

# MULTICULTURALISM, IDENTITY, AND THE ARTICULATION OF CITIZENSHIP

## The “Indian Question” Now

*William D. Smith*

*Western Oregon University*

*MAKING INDIGENOUS CITIZENS: IDENTITIES, EDUCATION, AND MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PERU.* By María Elena García. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005. Pp. 232. \$52.95 cloth, \$20.95 paper.)

*MAYAS IN THE MARKETPLACE: TOURISM, GLOBALIZATION, AND CULTURAL IDENTITY.* By Walter E. Little. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004. Pp. 332. \$55.00 cloth, \$22.95 paper.)

*THE STRUGGLE FOR INDIGENOUS RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA.* Edited by Nancy Grey Postero and Leon Zamosc. (Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 2004. Pp. 272. \$67.50 cloth, \$27.50 paper.)

*CONTESTING CITIZENSHIP IN LATIN AMERICA: THE RISE OF INDIGENOUS MOVEMENTS AND THE POSTLIBERAL CHALLENGE.* By Deborah J. Yashar. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. 388. \$85.00 cloth, \$37.99 paper.)

Latin American history over the last three decades has made it plain that indigenous people are playing key roles in re-visioning the democratic process from local to global horizons. If both phenomenologically and politically the local level remains fundamental for Indian communities struggling against everyday political-economic exigencies, Indian movements in Latin America have both drawn on and animated ethnic rights initiatives that exceed the national context (Brysk 1994, 2000). But amid ongoing interest in the implications of local-global linkages for indigenous prospects, it bears reminding that the meso-level of ethnic politics—between national governments and Indian organizing at various scales—remains definitive in how indigenous communities negotiate their futures. An especially important issue in this regard is the negotiation of citizenship in multicultural, neoliberal states (Smith and Moors 1990; Urban and Sherzer 1991; Van Cott 1994; Warren 1998; Warren and Jackson 2002a).

*Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 42, No. 1, February 2007

© 2007 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819

One significant scholarly current on indigenous ascendancy within national contexts has centered on a wave of constitutional reforms beginning in the 1990s that has promised to rewrite the compact between Indians and states in the post-corporatist era (Hernández 1997; Sieder 2002; Van Cott 2000). More than ten years into this new moment, however, substantive political and ethnodevelopmental gains for indigenous communities continue to be elusive. And indeed, as Charles Hale has argued, new modes of neoliberal governance have shown a remarkable capacity to disperse the forces of indigenous mobilizations (Hale 2004, 17).

All but one of the works reviewed below frame analysis of indigenous politics within national political histories. I begin with a discussion of the first three volumes on the list—Postero and Zamosc, García, and Yashar—and conclude with Little's study of how one dimension of global markets, ethnotourism, shapes Mayan strategies of livelihood and cultural expression in Guatemala. This last is an account that resonates with observations, such as Hale's, about culture and neoliberalism.

#### THE "INDIAN QUESTION" IN SEVEN COUNTRIES

*The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* explores indigenous movements in Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Brazil. In their introduction to the volume, Nancy Postero and Leon Zamosc explain the importance of working at the nation-state level, both for Indian organizations and scholars. Although the local remains a basic horizon for organizing, and indigenous initiatives in Latin America participate in global streams of ethnic politics, "ultimately, it is at the level of the nation-state where movements wage their principal [political] struggle" (3; also see Warren and Jackson 2002b). In fact, the state has long been a decisive factor in the construction of Indian identities themselves.

