
REVIEW ESSAYS

INDIGENEITY UNPACKED

Politics, Civil Society, and Social Movements in the Andes

Brooke Larson
Stony Brook University

Indigenous Development in the Andes: Culture, Power, and Transnationalism.

By Robert Andolina, Nina Laurie, and Sarah A. Radcliffe. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009. Pp. xii + 345. \$89.95 cloth. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822345404.

Long Live Atahualpa: Indigenous Politics, Justice, and Democracy in the Northern Andes.

By Emma Cervone. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.

Pp. xiii + 332. \$89.95 cloth. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822351894.

Fighting Like a Community: Andean Civil Society in an Era of Indian Uprisings.

By Rudi Colloredo-Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Pp. xviii + 233. \$69.00 cloth. \$23.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226114033.

New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia.

By Bret Gustafson. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.

Pp. xx + 331. \$84.95 cloth. \$23.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822345466.

Of the myriad “new social movements” that scrambled onto Latin America’s political stage during the last two decades of the twentieth century, native protest movements were perhaps the most politically consequential for the redefinition of state-society relations in many nations during the era of neoliberalism. Waves of indigenous movements that swept across southern Mexico, Guatemala’s highlands, southern Colombia, and highland regions of Ecuador and Bolivia became part of the volcanic political landscape and together signaled “the return of the

Latin American Research Review, Vol. 49, No. 1. © 2014 by the Latin American Studies Association.

Indian" (to borrow anthropologist Xavier Albó's words) to the center of national politics, most especially in Ecuador, Bolivia, and Guatemala.¹

Those political rumblings, and the growing continental movement for indigenous rights, sparked a scholarly boom among social scientists, who brought their disciplinary tool kits and sensibilities to the burgeoning field of contemporary indigenous movements. More recently, historians have joined the fray by bringing into focus Indian traditions of political struggle and using the current cycle of contention to reflect on the past. From the start, then, the field of Indian movements, and more broadly the study of ethnic politics, has attracted scholars from a wide array of disciplinary traditions. Political scientists, especially those inspired by Charles Tilly's early work on the political environment of popular movements in Europe, usually went in pursuit of structural determinants to build plausible frameworks for explaining the emergence, location, leadership structures, political strategies, ideological framings, larger structural impact, and legacy of indigenous social movements. Chasing down such causative factors and outcomes often required macro-comparative matrices specifying the variables that operated in different historical and political circumstances. And while political scientists did not come up with a facile formula for explaining indigenous cycles of political contention, they did underscore the calculated political risks that indigenous leaders took in responding to shifting structures of threat and opportunity that narrowed or widened possibilities for collective action.

In contrast, the normative turn in anthropology tended to plant the researcher within the locus of indigenous cultural politics, and it was through the medium of intercultural dialogue and participation that politically engaged ethnographies of native politics and subjectivities were nurtured. Political ethnographers of indigenous movements concentrated on the intricacies of indigenous political subjectivity and contests over the political meanings of such key notions as citizenship, multiculturalism, autonomy, and territoriality, as well as the very meaning of indigeneity itself—all of which were up for hermeneutical grabs during the multicultural reforms of the 1990s. Making sense of indigenous cultural politics called for nuanced ethnographic and semiotic inquiries into the construction of indigenous self-identification and the process of ethnic identity formation. Yet, as many scholars have noted, working at either end of the disciplinary spectrum imposed limits and created blind spots. Among an earlier generation of scholars, those working on abstract structural problems of causality tended to overlook grassroots political agency or recognize that collective identities and strategies were fundamentally bound up with culture. On the other hand, narrow-gauged cultural theory and ethnography, in search of deep symbolic structures, primordial identities, or oppositional antistate movements, tended to overlook the larger political and historical conditions and internal political dynamics that opened up (or choked off) avenues for collective mobilization and interaction with dominant state structures.

1. Xavier Albó, "Andean People in the Twentieth Century," in *The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas*, ed. Frank Salomon and Stuart Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 3:2, 823.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, several influential conference volumes called for interdisciplinary designs to close the gap between systemic models in search of causality and the new social movement (NSM) emphasis on ethnic identity politics.² Their call was timely, and over the 1990s reams of scholarship began to paper over older disciplinary and conceptual divides. Scholarship on Latin American social movements (including indigenous movements) turned into a vibrant meeting ground of cultural studies, comparative analysis, and structural theorizing, and both disciplinary wings of the NSM literature came away stronger for it. Other developments reconfigured the study of indigenous movements: disparate regional and country foci were brought into comparative reference so that scholars working on, say, the Guatemala highlands were in dialogue with researchers working at the edge of the Amazonian Andes. Although the social ecology and strategic expressions of indigeneity might take starkly different forms in different locations, such comparative cases raised broader conceptual issues about the multivocality and contingency of ethnic-based movements, and the political and historical circumstances that gave rise to them in some, but not other, parts of Amerindian America. In the Andean world, for example, comparative case studies raised basic questions about causality and context to explain the so-called Peruvian anomaly—that is, the putative absence of nationally rooted indigenous movements in highland Peru, even as new cycles of rural peasant protest and political violence convulsed many regions during the age of Sendero Luminoso. Whether, or why, Peru stands alone among the three Andean nations of the old viceroyalty has been the subject of lively debate since at least the early 1990s.³

Meanwhile, the intensity of scholarship over the past two decades has unleashed a torrent of conference volumes, monographs, journal issues, documentary films, and testimonies on indigenous movements. Indigenous intellectuals, scholars, artists, policy makers, and activists have become crucial participants in academic circles and in nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and have challenged the epistemic monopoly of Western forms of academic and technical knowledge. Social scientists (particularly anthropologists) have experimented with intercultural methods of politically engaged scholarship; and stale debates over ethnic/class politics have been nuanced, reformulated, or transcended.

2. See, for example, Arturo Escobar and Sonia E. Alvarez, eds., *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy, and Democracy* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992); Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds., *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-Visioning Latin American Social Movements* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998); and Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, eds., *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002).

3. For a small sample of scholarly comparison and debate on the “Peru anomaly,” see Orin Starn, “I Dreamed of Foxes and Hawks: Reflections on Peasant Protest, New Social Movements, and the *Rondas Campesinas* of Northern Peru,” in *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America*, ed. Arturo Escobar and Sonia E. Alvarez, 89–111; Deborah J. Yashar, *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); and Lisa M. Glidden, *Mobilizing Ethnic Identity in the Andes: A Study of Ecuador and Peru* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011).

