector. Labor coalitions and Latino immigrant and civil rights organizations are strong, for example, while environmental coalitions/movements outside the border region have been difficult to forge (a point that Haenn corroborates in her chapter in Eckstein and Wickham-Crowley’s 2003).

12. Heather Williams (2001) examines how neoliberal policies have shifted the terrain upon which social movements act. Williams argues that the retreat of the federal government in the area of redistribution is likely to channel social demands into new

Finally, contributors to Maybury-Lewis's volume—anthropologists, historians, and political scientists—focus on the relationship between state institutions and social movement activists. Each chapter examines a regional or national-level indigenous movement “in order to understand, through comparative analysis, why the relations between indigenous peoples and states play out in such different ways in different countries” (xv). The variation in national cases is striking and not surprising given that the volume includes chapters on Mexico, Guatemala, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Brazil.

Bret Gustafson's chapter, “Paradoxes of Liberal Indigenism: Indigenous Movements, State Processes, and Intercultural Reform in Bolivia,” does a particularly good job of putting movements in dialogue with state projects. Gustafson looks at three reform initiatives representative of Bolivia's new liberal indigenism: bilingual education, decentralization, and land reform. Gustafson argues that while these reforms “are certainly improvements on prior histories of violent assimilation or paternalistic indigenismo,” they are in tension with demands of multiple indigenous actors. In Gustafson's view, multicultural reforms in Bolivia have not resulted in the inclusion of previously excluded indigenous peoples, but have “gradually dismantled prior idioms and forms of corporatist statecraft—including most significantly the idiom of class, centralized national unions, and discourses linked to ‘revolutionary nationalism’” (274). For example, while Bolivia's municipal decentralization program (called the “Popular Participation Law”) has strengthened “traditional” indigenous organizations such as *ayllus*, *captaincies*, and *cabildos*, it has also decentered national opposition movements and unions. Proponents of the law, Gustafson argues, have sought to “relegitimate national political parties managed in quite undemocratic fashion by urban elite” (280).

Several of the authors in the Maybury-Lewis volume point to the gap that exists between the constitutional recognition of Indian rights and the enforcement of these rights, arguing that enforcement has been far from automatic. As Maybury-Lewis notes in his chapter on Brazil, “Indigenous cultures have been recognized in the constitution, yet powerful interests within the state are fighting to minimize such recognition” (344). Several of the authors in the books under review echo Maybury-Lewis's caution, stating that many of the political elite in Latin America, members of the military establishment, and average citizens

domains—toward municipal and state governments. Williams observes that in the current context, struggles over micro-level issues tend to last for long periods of time and are costly. Social movements, she argues, mitigate these costs by building coalitions, making deals with political parties, and courting the sympathy of the media (13).

continue to view Indians as backward and unproductive, as traitors to the nation, and as children in need of reeducation. Throughout the continent Indians have resisted these stereotypes in distinct ways: running for political office and forming indigenous political parties, allying with non-governmental organizations, engaging in contentious forms of mobilization and strikes, and making common cause with other disadvantaged peoples.

CONCLUSIONS

The slogan “All politics are local” is axiomatic for campaigning politicians and local activists seeking to mobilize support behind a particular cause. Yet those seeking to increase their influence within a political system must often expand the scope of conflict, reaching beyond the local to seek additional resources, allies, and support. This has been particularly true for indigenous peoples in Latin America, who have circumvented local *caciques* and exploitative landowners by appealing to national and international authorities to get their demands met. In recent years, scholars of social movements have focused a great deal of attention on the ways that indigenous peoples—as well as other historically marginalized citizens in Latin America—have used the international arena to call attention to the abuses and neglect of national and local governments (see Brysk 2000; Keck and Sikkink 1998).

While some social movements in the continent have been successful at negotiating the terrain of international institutions and actors, the books under review here point to the continued importance of local politics. By examining the links between macro and micro contexts, these authors show that social movements and social movement activists do not respond in uniform ways to neoliberal economic policies, to electoral democracy, or to multiculturalism. While the current context poses particular challenges for social movement activism, as several of the authors point out, social movements continue to be vibrant and vital actors in the political life of Latin America.

REFERENCES

- Brooks, David and Jonathan Fox
 2002 *Cross-Border Dialogues: U.S.-Mexican Social Movement Networking*. La Jolla: University of California, San Diego, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.
- Brysk, Alison
 2000 *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Foweraker, Joe
 1990 “Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico.” In *Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico*, edited by Joe Foweraker and Ann L. Craig. Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers.

Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink.

1998 *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nash, June.

2001 *Mayan Visions: The Quest for Autonomy in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Routledge.

Sieder, Rachel, ed.

2002 *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity, and Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Cott, Donna Lee

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

Warren, Kay B.

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

Williams, Heather L.

2001 *Social Movements and Economic Transition: Markets and Distributive Conflict in Mexico*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.