Indigenous struggles are irreducibly diverse in character, dependent on specific histories of ethnic and class relations, the national political context in which organizations press their claims, and sheer demography. Thus a host of contextual factors shape different modes of organizing; still, the comparative ambitions of the book demand that one look for patterns in the diversity. Postero and Zamosc propose four problems analyzable across national ambits. First, the "Indian Question"—a "framework of contestation, where the future of indigenous citizenship is at stake" (4)—the examination of which allows one to look at rights struggles in the framework of state reform and democratization processes. Second, historical conjuncture: when and how does the Indian Question arise on the national scene, how does it achieve political salience, and what is the role of social movements? Third, the stakes. For what are indigenous organizations struggling in a given national context at a given historical point? Finally, the connection between neoliberalism and the politicization of indigeneity. This is a theme

that most of the books reviewed here address either directly or implicitly. Neoliberal governments have reduced public budgets and ramped up extractive regimes supplying global markets, often to the detriment of indigenous communities. At the same time, the withdrawal of the corporatist state has opened wider spaces for indigenous organizing and enabled new attention to relations between multiculturalism and democracy.

The country studies in *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* seek to bring the specificities of individual cases into connection with these four interrelated questions.<sup>1</sup> I wish to touch on several key issues that are addressed in one way or another by most of the contributors to the volume and that seem especially to mark the terrain of indigenous negotiations with states. Those issues have to do with one central problematic: how can indigenous communities increase their presence in the national community—of citizens, of policy makers—while preserving some measure of political, economic, and cultural autonomy?

The stickiest issue when it comes to reconciling multiculturalism and national citizenship concerns the tensions between enhancing political inclusion in the nation on the one hand and preserving difference on the other. One of the most important questions in many contexts concerns territory—whether or not autonomous regions should emerge from state reform processes. Neoliberal political and economic priorities, of course, militate against conceding rights to territory and natural resources. Further, few are the cases in which state and national legislatures have granted anything beyond the most local level of Indian self-determination. One should therefore approach the prospects for territorial autonomy circumspectly. I would argue that at the same time, given the ways in which territorial rights would in many cases link political to economic (or development) autonomy, we should expect territory to continue figuring centrally in discussions about land, socio-ecology, and multicultural citizenship.

Another sphere that exercises the integration-autonomy tension is national political culture, in particular partisan politics. Zamosc's chapter on Ecuador sketches one signal example of this problem, the history of the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE), indisputably one of the most significant indigenous movements in Latin America's recent history. Zamosc points out that CONAIE's influence in national politics, mainly through the Pachakutik Party, owes itself to the

1. The volume's contributions are as follows: "From *Indigenismo* to *Zapatismo*: The Struggle for a Multi-ethnic Mexican Society," by Gunther Dietz; "Beyond Victimization: Maya Movements in Post-war Guatemala," by Edward Fischer; "Indigenous Struggles in Colombia: Historical Changes and Perspectives," by Theodor Rathgeber; "The Indian Movement in Ecuador: from Politics of Influence to Politics of Power," by Leon Zamosc; "*Un País sin Indígenas?*: Re-thinking Indigenous Politics in Peru," by María Elena García and José Antonio Lucero; "Articulations and Fragmentations: Indigenous Politics in Bolivia," by Nancy Postero; and "Socialist *Saudades*: Lula's Victory, Indigenous Movements, and the Latin American Left," by Jonathan Warren.

ability to link Indian organizations in both the Andes and Amazon Basin with other subaltern groups in the country in a shared movement against the exclusionary tendencies of neoliberalism. Presidential power, however, quickly marginalized Pachakutik from significant decision-making on crucial political and economic matters, much to CONAIE's detriment. To avoid the trap of party-led political culture, Indian organizations across Latin America are demanding alternatives to party systems as an essential component of state reform and Indian autonomy.

The complexities of neoliberalism give *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* one more context in which to examine indigenous processes today. The volume comparatively explores the ways in which neoliberalism both limits and expands the scope of indigenous possibilities. Intensifying global trade, indebtedness, and structural adjustment have dramatically increased the pressure on indigenous resource bases since the neoliberal turn of the 1980s. Simultaneously, political liberalization provides more latitude for actors in civil society to contest the state. Indigenous peoples mobilizing as such have, of course, been some of the most visible actors in this freer political atmosphere. And it is ironic perhaps that the rise of autonomy as the central demand of so many indigenous movements has been enabled in part by neoliberalism itself.