Taken together, these developments forged a vibrant interdisciplinary field that has matured considerably over the past decade or so.⁴

The books under review here represent a good sample of the infusion of interdisciplinary energy that has animated the field of indigenous movements since 1990. The authors—one political scientist, Robert Andolina; two geographers, Nina Laurie and Sarah Radcliffe; and three anthropologists, Emma Cervone, Rudi Colloredo-Mansfield, and Bret Gustafson—are all crossover scholars: their research collectively engages a host of structural, historical, institutional, and cultural questions surrounding the specific political movement that defines the subject of each book. None of these studies approaches Indian political movements as pristine subjects operating beyond the reach of the state, the market, or the ebb and flow of globalization. In each case indigenous subjects are situated within the neoliberal political environment, which allowed them to flourish and/or held them in check. These books share the basic premise, by now a commonplace among scholars, that during the 1990s neoliberalism's sharply contradictory logics presented a moving set of targets and tools for indigenous peoples to use to mobilize and eventually to wrest a package of cultural and political reforms from their governments and allied international agencies. The contradictions of neoliberalism include its mix of economic austerity and pro-market and anti-poor reforms that put the squeeze on most middle- and lower-income groups, on the one hand, and its progressive pro-democracy, social, and multicultural reform agendas, on the other. Like Tilly's generation of social movement theorists, then, these authors focus on the politics of possibility created by the paradoxes of neoliberalism's combined economic, political, and multicultural agendas. At least implicitly, these books also engage in narrative analysis to the extent that they plot the shifting tides of indigenous activism and its ambivalent relationship to unstable governments and deepening globalization. Inevitably, questions crop up about the substance and significance of indigenous political success in influencing national reform agendas and NGO policies; the political fate of those indigenous organizations that worked closely with state and NGO agencies; and the ways indigenous movement politics played out in rapidly polarizing political climates around the turn of the millennium.

Overall, these Andean ethnographies chronicle an era of extraordinary indigenous battles and achievements that took place in Ecuador and Bolivia, the only two nations in the South American continent that have sustained large, institutionalized indigenous movements. In both countries, local and regional indigenous political organizations dramatically jumped scale to become major political

4. Sample volumes, in addition to the work cited above, include Alison Brysk, *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000); Rachel Sieder, ed., *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity, and Democracy* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); David Maybury-Lewis, ed., *The Politics of Ethnicity: Indigenous Peoples in Latin America States* (Cambridge, MA: David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University, 2002); Erick D. Langer with Elena Muñoz, eds., *Contemporary Indigenous Movements in Latin America* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2003); and Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc, eds., *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* (Brighton, England: Sussex Academic Press, 2004).

players on the regional and/or national scene. Ecuador's Confederation of Ecuadorian Indigenous Nationalities (CONAIE) is widely recognized for its success in integrating Indian federations from the Amazon, sierra, and coastal regions into a mass organization dedicated to promoting indigenous rights before the state and transnational agencies. Other indigenous and class-based organizations in Ecuador have taken up the cause of multicultural citizenship and resource rights. Bolivia's less unified indigenous movement, composed of deeply rooted regional confederations and rural union groups, also emerged in the 1980s and 1990s as a powerful player within the political system and in opposition to it. Although indigenous political organizing differed between and within Ecuador and Bolivia, indigenous movements in both countries shared strategic positions and flourished under wobbly neoliberal orders, in regions with deep histories of rural political unrest and indigenous majorities (or near majorities). As José Antonio Lucero recently argued, "Indigenous movements have tested the architecture of [those] new democracies in calling for the creation of state institutions dedicated to indigenous concerns."⁵ While taking different approaches, the books reviewed here set out to show just how, and with what social consequences, local indigenous movements "tested the architecture" of Ecuador's and Bolivia's globalizing neoliberal democracies.

Of the four books, Cervone's *Long Live Atahualpa!* is the only study to focus on a discrete indigenous organization that formed the core of local indigenous politics. Cervone profiles the Inca Atahualpa (IA) confederation, which interlinked rural villages throughout Ecuador's Tixán parish (in the province of Chimborazo) and eventually connected local villages to the broader Indian movement after the nationwide uprising in 1990.⁶ Her fieldwork focused on the internal cultural workings and organizational networks of IA at a time when Tixán's rural inhabitants were coming into contact with nationwide Indian rights organizations, progressive Catholic priests, and other nonindigenous actors (including a few involved social scientists like Cervone). The analysis also invokes history and memory to open up a time horizon for understanding the antecedents of Tixán's ethnic movement.

Cervone's beautifully rendered regional historical analysis is interwoven with the *testimonio* of Tixán's elders to illuminate how the remembered past of Quichua labor exploitation, during the "time of the lords," has shaped the contours of social memory and the idioms of a lived heritage of "injustice and resilience" (39). Through these oral testimonies, Cervone gets at the rootedness of cultural memory, meaning, and identity constitutive of local political processes and identities in Tixán today. Cervone's work is also notable for its expansive analysis of

5. José Antonio Lucero, *Struggles of Voice: The Politics of Indigenous Representation in the Andes* (Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press, 2008), 12.

6. The 1990 uprising was sparked by the occupation of a church in downtown Quito by CONAIE leaders and other activists. Their action eventually escalated into a series of massive street demonstrations, road blockades that essentially shut down the government, and peasant land occupations. Although land issues defined the movement's early agenda, the uprising marked the consolidation of a national Indian movement and the insertion of ethnic rights into the center of national discourses and constitutional reforms (most dramatically, the legal redefinition of Ecuador as a multicultural nation).

agrarian crisis and transformation that eventually spurred indigenous mobilizations around issues of class and ethnicity. In broad terms, the scenario sketched out for this region is familiar across the Andean highlands, wherever agrarian reform laws (promulgated in Ecuador in 1964 and 1973 and in Bolivia in 1953) dramatically altered regional power relations. These reforms led to the profusion of smallholding land tenure patterns; the arrival of agrarian unions, parties, and public schools; the deepening of market relations; a flood of outmigration; and the intensification of local land disputes. This classic scene of “great transformation” was complicated by Ecuador’s 1937 *pro-comuna* law, which made possible the legalization of corporate landholding and creation of local Indian jurisdictions in ex-hacienda areas. These midcentury state reforms created an institutional environment that encouraged the intermingling of ethnic and class strategies of local defense and empowerment. Cervone’s capsule history of Tixán identifies the structural context within which an indigenous land-claims movement arose. Her narrative also hinges on the precipitous arrival of a group of progressive Catholic priests, who functioned as activists and mediators in the growing land-claims movement during the 1970s and 1980s.

Cervone argues that the region’s deep trajectory of peasant political struggle, nurtured by class resentment, land disputes, and the activist alliances forged during those years, eventually created the platform on which the IA built its sprawling political constituency among the villages of Tixán. The key to the IA’s initial success, Cervone suggests, was its ability to institutionalize and channel a wave of spontaneous land seizures into a sustained institutional land-claims movement organized around the long-standing *comuna* ideal of indigenous rights to land, community, and recognition. Eventually, IA became the hub of a regionwide network of political leaders and interlocutors in ongoing conflicts and negotiations with the Ecuadorian state as it began to frame constitutional and social reform in the neoliberal era. The IA addressed not only issues of land but eventually indigenous cultural rights, including access to bilingual education and other cultural resources.

In narrating the IA’s protracted political evolution against the backdrop of agrarian change, Cervone reminds us that the IA’s ethnic politics did not spring out of the ground in the aftermath of the 1990 uprising but were nurtured by decades-long struggle and memory. That said, and implicitly recognized by the author, this generalized view of regional history (one that is familiar across locality and region) muddies the waters when it comes time to identify the regionally specific factors that crystallized the “politicization of ethnicity” (and institutionalization of the IA) in Tixán, as against other highland regions where similar processes of agrarian transformation were under way in the postreform decades. Given the long history of indigenous political engagement and the generic Andean “habitus of resistance” (the author’s phrase, after Bourdieu) in highland Ecuador, we are left with a series of conceptual questions about the murky process of ethnic identity making that played out in this regional context. Do we locate the wellspring of indigeneity in the teachings and organizational work of pro-Indian priests who swept through the region? Did the reemergence of ethnicity diffuse outward from the center, as the CONAIE’s discourse of ethnic *revindicación* and citizenship

rights began to filter down to local organizations like the IA? Alternatively, was there a local instrumental dynamic at work, whereby the IA's organizational strategy and politics of identity worked in tandem, so that collective mobilization and the operational meanings of indigeneity became mutually constitutive within the parameters of the organization? Or are we to locate the intricate process of ethnic mobilization at the nexus of these multiple analytic domains? This study never quite clarifies this complex interplay, in spite of the introduction's extended discussion of "anthropological theories of identity politics" laying out methodological guidelines and caveats.

Although theory, evidence, and analysis never quite gel in the body of the text, the empirical case of Tixán is richly suggestive. Read and reread, the text seems to imply that the origins of ethnic politics resided in the structural paradoxes of Tixán's protracted process of rural modernization in the post-agrarian reform era, but only became manifest once the IA "emerged as a powerful ally and mediator of indigenous communities involved in land disputes with landowners" (143). Cervone shows that as the IA came to rally and rely on rural community structures, networks, and sociabilities, it made calculated use of indigeneity to build its organization and inscribe local grievances about land into broader "social movement" claims. These local developments dovetailed with the discourses and projects of Ecuador's national Indian movement during the 1990s.

Whereas the book's early chapters dwell on the history and institutional politics of ethnic identity making, later chapters hew to fine-grained ethnographic explorations of the IA's administrative and ritual presence in Quichua communities. There is an extended discussion, for example, on vernacular judicial norms and practices (*derecho propio*), where the IA functioned as the "superior body of justice" in parish matters. However, since many *comunas* in Ecuador (as well as *ayllus* and other rural communities in Bolivia) in the 1990s came to enjoy local judicial autonomy and practice customary law, it is difficult to gauge the differential impact that this indigenous organization may have exerted on Tixán communities. Where we do see the shaping influence of the IA's authority is in the realm of ritual public space. Cervone devotes a long chapter to the symbolic and institutional politics behind the creation of the "festival of the harvest" to celebrate authentic Quichua culture. These close textual encounters with the quotidian workings of communal justice and ceremony point to the IA's crucial work in normalizing the practical meanings of indigeneity and reveal the experiential dimensions of living locally in the age of multicultural reform.

But what about historical process and outcome? How did this robust political organization fare under Ecuador's neoliberal regime? In her concluding chapters, Cervone leaves behind the case study to reengage the anthropological literature and reflect on the ambiguities and limitations of indigenous forms of representation and empowerment in the age of multicultural reform. Using the IA as microcosm, the author acknowledges several important achievements. For example, Ecuador's constitutional openings and decentralizing political reforms allowed some IA activists to run for local political office, occupy administrative positions, align themselves to regional and national Indian organizations, and so forth. But in the end, the author delivers a bleak appraisal of neoliberalism's structural

limits and the ensuing polarization that has fragmented indigenous movement praxis and stifled momentum at the national and local level. As for the IA, apparently it has lost its sharp edge and turned into a local agency of bureaucratic and legal mediation (“*tramitador*”), helping families and communities in their ongoing interactions with the state and NGOs.