Finally, closely related to challenging neoliberalism and already broached in the mention above of CONAIE's sway in Ecuador, is the process of *articulation*. "Articulation" refers to the capacity of indigenous movements to link their citizenship demands with those of other groups disenchanted with neoliberal political economy—campesinos, poor barrio residents, labor and student movements, environmental activists. The category of "citizen" has certainly been ethnicized by indigenous movements, opened up to respond to the pressures of a culturally plural national community. But citizenship is not renewed *merely* by ethnicization. In addition to CONAIE, neo-Zapatismo in Mexico and Evo Morales's "Power of the People" in Bolivia are two particularly celebrated examples of movements that have succeeded in articulating indigenous citizenship demands with those of other groups in civil society disadvantaged by neoliberalism.

*The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* delineates the impact of indigenous organizations on democratization in individual countries and the region as a whole, the role of rights organizing in shaping identities as indigenous citizens, and the role of indigenous actors in forging national communities and states that embrace multiculturalism. The contributors note, too—although, in general, less so—patterns of negation, or at least of complication. Here I mean the factors, peculiar to each case, that impede the progress of Indian organizing. The range of those factors is wide, from internal factionalism to NGO cooptation to government repression. One extremely important, if prosaic, factor that goes almost unmentioned in the book is sheer material hardship. In my own work with Totonac organizations in the Sierra Norte de Puebla, Mexico, I have seen year after year of

livelihood struggle dampen the spirits of erstwhile militants. The pull of jobs in the cities, and increasingly in the United States, draws members away such that a younger generation of leaders is not replacing the older. Arguably, political gains with respect to consciousness-raising, cultural and political rights, and perhaps even of rights to territory and resources must precede the construction of sustainable economies by providing cultural and institutional guarantees. The question is whether people can afford—literally afford—to wait for those conditions to be in place.

#### PERU: QUECHUA COMMUNITIES AGAINST MULTICULTURALISM?

Most broadly, María Elena García's *Making Indigenous Citizens* is motivated by debates on how to represent indigenous political agency. What are the criteria that mark organized mobilization? What makes a movement? The book builds on her co-authored contribution in the *Postero* and *Zamosc* volume. One of García's key objectives in both works is to explain a paradox. Since the pacification of Sendero Luminoso in the early 1990s, and with gestures during the Fujimori and Toledo administrations toward acknowledging the cultural plurality of the nation, indigenous rights organizing has indeed proceeded in Peru, despite arguments by many analysts to the contrary.<sup>2</sup> Yet in the Cuzqueño communities García studied, Quechuas have largely resisted it (see also Warren 2002). In the latter half of the 1990s, indigenous rights mobilization centered on language rights and the right to improved education within a broader framework of agitation for cultural rights. In the post-Sendero political climate, this was a more viable avenue of mobilization than, say, agitating for human rights recognition, and indigenous communities capitalized on the new window for multiculturalism cautiously supported by 1990s governments consolidating neoliberalism. "Culture," then, became both the focus and instrument of resistance (59). But according to García, such concerns as language preservation, championed by cultural rights NGOs and instituted through bilingual education, have been rejected by some communities in the Cuzco region. Quechua communities there know that indigenous ascriptions mire them in racist social relations and structural poverty. If one must surmount marginality, then multicultural bilingual

2. Those arguing that Peru has not registered as meaningful Indian organizing at regional and national levels typically cite three reasons for inaction: Velasco's agrarian reform, which inculcated peasant identities and not indigenous ones; the disruptions of civil war through most of the 1980s and early 1990s; and a kind of ethnic mobility, linked to class mobility, as Indians from the countryside urbanize as "mestizos" in the cities (de la Cadena 2000). García asserts that by no means all Quechuas and Aymaras migrate to the cities, and political-structural approaches cannot account for the complex cultural dynamics that shape the attitudes and behavior of people on the ground. It becomes necessary, then, to investigate just how indigenous communities in Peru are responding to the present climate of Indian organizing in Latin America.

education as rights activists formulate it— privileging Quechua over Spanish—does not appear to them the appropriate vehicle.

In resisting this type of rights activism, García suggests that communities “have created new local spaces for collective action that have resulted in one of the very goals of intercultural activism, greater local participation in development and politics, albeit through means that intercultural activists never expected” (García and Lucero 2004, 175). Parents and local leaders have stepped into the infrastructure provided by NGOs and state agencies to advance their own agendas. García is of course right to point out that indigenous identities are complex constructions that take shape in unequal power relations (2004, 177), and here is yet another case in which ethnic and class positions come together in consciousness and strategy. It remains unclear, however, precisely how one should consider parental agency in the Peruvian highlands in relation to broader currents of indigenous organizing in Latin America. The problem of definition arises again: how do we *usefully* link local cases of indigenous agency to those currents; how should we define the parameters of “indigenous;” in short, how do we (should we?) mark this category off as a distinct field for pressing claims, so that we have analytic coherence?

Uncertainty here is inevitable; it accompanies the urgent set of questions that attend the character and content of citizenship in multicultural states today. One of the most significant tasks now and in years to come will be to track the shifting contours of citizenship as states respond to demands for politically substantive multiculturalism. García’s portrayal of Quechua parents in *Making Indigenous Citizens* seeks to insert them into the mix of indigenous activism. But if indigenous struggles to transform citizenship should show a clear, politically energetic autodefinition of Indian identity, then García’s efforts may not convince us. There is little evidence that the families we meet in the book are pressing for changes in how the state deals with the ethnic diversity of its citizens.

There is another theme toward the end of *Making Indigenous Citizens*, however, that bears crucially on how we should look today at indigenous identity, subjectivity, and movements. In an account of PROEIB (the Programa de Formación en Educación Intercultural Bilingüe) Andes, a facility for higher learning supported by the Bolivian and German governments, García treats a new initiative among Indians in Andean countries to intellectualize Quechua and Quechuas by sanctioning the language and forming Indian intellectuals in institutions of post-secondary education. This is one way to liberate indigenous people from the tradition-modernity binary, and it indicates a budding movement in Latin America in general to enhance the presence of indigenous people and culture in higher education. In addition, in training its own teachers, PROEIB Andes would shape a “from-below” alternative intercultural education project, flexible and

sensitive to regional conditions. What makes García's account significant in a much broader theoretical context is that she situates PROEIB Andes in a process of articulation. Here García draws on a notion of articulation formulated by James Clifford. Identity politics, writes Clifford, is less a matter of "rigid confrontations. . . . [Instead] one sees continuing struggles across a terrain, portions of which are captured by changing alliances, hooking and unhooking particular elements . . . crucial political and cultural positions are not firmly anchored on one side or the other, but are contested and up for grabs" (164; Clifford 2001, 477; also see García Canclini 1993, 1995; Hale 2004; Hall 1996; Li 2000). García argues that conceptions of citizenship and social movements are put together through processes of hooking and unhooking between communities, states, and NGOs. And indeed, any future analysis of "indigenous identity" will have to attend to how that concept takes shape on the ground in unpredictable fields of articulation.

#### AN INSTITUTIONAL VIEW OF INDIAN CITIZENSHIP AND ACTIVISM

Deborah Yashar's *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America* attempts to explain patterns of indigenous identity building and movements, or the lack thereof, across several Latin American countries since the 1970s. The book, a much expanded reprise of an argument made in a 1998 article (Yashar 1998), takes the meso-level approach, leading the reader through a comparative survey of histories of indigenous organizing in Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru. Yashar chose these cases in part because each possesses both Andean and Amazonian regions. That is, her comparative project includes exploring state-Indian relations in highland versus lowland regions to determine whether configurations of geography, demography, government policies, and indigenous rights mobilization recur across countries.