If Cervone’s prime concern is to study ethnic identity politics, Colloredo-Mansfield’s *Fighting Like a Community* is decidedly not centered on any formal indigenous organization. He focuses instead on social tensions and differences within Quichua (he uses the alternative spelling Kichwa) communities in two regions in Ecuador’s northern highlands, the Tigua Valley (province of Cotopaxi) and rural Otavalo towns (province of Imbabura). Colloredo-Mansfield’s insistence on problematizing ethnic identity seems particularly salient since the Otavalo have become the globe’s iconic brand of picturesque Indianness. There is an implicit theoretical agenda to problematize an earlier wave of primordialist approaches to Andean peasant identity and Indian movements by situating the constructedness of indigenous identity in a rapidly urbanizing regional political economy, where to be Indian no longer means being tied to the land, either materially or spiritually. Rural poverty, the allure of commodity capitalism, and the pull of nearby towns and cities (not to mention the global economy) has spurred an exodus and transformed the rural landscape. Peasant livelihood has given way to diversified household economies, a buoyant rural petite bourgeoisie, and growing class differentiation. In short, all the signs of agrarian modernization are on view in these two highland regions. This forms the backdrop for understanding how communal politics worked and collective political action was operationalized in this socially dynamic, heterogeneous rural society. The book’s aim is to tease out the paradoxical process by which this socially differentiated rural society, one characterized by “internal pluralism” (a favorite term that vaguely alludes to popular democracy more than to class-driven conflict), managed to channel and contain endemic moral and material conflicts and, in the process, forge a moral ethics of communal identity and belonging. By mapping this political infrastructure at the local and regional level, we can better understand how the CONAIE and other translocal Indian organizations were able to build and sustain a nationwide indigenous movement in “the era of Indian uprisings” during the 1990s.⁷

Fighting Like a Community approaches the entangled themes of contention and

7. This book fits into a larger body of historical and anthropological literature that departs from the premise that Andean rural society, and indigenous communities in particular, were fraught with internal conflicts militating against the organicity of a unitary political consciousness (class, ethnic, or otherwise). Andean studies offer a wealth of approaches to and case studies of Andean peasant politics—scaling up from the quotidian locus of resistance to the millenarian moment of mass upheaval. Random examples spring to mind: Gavin Smith’s *Livelihood and Resistance: Peasants and the Politics of Land in Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), which shows that grassroots mobilizations were powered by communal traditions of dissension and democracy; Florencia E. Mallon’s *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), theorizing and documenting “the conflictual construction of community” in the cases of nineteenth-century highland Peru and Mexico; and Joanne Rappaport’s *Intercultural Utopias: Public Intellectuals, Cultural Experimentation, and Ethnic Pluralism in Colombia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), which advances what she calls a “pluralist approach to ethnic politics” for Colombia’s Cauca region. Following different disciplinary priorities, all these books have sought to understand how rural peoples have

collectivity from a variety of vantage points. In a subtle play on words, the book's title refers to two overlapping arenas of struggle—internal politics and external mobilizations. Colloredo-Mansfield inquires into the micropolitics of everyday conflicts and negotiations over communal and individual values, the warp and woof of community life, and argues that communal forms of democracy and discipline created a political infrastructure for mobilizing alliances within wider indigenous coalitions, once political conditions turned favorable. The first section provides a novel approach to contextual development by “humaniz[ing] the history of the post-land reform era” (20). Colloredo-Mansfield presents vivid life histories of three Quichua men (an artist, an activist, and a capitalist) whose lives shatter stereotypes and open perspectives on the complicated lives of men “trying out life beyond the racial markers of ponchos, the Kichwa language, and rural residence” (23). And yet these men never quite shed their native identity, either. The point is to illustrate cultural adaptation and continuity through the flux and transformation going on in Ecuador's northern highlands: concretely, to track these outwardly mobile Quichua men who have articulated their urban-oriented values and aspirations to their deeper allegiances to their lands and villages of origin.

These individuals' stories do indeed humanize the landscape of rural Andean modernization, but because Colloredo-Mansfield extrapolates from the lives of three individuals, broader questions arise as to the active role that region, gender, and class play in structuring the opportunities and constraints of these men's individual trajectories—where, for example, the individual choice to shed the outer trappings of Indianness has traditionally been far less common for rural women than for men, as the work of Marisol de la Cadena and other anthropologists has so clearly shown.⁸ Regional differences are also at play here. Although the author's research communities were all caught up in the tourist and artisan trade of the globalizing economy, the Otavalo region (with its historically cosmopolitan and entrepreneurial political culture) bustled in comparison to the poorer, more isolated villages of the Tigua valley. Regionalism is put aside here, however, to pursue a broader theme, namely the stresses of rural change and “deep pluralism” that have contributed to the development of a vigorous political culture of communal sovereignty and civil society.

The linchpin of the book's middle section on communities is a fascinating discussion of “vernacular statecraft”—that is, the profusion of local structures of governance and voluntary associations, and their functional value in channeling quotidian forms of political contention into collective action—whether that meant mobilizing traditional work parties to build a bridge, for example, or building communal consensus about associating with the broader coalition of political forces that burst onto the scene after 1990. Colloredo-Mansfield's discussion

struggled “to regain the solidarity, cohesion, and mutuality of their communal traditions” in the face of corrosive market and state forces (Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 64).

8. Marisol de la Cadena, “Women Are More Indian: Ethnicity and Gender in a Community near Cuzco,” in *Ethnicity, Markets, and Migration in the Andes: At the Crossroads of History and Anthropology*, ed. Brooke Larson and Olivia Harris, with Enrique Tandeter (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 329–348.

of Andean village governance and direct democracy draws on many sources, as well it might, since the subject continues to attract intense scholarly interest. In particular, he makes use of James Scott's notion of the modernist "seeing state" as a framing device for showing the process by which Quichua communities made legible and managed their communal resources through the use of maps, lists, and other devices of social measurement and control.⁹ (These, it must be said, were deeply inscribed in the apparatus of indirect rule since Inca and early colonial times, Scott's "seeing state" notwithstanding!) Vernacular statecraft and civil society—essential to the reproduction of community and cultural identity amid the disruptive forces of economic change—are also viewed through other lenses: the workings of communal assemblies, the administration of communal justice, peasant cooperatives, and myriad voluntary church and trade associations. Taken together, these local forms of governance and civil society generated an ethical sense of indigenous community. Here, indigeneity was manifested not in a formal Indian organization like the IA, but in the everyday normative work of communal politics and administration.

The book's final section extends the discussion of communal politics outward into the larger realm of regional networks and commercial circuits, illustrating the importance of political opportunity for transforming the local-level potential for mobilization into direct action. Moving from the locality of the Quichua assembly (and individual experience) to the broader arena of national Indian politics under the neoliberal state, the author ponders the dramatic transformation of CONAIE's reformist platform into a militant oppositional position during the uprisings and blockades of 1994 and 1996. Ultimately, however, the analysis circles back to the problem of local/national articulations that were grounded in local communal practices and "the political meaning that communities have given to their acts," as many council leaders began to view the governing "work of communities as a legitimate alternative to the state" (204–205). In this sense, the internally pluralized "fighting community" transformed itself into a cohesive cell of the larger body politic of Ecuador's national Indian movement during the 1990s and early 2000s.