Yashar's primary aim is to explain the timing and the relative viability of organized indigenous identity politics. Her theoretical model works with a mere three variables. First, motivation: why did indigenous people in a host of Latin American nations organize in the last quarter of the twentieth century to press claims on governments? Yashar's concept of "citizenship regimes" is critical here. She defines a citizenship regime as "the patterned combination of choices about three fundamental questions. . . . Who has access to citizenship? . . . What is the form of citizenship? In particular, what are the primary modes of interest intermediation? . . . What is the content of citizenship rights?" (47–49). Yashar finds that the transition from corporatist citizenship regimes to neoliberal ones was decisive in all countries analyzed. Neoliberalism, she argues, has threatened the local autonomy Indian communities enjoyed under corporatist citizenship regimes. Readers might pause here over the seeming paradox of seeing

corporatism and autonomy in symbiosis. But under corporatist systems, Yashar asserts, indigenous communities classified as peasants won a degree of autonomy characterized by control of local systems of authority and communal landholding. That autonomy was then jeopardized by the slimming down of the state, among other neoliberal policies. Neoliberal regimes have undermined institutions like corporate control of resources at the same time that they have glossed over entrenched social inequalities (53). Yet the erosion of peasant-centered, state-sponsored rural development models has meant the erosion of peasant identities, opening the way for other bases of mobilization, in particular indigeneity as a focus for altering the concept and substance of citizenship.

Yashar's examination of citizenship regimes participates in a current of work on political reforms in the neoliberal period. Much of this work has underlined the tensions that have developed between changes in the law, neoliberal economics, and indigenous political and economic agency (Friedman 1999; Hale 2002, 2004; Sieder 2002). While some scholars have emphasized the significance of constitutional reforms that recognize the cultural plurality of national citizenries (Sieder 2002), others have alerted us to the perils of multiculturalism. Hale, for example, notes that some categories of rights, e.g. "cultural rights," receive due attention from governments while rights to "self-development," hinging on the control of natural resources, typically do not. Indeed, there is much evidence now that shifting government policy from development programs to constitutional changes does more to limit and manage cultural pluralism within nation-states than to expand real indigenous possibilities (Hale 2002, 2004).

Even so, in various Latin American contexts the peasant-to-Indian shift has stimulated a shift from demands for land to demands for *territory*. This is highly significant insofar as it represents a consolidation in how people are linking geography, landscape, and identity. Yashar suggests that territorial demands are strongest in the Amazon, where indigenous economies require extensive land and where long, punishing histories of extractive regimes and state-sponsored colonization schemes have politicized Amazonian communities to defend their spaces (Hvalkof 2000; Ramos 1995). Although it may be the case that one finds territorial demands strongest in the Amazon, arguably the issue of territory will become a more important pivot around which Latin American nation-states will deal with indigenous groups generally.

For Yashar, the motivation for organizing, visible across the Latin American spectrum with the onset of neoliberal policies, does not explain why movements get off the ground in some places (nationally in Ecuador, regionally in Bolivia) and not in others (Peru). To explain this, Yashar moves to her other two variables, "political associational space" and "transcommunity networks." The first of these concepts refers to the extent to which states permit political action by indigenous



organizations, the second to the ability of local communities and organizations to join in common cause with others. Notably, Yashar suggests that this latter capability usually depends on groundwork laid by outsiders—the Church and NGOs, for example.

Again, according to Yashar, indigenous mobilization occurs in response to changes in citizenship regimes, essentially from corporatist structures of interest mediation to neoliberalism. From here the argument is simple and straightforward: where one finds latitude in political associational space and the capacity to form transcommunity networks, one will find advances in indigenous organizing. Beyond identifying in which countries it has been possible to organize effectively, there is an implication in Yashar's argument that may warrant underscoring: that movements hinge not as much on the subjectivity of leaders and communities as on certain stimulæ and structural enablers. Yashar's case studies are replete with historical detail; she does an excellent job of laying out regional and national trajectories. But institutional approaches such as Yashar's cannot attend to the myriad contingencies that influence indigenous actors *in movement*. They cannot follow indigenous identities and movements as *processual* and *articulated* in fields crowded with different political forces. Thus they may not satisfy scholars who have experienced first- or second-hand the messy details—the personalities, the structures of patronage, the cleavages—of movements in the flesh (see Warren 1998). For instance, in Yashar's analysis, NGOs come off as *factors* whose histories of connection with indigenous organizations have produced the "transcommunity networks" necessary for "upscaling" movements. Also, when it comes to Yashar's negative case, Peru, her argument about the absence of meaningful organizing there only holds according to the transcommunity networks criterion. García has contested Yashar on this point. Yashar's explanatory elegance thus may become a liability, and the issue then begs the question, again, of what qualifies as a movement.