An anomaly of this ethnography is the author's ambiguous stance toward the dated notion of "moral economy"—which is still sometimes deployed by other scholars to conjure up seamless, transhistorical notions of *lo andino*. *Fighting Like a Community* produces a strong counterargument to discredit older culturalist tropes of *andinismo*. Yet, in the end, the book seems to suggest the emergence of an indigenous moral ethos that mediated internal dissension, disciplined communal behavior, and shaped identity among Quichua communities. Curiously, this idea is presented by way of the book's chapter subtitles (chapter 1 is subtitled, "Don't Forsake"; chapter 2, "Don't Be Backward"; chapter 3, "Don't Suffer"; chapter 5, "Don't Shirk"; and so forth). This organic moral code bubbling up from below—presumably, the cultural product of Quichua vernacular statecraft and assembly-style democracy in the local communities that Colloredo-Mansfield studied—is

9. James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

an idiom that has been used to assert indigenous authority and legitimate local communal practices of justice and discipline in many Andean regions. Indeed, in Ecuador the CONAIE incorporated elements of this “Inca code of morality” into its own political platform. Working at the local level, Colloredo-Mansfield shows how, through the workings of vernacular statecraft and “rough justice,” Otavalo towns (in particular) organized themselves around these distinctive nativist norms to confront outside threats and assert indigenous authority over expanded territorial jurisdictions during the early 1990s. The chapter subtitles seem to suggest that internal pluralism and contention ceded to a new normative order of communal harmony and discipline (moral economy in another guise?). Perhaps the subtitles simply allude to a “hoped-for public morality” (in the author’s words), but even so, the questions that these allusions raise are left largely unexamined. Indeed, the book refers more often to the Frankfurt school in its deployment of such liberal political notions as self-governance, civil society, pluralism, and consensus.

In sum, this rich ethnography moves from local to national and back again, plumbs the depths of cultural politics, and sheds new light on the infrastructure of Ecuador’s famous Indian movement. Its heavy reliance on the idea of pluralism, however, comes with conceptual risk, especially when it is invoked to describe and explain the institutionalization of contention so as to make possible collective action. The scenario sketched here almost ends up sounding like the local Andean analogue of an ideal western European democracy.

Comparative and transnational in scope, *Indigenous Development in the Andes* offers a kaleidoscope of rural development projects (broadly defined) in highland regions in Ecuador and Bolivia that became vital sites of local/global interaction between indigenous groups and the sponsors and funders of those projects. This book is not a standard policy-oriented study of applied development but rather examines a variety of neoliberal-era social policies and NGO-funded grassroots projects, in what amounts to a compilation of locally based ethnographic studies of Indian involvement in social reform initiatives in Ecuador and Bolivia’s globalizing economies.¹⁰ While quick to recognize the devastation that neoliberalism’s shock treatments wreaked on many sectors of society during the 1980s and 1990s, authors Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe present countervailing evidence to critically revisit the neoliberal turn toward social reformism, with a peculiarly Andean multicultural twist. Broadly, the authors argue that a new “ethnodevelopment” paradigm, repudiating earlier statist and assimilative models of modernization, was fashioned out of the ascendant democratizing ideals of cultural pluralism, indigenous rights, and local forms of self-determination, which were beginning to define multicultural citizenship regimes by the 1990s. At the level of practice, these ethnodevelopment projects were to be coauthored and negoti-

10. This book keeps company with a growing subfield of study that relates indigenous movements not only to international agencies promoting Indian rights but also to the vast multinational world of development policy and discourse. For sample work, see David Gow, *Countering Development: Indigenous Modernity and the Moral Imagination* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); Rappaport, *Intercultural Utopias*; and Kevin Healy, *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate: Multicultural Grassroots Development in the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001).

ated among disparate groups of stakeholders, including state reformers, NGO experts and funders, and representatives of the indigenous communities involved. The extent to which social reform projects came out of local struggles and initiatives or were largely imposed from above by state or NGO reformers must be approached fundamentally as an empirical question, contingent on deep fieldwork. And, in any event, the locus of study is precisely the intercultural terrain of local/global interaction. Thus, these authors are not so interested in bifurcating “authentic” versus “tainted” indigenous projects of development and empowerment as they are in showing the opportunities, initiatives, negotiations, and dilemmas that Andean indigenous people faced as they came into contact with local and international development agencies. To achieve this goal, the book approaches rural development projects from various angles that converge at the intersection of the globalizing economy, state reforms, and indigenous politics.

Looking at sites of ethnodevelopment from the outside, the book’s early chapters focus on the global world of NGOs and multilateral agencies that were active in rural Ecuador and Bolivia. During the United Nations’ campaign for Indian rights, robust indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia became major targets of international NGOs (such as the Inter-American Foundation, Oxfam, Cultural Survival, Catholic-based groups, etc.), big donors like the World Bank and UN, and small, wealthy western European nations (Denmark, Holland, Belgium, etc.). New global sources of funding, forums, advocacy networks, mobility, and information technology allowed local indigenous groups to ramp up their activism, extend their transnational reach, and insert their local concerns and knowledge into broad policy discussions about social reform, development, and democracy. Ecuador and Bolivia soon became “global exemplars of multicultural democratization” and a testing ground for local experiments in “indigenous development policy” (50–51).

Having sketched these transnational circuits of highland indigenous movements, the authors then examine how the pro-market orthodoxies of neoliberal thinking gave way to discourses of social development—a broad concept that broached such structural problems as inequality, poverty, and political exclusion, while also promoting various positive state/society agendas (such as indigenous rights, ecological sustainability, cultural survival, civil society and democracy). New pro-indigenous development discourses crystallized roughly at the time the International Labor Organization issued its 1989 indigenous rights code, prescribing “culturally appropriate” and interactive development projects. Thus, the paradigm shift pivoted on the normative notion that agrarian development should be situated squarely within a cultural framework that valorized native Andean knowledge and practices. In their illuminating discussion of ethnodevelopmental thinking, Radcliffe, Laurie, and Andolina argue that the idea of Andean “culture-as-social-capital” became the recurring motif of progressive transnational development projects, which began touting programs that aimed at boosting living conditions while respecting and strengthening native cultures.

Under the banner of “development with identity,” myriad projects of ethnodevelopment were launched throughout highland Bolivia and Ecuador. Many indigenous rights activists and development practitioners began to view Andean

history and culture as social capital and as potential engines of sustainable development under the aegis of multicultural states. Some transnational organizations simply promoted the commodification of native Andean cultural forms (the “cultural patrimony” approach); others tapped the roots of communal norms and institutions, such as rotative and collective work parties, to carry out NGO-funded public-works projects; and still other international agencies bolstered vernacular forms of civil society (of the sort that Colloredo-Mansfield elucidates) as a way to deepen and pluralize the democratization of Ecuador and Bolivia at a moment of political decentralization. But the book’s more dramatic point here, I think, is simply to apprehend the scope and depth of transnationalization that was occurring in rural Andean communities over the late 1980s and 1990s.

Questions remain about the principles of ethnodevelopment, as they were interpreted and applied by different advocacy and aid agencies under radically different regional and local conditions; the extent to which indigenous actors actively shaped, participated in, or stonewalled various grassroots development projects; and whether those transnational alliances ultimately empowered or disempowered indigenous movements. These social-historical questions are temporarily set aside in the book’s early chapters, however, to allow for an extended examination of new development discourses that aligned with the transnational Indian Rights movement and emerging multicultural state agendas. Fortunately, the authors shy away from reifying a unitary top-down meaning of developmentalism (ethno- or otherwise): “Development policy [and discourse] directed at indigenous people is not free floating, as some interpretations of globalization would suggest, but arises from and takes [multivocal] meaning in particular places” (53). The bulk of the book, in fact, is concerned with the social geographies and intercultural spaces where global agencies and indigenous activists negotiated the practical meanings of development in specific locales of highland Ecuador and Bolivia.

The book’s ethnographic approach to ethnodevelopment in various highland regions is to focus on four topical areas: “development in place: ethnic culture in the transnational local,” “transnational water politics and indigenous people,” transnational professionalization of indigenous actors and knowledge,” and “gender, transnationalism, and cultures of development.” All these areas were fields of intense grassroots political activism—particularly the struggles over issues of territoriality, water, and other material resources. But the rights of indigenous youth to education and the inclusion of indigenous women in civic and public life also emerged as critical fields of grassroots organizing and NGO funding under the new multicultural order. For purposes of illustration, I will focus on the theme of locality and territory.

Andolina examines the “spatial imaginaries and practices” involved in the production of alternative spaces where vernacular governance, civil society, multicultural practices, and livelihood all flourished. The new plural geography of space came from two converging sources—long-standing rural Andean movements (and their reassertion of collective land rights and self-governance), and short-term official policies of decentralization (which shifted resources and jurisdictional rights to parishes, municipalities, and provinces). This conjuncture marked the turn of neoliberalism toward democracy and decentralization. By the

early 1990s development agencies were flooding into Bolivia and Ecuador to help indigenous organizations establish best practices of governance and civil society. A host of foreign funders saw opportunities to promote democratic institutions and strengthen certain indigenous initiatives. They funded local showcases of democracy, civil society, and development—vital proof of the apparent mutuality of neoliberalism and democracy. Meanwhile the profusion of small municipalities under newly elected indigenous mayors made it possible for many rural towns to ally under indigenous movement agendas.

Examples from both countries abound in this empirically rich chapter, but Bolivia's vigorous confederation of ayllus in regions of Oruro and Northern Potosí (and the advantage they took of Bolivia's 1996 law in support of the Original Community Lands [Tierra Comunitaria de Origen, TCOs]) is the most stunning case in point. The Bolivia case also points to deep indigenous roots of communality and democracy stretching back into colonial times and reinvigorated by the resurgent movement of Aymara and Quechua activism that began in the 1970s and 1980s. On the other hand, general political conditions were propitious for the production of indigenous localities and autonomies in the neoliberal era. The survey data is impressive. By the late 1990s, there were hundreds of titled and financially supported TCOs in the Bolivian highlands, quite a few with technical links to Danish funding (through DANIDA), which viewed the restitution of the ayllu as a means of aiding local civil society within an indigenous jurisdiction. Not nearly as dramatic, Ecuador's "pueblo movement" was still an important part of the larger Indian movement there because it bolstered the local institutional apparatus of Quichua self-governance and civil society with the aid of CONAIE and key state institutions. As both Cervone and Colloredo-Mansfield discuss in their books, here too we see how this network of "indigenous counterspaces" (its vernacular statecraft and cultural revitalization) became the fretwork of Ecuador's larger Indian movement (Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe, 100). Transnational in scope and yet attuned to national and regional disparities, this chapter on "ethno-development in place" is a magnificent overview of the complexity of shifting spatial politics in highland Bolivia and Ecuador. Together with three other chapters on the politics of water, the education and training of indigenous leaders, and indigenous women's issues, these linked ethnographies present a dazzling array of NGO ethnodevelopment projects that functioned as intercultural fields of negotiation and struggle over the practical meanings and resources at stake.

In the aggregate, however, it is far more difficult to assess the kinds of political risks and gains that accrued to indigenous communities in highland Ecuador and Bolivia across the neoliberal decade of the 1990s. In both Bolivia and Ecuador, the flowering of ethnodevelopment projects cultivated possibilities for indigenous self-determination, but the heavy flow of transnational aid and expertise into indigenous localities and vernacular administrations made them beholden to outside donors and forced them to operate as clients under radically asymmetrical power relations. This book takes seriously the role of native Andean agency, yet it usually appears in the managerial shadow of the multilateral funder or NGO armed with disciplinary technologies and bureaucratic norms. Power usually resided in the mutual understanding that the foreign funder held the trump card

whenever it came time to decide about development goals, methodologies, financing, and personnel.

Both the pro-development policy maker and anti-modernity social critic will be disappointed if they are looking for a clear appraisal of twenty years' worth of foreign-funded ethnodevelopment projects in highland Ecuador and Bolivia, because these nuanced case studies constantly try to navigate between those two ideological poles. The book's theoretical orientation is eclectic, even diffuse. Perhaps this simply is a function of three different authors seeding the text with their favorite theoretical metaphors and references. If there is an overall appraisal of ethnodevelopment reformism, it is situated in a normative gray zone—lying somewhere between critical social theories of globalization, the political ethnography of Andean agency, and the politics of possibility. Like other studies of indigenous activism in the globalizing order, this book closes on the resolutely irresolute point at which globalization simultaneously situated, enabled, and besieged the very indigenous people it targeted for Western aid and expertise (51).