Apart from definitions, Yashar seems to leave much unexamined that, I believe, we have to consider very carefully. We know by now, for example, that not all NGOs have shepherded perfectly democratic grassroots movements. To what extent, then, do NGOs and, for another, the Church, encumber "indigenous autonomy?" One has, of course, to look at these questions case by case. The trouble here is that Yashar treats "autonomy" as a given—as though we know what it means and it means the same everywhere, without, that is, recognizing the complicated historical processes through which its meaning gets hammered out. What may in fact be most interesting about autonomy is how it gets defined, if not instantiated as a political form, in specific historical conjunctures.

## IDENTITY, SUBJECTIVITY, AND THE MARKET IN ANTIGUA

If the studies reviewed thus far have pointed up the national ambit, this is the horizon that seems the least important for the Kaqchikel and K'iche vendors that Walter Little describes in *Mayas in the Marketplace*. Little's book on *típica* vendors (makers and sellers of handicrafts) is illustrative of one way in which the market shapes Indian livelihoods. The Maya vendors in his analysis sit on the *Ruta Maya*, a tourist circuit promoted in widely read guidebooks. This has definitive consequences for Maya cultural identity and agency. Little's study is not so much about how local communities bear the brunt of global forces as it is about individuals and communities negotiating with, indeed capitalizing on, those forces—in this case international tourism and the commodification of “the Indian.” Immediately here, of course, is where those who take a dim view to marketing indigeneity might respond to Little's account with some dismay. The vendors that Little studied make no bones about modifying “tradition” to suit tourist tastes and widen their market niche, even conducting their own research to find out what potential buyers are looking for in “traditional” Maya style and execution. In this regard Little's work joins García's in suggesting that some Indian actors have agendas that “we” might not expect or wish to accept, if only because they subject communities to the vagaries of markets. From the angle of Maya entrepreneurship, Little joins other analysts of neoliberalism in pointing out the fact that multiculturalism is not incompatible with some of the dearest neoliberal tenets (Friedman 1999; Hale 1997, 2002; Warren and Jackson 2002a).

*Mayas in the Marketplace* hits its stride as an ethnographic study in its concluding four chapters, which deal with the gendering of *típica* marketplaces, the reconstitution of household relations as an effect of *típica* commerce, the integration of vendors in their home communities, and the marketing of household and community themselves as objects of tourist desire. These are all issues that bear on the question of identity—transformations in identity as well as continuities. Within households that depend on *típica* vending, men's and women's economic roles have altered, ultimately because tourists view women as more indigenous than men and thus favor women vendors. A woman's position in the household economy increases in importance the more households commit to vending.

As to the question of identity, Little's account of especially Kaqchikel identity correctly resists the global-local binary that typically sees global cultural and economic forces steamrolling local communities. The Mayas in Little's analysis have a strong sense of who they are as members of local communities *and* as actors in an international economy. In this latter sense, they know they must self-present as *puro indígena* if tourists are to warm to their wares. Little is in fact quite explicit about the strategic deployment of identity in the commercial context that centers vendors' economic lives. In contrast to the indigenous actors portrayed in the

other books reviewed here, *típica* vendors are working with a different sort of multiculturalism, one taking shape between disparate actors in an international economic arena, not in negotiations with the state. This arena bears directly on the reproduction of “community” in Kaqchikel villages, as resources from global tourism enter the social fabric of the latter. For the Mayan families under study here, the “hard kernel” of identity, the really deep sense of belonging, is local, embracing town of origin and institutions such as confraternities and cargo systems that reproduce community identity and relations therein (Watanabe 1992). The implication of Little’s analysis is that this hard kernel is impervious to the market. In fact, Little makes the critical observation that entrepreneurialism does not weaken the ties that bind vendors to home places.