All of the issues discussed above—from indigenous political organizing and contentious forms of communal politics to the rise of indigenous development initiatives in the context of neoliberal state and global transactions—are explored in Gustafson's riveting study *New Languages of the State*. Whereas the three other books are concerned with highland Bolivia and Ecuador, this book plunges into "Guarani country" in the eastern lowlands of the Bolivian Chaco. There, in the late 1980s and 1990s, a nascent movement for bilingual schooling turned into a major site of colliding subcultures of NGOs, the Bolivian state bureaucracy, the teachers' union, regional landlords, a regional bloc of Guarani communities, and a small group of Guarani scribes and activists working on behalf of the school movement. Gustafson approaches the prosaic public school as a vital battleground in the ongoing intercultural war over the social purpose that public education should serve in this deeply divided, pluriethnic nation, where indigenous people (Quechua, Aymara, Guarani, etc.) constitute the majority. Historically, Indian education had long been an ideological flashpoint among Bolivia's ruling elites, but Gustafson shows how the cause was taken up in the 1980s by the Guarani themselves, as they turned the issue of bilingual education into an instrument in their larger battle over the right to cultural patrimony, knowledge, language, identity, and territory within a reconstructed multicultural state. To be sure, the traditional regional epicenter of combative ethnic politics continued to be the Aymara *altiplano*, where Bolivia's integrationist, *pro-mestizaje* policies (holdovers from the MNR era) were under siege by militant trade unionists and young Aymara activists by the late 1970s and where, in addition, a massive land-claims movement would see the proliferation of (restored) indigenous ayllus and communities by the late 1980s and early 1990s.¹¹ But precisely because this book decamps from the familiar Aymara-centric context and pivots toward the understudied Gua-

11. The Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario (MNR) governed the country between 1952 and 1964. It launched a series of social reforms (including land reform, universal suffrage, public education reforms, and the nationalization of the largest tin mines) and promoted the idea of Indian assimilation into Bolivia's mestizo national culture.

rani, it opens a window into the complex interplay between indigenous movement politics, neoliberal education reform, and roving donors from Denmark and Germany, who were eager collaborators in the vogue field of bilingual education during the 1990s.

Like the other studies reviewed here, this book describes its methodological reach as multiscalar and multisited, and indeed Gustafson's research itinerary charts pathways across the Chaco into remote villages and rural schools. He camped out in sterile offices in Bolivia's Ministry of Education and teachers' unions, where he studied the subjects and ideas surrounding the state's heralded education reforms in the 1990s; and he ventured into the hushed, carpeted offices of NGOs and overseas meeting sites, where bilingual education and other cultural rights policies were being hammered out for many parts of Amerindian Latin America. With fifteen years of NGO-related ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork under his belt, Gustafson has been able to mine an extraordinary range and depth of cultural knowledge and research to compose this rich ethnography. As does Cervone's book, this study bridges past and present by tracing the roots of the Guarani school movement across the 1980s and 1990s and into the years of nationwide popular insurgency in the early 2000s. This study also moves across fields of action, bridging the local and regional history of Guarani resurgence (anchored in the village of Itavera) and the globalizing apparatus of education reform (and attendant anxieties about managerial control). The book's textual design (and the author's craftsmanship) offer up a palette of colorful characters from all walks of life, vivid imagery of the local landscape and people, as well as vignettes, interviews, dialogues, and humor—all of which demonstrates how “engaged anthropology” not only raises moral and methodological issues but can actually enliven ethnographic analysis!

New Languages of the State explores how Bolivia's official reform in “intercultural bilingual education” (EIB) became an arena of hegemonic struggles over the relationship of public schooling to indigenous forms of knowledge and authority in the context of the Guarani struggle for cultural rights and autonomies. It does so by shifting the locus of enunciation between Guarani cultural affirmations and political activism, and the managerial elites (both national and foreign) that inscribed their own normative agendas onto Bolivia's EIB reforms. This study implicitly dialogues with the arguments in *Indigenous Development in the Andes* by placing the EIB within the matrix of multicultural state building, international agencies, and local native resurgence, and by tracing the evolution of that complex interplay.

Of course, this story is not specific to the Guarani region, and neither was the EIB a specifically Bolivian program. Bilingual schooling had multiple sources; it played out differently across regions and nations and provoked different responses among indigenous communities. A case in point is María Elena García's recent ethnography on schooling in peasant communities in highland Peru, where Quechua-speaking parents challenged Peru's EIB bilingual curricula.¹² Wherever

12. María Elena García, *Making Indigenous Citizens: Identities, Education, and Multicultural Development in Peru* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005).

it went, official bilingual school reform often turned into intensely contested ground. What seems to be singular about the Guarani case is the symbolic power that bilingual schooling exerted on indigenous political organizing and consciousness. Basic comparative questions remain: How singular *was* the Guarani school movement? Why did bilingual school activism flourish in Guarani country but languish in many highland regions? What place did the Guarani territory occupy in the larger political geography of EIB reform? Here, again, historical, regional, and cultural context building is indispensable to a broader understanding of the varied and changing ways in which indigenous communities initiated or engaged bilingual school reform. At base we are dealing with the constitutive processes by which the local meanings of language, knowledge, and schooling were negotiated in specific fields of force. To the extent that bilingual intercultural education bubbled up from the base and became an integral part of the struggle for indigenous political and cultural rights, as well as a symbolic and communicative instrument to advance that agenda, we might plausibly expect that local rural communities and political organizations would rally as active coparticipants and stakeholders in the state's EIB project—at least during an initial period.