But one potential consequence of the market as a source of wealth for some and not others is the development of both intra- and inter-community class differences. Curiously, Little is largely silent on how non-vending members of the community view their vendor neighbors. It may indeed be the case, as Little argues, that the most relevant social divide in Guatemala remains that between Ladinos and Indígenas. And perhaps Mayas who bring their money home from Antigua are “reinscribing significance in the local” (10). But since Little provides scant discussion of how non-vendors and less successful vendors view the upward mobility of their neighbors, the reader may not receive a full account of what “significance” might mean. Nor do we get a strong sense of how Maya ethnopolitical activists feel about selling *lo indígena* to tourists.

Still, the complex location of vendors in and between different social registers allows *Mayas in the Marketplace* to make a significant theoretical distinction between *identity* and *subjectivity*. Little’s subjects are residents of the town of Santa Catarina Palopó, are vendors of *típica* in an Antigua market, are *indios* (not to say *inditos*) in the agon of Guatemalan race relations, and are “real Indians” in the eyes of tourists shopping for an authentic piece of the Fourth World. Little thus emphasizes that “identity constructions are structured around the overlapping constellations of social relations embedded in local, regional, national, and global spaces” (16). This point, on which all authors in these works appear to agree, hardly needs highlighting, perhaps, but in the case of indigenous identity and social movements, we are reminded that we need to dissolve dualisms between “tradition” and “modernity.”

Finally, I wish to note another contribution of Little’s book, one that bears on a broader issue linking people and place in Latin American indigenous contexts. The city of Antigua has only since the 1940s been the colonial city “stuck in time” that guidebooks gush about. Maya vendors are fixtures in this cityscape, and they “accept the roles they play in reconstructed colonial Antigua” (74)—because, of course, their livelihoods depend on it. This point regarding the reconstruction of places and the

retooling of roles is intensified in a chapter treating the town of Santa Catarina Palopó. As a “traditional” Maya village on the shore of Lake Atitlán, volcanoes rising in the background, Santa Catarina boasts the whole picturesque package—a living postcard. And vendors in Santa Catarina have encouraged tourists to step into that postcard, consuming the village as the quintessential Maya world. At these junctures of the argument, Little refers to the commodification of place as well as people. The important point is that indigenous spaces and places get reconfigured not as home places for cultural and ethnopolitical revitalization, but as a kind of market niche. It must be stressed, however, that this does not constitute the Epcot Center-ing of Lake Atitlán so much as the “hybridization” of a real place. Santa Catarina does not cease being a Maya town for welcoming white folks from the West, but it may not be a Maya town in the front ranks of Maya politics vis-à-vis the nation.

In the broader Maya context in Guatemala, however, it isn’t at all certain that Little’s subjects provide an encouraging answer to questions regarding ethnic survival and indigenous claims on the nation and state. No one should expect them to provide that answer, of course, and Little’s account is not about ethnopolitical initiatives. In my own view, however, one of the important contributions of indigenous movements the world over—what has linked them to larger movements for democracy and social justice, what has linked ethnic concerns to class ones—has been the critique of neoliberalism and the rigors of the market. This is an issue that Little addresses too lightly. If it is true that one cannot ask *típica* vendors to be committed ethnopolitical soldiers, one might still expect consideration of how *típica* vending is viewed in broader discussions of Maya identity in Guatemala, and indigenous identity in Latin America more generally.

#### CONCLUSIONS

We cannot forget that indigenous communities often do not define the terms of struggle, whether for rights or livelihood. One important issue remains the relationship between territory and the ecology of identity. Some of the most worrying threats to indigenous communities, such as oil development, biopiracy, and pollution of local crop landraces by GMOs, are part and parcel of the issue of territorial integrity. Land and its myriad concomitants will continue to matter when it comes to Indian-controlled livelihood strategies in the future, surely an important aspect of multicultural citizenship. Thus, while it is important to interrogate utopian notions of autonomy, which too often (still) imagine Indian communities building sustainable economies and socioecologies in delinked territories, one still has to come to terms with the issue of self-determination in meaningful material ways.

Yet in concluding this review I would reiterate a point that runs through all these works—that the political field in which indigenous individuals and communities are forging identities is enormously complex. If it is indeed true in most cases that identity remains rooted in community, landscape, uses and customs, and so on, we know that identity gets shaped and reshaped through the interaction of local processes and those at national and global levels—constitutional amendments, state and international development policies, the Latin American and global indigenous rights movement. Those of us who study indigenous movements and identities closely are accustomed now to see both as contingent, put together by fortuitous as well as strategic processes, by articulations, conjunctures (García Canclini 1995; Gupta 1998; Kearney 1996). Identity is emergent from the process of mobilization itself as movements draw on resources made accessible from a variety of wider spheres (Clifford 2001; Hale 1997; Hall 1996; Li 2000; Ramos 1995; Rubin 1997; Warren 1998). The task of the study of identity-in-movement today, therefore, is to trace out the connections that structure it.

## REFERENCES

- Brysk, Alison  
 1994 "Acting Globally: Indian Rights and International Politics in Latin America." In *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by D. L. Van Cott, 29–54. New York: St. Martin's Press.  
 2000 *From Tribal Village to Global Village*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Clifford, James  
 2001 "Indigenous Articulations." *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 468–490.
- de la Cadena, Marisol  
 2000 *Indigenous Mestizos*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Friedman, Jonathan  
 1999 "Indigenous Struggles and the Discrete Charm of the Bourgeoisie." *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 10 (1): 1–14.
- García Canclini, Nestor  
 1993 *Transforming Modernity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 1995 *Hybrid Cultures*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- García, María Elena, and José Antonio Lucero  
 2004 "Un País sin Indígenas?: Re-thinking Indigenous Politics in Peru." In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by N.G. Postero and Leon Zamosc, 158–188. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press.
- Gupta, Akhil  
 1998 *Postcolonial Developments*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hale, Charles R.  
 1997 "Cultural Politics of Identity in Latin America." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 567–590.  
 2002 "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34: 485–524.  
 2004 "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the 'Indio Permitido'." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38 (2): 16–21.

- Hall, Stuart  
1996 "On Post-Modernism and Articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall." In *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 131–150. New York: Routledge.
- Hernández Navarro, Luis  
1997 "Ciudadanos iguales, ciudadanos diferentes: La nueva lucha india." *Este País* 30–40.
- Hvalkof, Soren  
2000 "Outrage in Rubber and Oil: Extractivism, Indigenous Peoples, and Justice in the Upper Amazon." In *People, Plants, and Justice*, edited by Charles Zerner, 83–116. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kearney, Michael  
1996 *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Li, Tania Murray  
2000 "Articulating Indigenous Identity in Indonesia: Resource Politics and the Tribal Slot." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (1): 149–179.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita  
1995 *Indigenism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Rubin, Jeffrey W.  
1997 *Decentering the Regime: Ethnicity, Radicalism, and Democracy in Yuchitan, Mexico*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sieder, Rachel, Ed.  
2002 *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, Carol A., and Marilyn M. Moors, Eds.  
1990 *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Urban, Greg, and Joel Sherzer, Eds.  
1991 *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee, Ed.  
1994 *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- 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*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
2002 "Voting against Indigenous Rights in Guatemala: Lessons from the 1999 Referendum." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, 149–180. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Warren, Kay B., and Jean E. Jackson, Eds.  
2002a *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Warren, Kay B., and Jean E. Jackson  
2002b "Introduction: Studying Indigenous Activism in Latin America." In *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*, edited by Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, 1–46. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Watanabe, John M.  
1992 *Maya Saints and Souls in a Changing World*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Yashar, Deborah  
1998 "Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: Indigenous Movements and Democracy in Latin America." *Comparative Politics* 31 (1): 23–42.