This last point brings us back to the Guarani case, where a sputtering campaign for access to schooling (and other citizenship rights) was turned into a broader cultural and language revivalist movement, even before political conditions turned propitious during the 1990s. Gustafson's line of thinking is that, rather than serving as a disciplinary arm of the state, public schooling functioned as the fulcrum for indigenous organizing for Guarani activists and intellectuals. And by the early to mid-1990s, the grassroots campaign for literacy and schooling in the Chaco became a crucial nexus of articulation between Guarani communities and the Bolivian state. This proposition is demonstrated in novel and fascinating ways. We follow the tracks of Guarani scribes and teachers who went to La Paz and Camiri to work on redefining the content of the new "intercultural bilingual" curriculum and its textbooks. A site visit to a Guarani school allows us to see the civil and symbolic space it occupies in the daily life of Itavera and in the symbolic life of the Bolivian nation-state, as well as its deeper anticolonial and vindictory significance for many Guarani elders who bear the scars of a history of violence and dispossession. Beyond the bilingual classroom, Gustafson tracks Guarani political activists who turned the fiery issues surrounding the Guarani language, culture, and knowledge into political and symbolic weapons.

As Gustafson shows, then, this grassroots appropriation of the EIB school movement was transformative in its larger sociopolitical effects, because it forged the Guarani language, culture, and knowledge into tools of political mobilization and collective action. But this powerful narrative also reveals how the transformation of the prosaic bilingual school into a risky cultural rights movement fundamentally threatened local power relations in the Chaco and brought down the wrath of the entrenched teachers' union. Those battles might have been won had Guarani activists not eventually slammed up against the rigidities (and eventual retreat) of neoliberal reformers and their NGO allies, who began to perceive themselves as under threat by these new developments in the Chaco. Gustafson traces the contradictions and polarities that began to pit Guarani movement poli-

tics against the constraints of bureaucratic rationalism (and other forms of neoliberal governmentality) until, by the end of the 1990s and early 2000s, the EIB had forsaken its earlier commitment to *interculturalidad* and repositioned itself as the nation's ultimate arbiter of legitimate forms of knowledge and schooling. Meanwhile, political instability and the retreat of the multicultural dream in La Paz reverberated across the Chaco as reactionary local landlords and other elites mounted their own assaults on Guarani political movements for bilingual schools and other sources of cultural empowerment. Rather than being sites of intercultural advancement, provincial elites viewed Guarani projects of bilingual school and cultural affirmation as a threat to their position of racial and class dominance.

In the book's final section we are confronted with a powerful narrative analysis that poses the fundamental conflicts over cultural values and power relations that undergirded the multicultural era of reform. What was ultimately at stake was the very meaning of education and knowledge and the social uses to which they were to be put. The dramatic collapse of the EIB's "facade of intercultural enlightenment" (with the EIB barely surviving on lifelines from European funders), and rapid escalation of Guarani demands for land reform and self-determination in the late 1990s and early 2000s furnish the local narrative context within which the larger crisis of Bolivian neoliberalism played out. Popular insurgency, particularly among the Aymaras of El Alto, added fuel to the fires burning in the Chaco, but only recently have scholars begun to shift the focus to Bolivia's sparsely populated, remote periphery.¹³ Gustafson's ethnography of the Guarani's cultural movement is an eye-opener in that sense, too. In implicit conversation with the other three books reviewed here, Gustafson's study lays bare the conflictive and polarizing cultural politics that vexed, and by the turn of the millennium destroyed, neoliberalism's pro-Indian reform projects. Cultural and political education displaced to the streets and plazas, organizational and union meeting halls, and other venues beyond the reach of the state dramatically marked the distance that Guarani communities had traveled since the early 1990s, when neoliberal EIB reformers had first invited Guarani scribes to rewrite some textbooks under the supervision of Bolivian education officials.

In a seminal 2002 article entitled "Does Multiculturalism Menace?" Charles Hale recognized the 1990s as a "decade of extraordinary mobilization of indigenous peoples, and of considerable achievements, both in the realm of struggles over representations and in the substantive expansion of their rights." But Hale also worried that the new political openings and pro-indigenous reforms (such as those described in the political ethnographies under review here) were creating "a parallel mix of opportunity and peril."¹⁴ Perhaps the deepest structural ambi-

13. See for example Nancy Grey Postero, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007); and Nicole Fabricant, *Mobilizing Bolivia's Displaced: Indigenous Politics and the Struggle over Land* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

14. Charles Hale, "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34 (2002): 485, 491.

guity lay in neoliberalism's contradictory logics, simply because the states' shift to the politics of cultural recognition and social reform occurred within the larger context of economic austerity and globalization. For many indigenous people the result was, in Hale's words, a "paradox of simultaneous cultural affirmation and economic marginalization."¹⁵ This paradox was both part of the built-in machinery of the neoliberal era and a reflection of the trajectory of social conflict and impoverishment that deepened during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Time and again, in the fine ethnographic studies reviewed here, we encounter evidence that neoliberalism's promises were coming apart at the seams by the end of the 1990s, and we see how the state's social reforms did not (or could not) fully confront entrenched structural problems of rural poverty, racism, and marginality. And, as has often been noted, neoliberalism's cultural reforms—if disconnected from fundamental redistributive policies—could not take pluriethnic societies very far down the road toward equality and prosperity. Yet, following Hale, these authors also have been careful to distinguish grassroots initiatives and hard-won victories achieved by indigenous groups during the multicultural era from longer-term structural problems and political setbacks.

This brings us to another source of Hale's anxiety about the "multicultural menace": namely, the state's deployment of managerial devices of co-optation and coercion (a new version of the colonial divide-and-rule tactic) that aimed at controlling or crushing indigenous movements, depending on whether they were deemed useful or dangerous to the state and its NGO allies. At the peak of the multicultural reform era, Hale used his own ethnographic work on Guatemala's Mayan movement to issue a call for critical examinations of how pro-indigenous reforms were being achieved and with what social consequences for the indigenous movements involved. More than a decade has passed since that call to arms, and a new crop of political ethnographies—like the ones reviewed here—are now in a strong position to address those questions. As events have unfolded over the last decade, it has become all too evident that the managerial menace of multiculturalism has indeed made serious inroads into indigenous organizations. But from a presentist perspective, it also seems clear that there is no reversing the power of precedence or trajectory of indigenous political movements that scrambled onto the national political stage in Ecuador and Bolivia during the 1990s. Despite the past treacheries of neoliberalism's multiculturalism, indigeneity has emerged as a critical tool for claiming citizenship and advancing decolonizing agendas in both regions since the turn of the millennium.

15. *Ibid.*, 493.