

**Ethnic Politics and the Popular
Movement: Notes on Decolonizing
Politics in Latin America**

Guillermo Delgado-P.
**Latin American & Latino Studies Program
UC Santa Cruz**

**Working Paper No. 4
Chicano/Latino Research Center**

**University of California
Chicano/Latino Research Center
Santa Cruz, California 95064
[This article is part of a forthcoming book:
Latin American Faces the 21st. Century.]**

**Ethnic Politics and the Popular Movement:
Notes on Decolonizing Politics in Latin
America**

Guillermo Delgado-P.

**CRLC
Working Paper No. 4
Chicano/Latino Research Center
University of California at Santa Cruz**

**Guillermo Delgado-P.
Latin American and Latino Studies Program
University of California, Santa Cruz 95064
[This article is part of a forthcoming book: Latin
American Faces the 21st. Century.]**

For a long time, Latin American popular movements have been at the center of political arenas. The political culture of the 90's, however is challenging "centers" and "arenas", decentering and overtly questioning traditional popular movements, whose participants are surprised by ethnic and gender demands. It is my belief that a total process of decolonization is necessary before new political entities can appreciate the force of ethnic, gender and class demands as they become the new generators of Latin American political life. This article will reflect on the politics of recent coalitions and forces which remain outside traditional party real politicking.

The end of this century coincides with a noticeable collapse of traditional paradigms, atomization of ideas and systems, and disbelief in conventional politics, as well as with the emergence of decentralized forces--each demanding social justice or participatory democracy amidst forceful neoliberal programs that have deepened poverty in Latin America. Amongst these are forty million indigenous peoples of the Americas that have organized to demand territorial and human rights, a total process of decolonization, autonomy, and self-determination. As traditional forms of political mediation have lost appeal (e.g. the numbers of voters has dropped in recent national elections), forty million indigenous peoples continue to strive for basic human demands belittled and unanswered by nation-states, unions, or political parties. For example, Guatemala and Bolivia contain the largest indigenous populations of the Americas, each surpassing fifty per cent of its national population.

Indigenous peoples in the Andean world today define this moment of redefinition through the concept of *Pachakuti*--literally meaning the "turning about of the times". In *Quechuan* and *Aymaran* thought it means a change of direction. It is believed we are now experiencing

such a moment of upheaval and turn of direction, which is expressed in the oral traditions of these cultures.

On October 12, 1992, a Bolivian newspaper printed a heading with the following inquiry: "And the *Pachakuti* ...?". This news headline made reference to the widely expected and predicted "turning about of the times," and expressed disappointment at the lack of a visible "radical change" occurring on that date. The article dismissed the *Pachakuti* as mere indigenous delusion. Later, a *Quechua* woman, having read the news heading, told me: "See? They just do not get it. They wanted to see change NOW, in the same way the Sandinista Revolution ousted Somoza, from one hour to the next. Yet even that was a long process. They just cannot get it. Processes—you know—are difficult to understand." The *Pachakuti* as process had obviously not been understood by the writer, who was inscribed in a different culture and world view.

And, so I learned that *Pachakuti* is a process whose climax we are now experiencing, and that as a process it has been occurring since its cyclical inception, centuries ago. Today media capitalists labeled this same process "The New Age of Discovery," i.e. the European invasion of the old New World. *Pachakuti* expresses a block of events and time within approximately a five hundred year period. The archaeologist Richard P. Schaedel sees 1492 as a moment of radical change: "The fundamental dynamic of economic change was demographic catastrophe, decimating Indigenous populations and fundamentally altering the human-to-land ratio (almost turning it on its head)". (Schaedel 1992: 234)

The *Pachakuti*, a period on which to reflect, can be compared to the concept of the "long waves of Kondratiev", as "a major restructuring of the world economy, crises of ideologies, culture and civilization" (Hobsbawm 1992: 38). Cognizant of the events and time comprised in the *Pachakuti*, we might add the environmental collapse witnessed daily, as a process, as one of the best examples of its meaning, extending to the rest of human society.

The environmental collapse, on-stage and off-stage, along with pesticide residues on our table foods, water and air pollution (e.g. in Mexico City you can now buy oxygen to counteract the contamination) has been happening throughout these five hundred years. It is NOT ONE moment of history, it has been in fact a process of continuous destruction, increasing deforestation, soil depletion, tragedy, synergism.

Bringing this synergetic process to the attention of the world has, in fact, signaled sudden collapses: the disappearance of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Bosnian "ethnic cleansing wars". In Latin America new elements contributing to this process are also expressed through recent expressions or impacts of neoliberalism: unemployment, homelessness, xenophobia, homophobia, genocide, drug addiction, racism, uncontrolled imports of pesticides, chemical warfare, urban fragility, pollution and a visible polarization of haves and have nots. Not that these troubles are new. However, they have become more acute, as communities become aware of a distant handful of decision makers, faceless multinational corporations, increasing processes of impoverishment, and socio-economic polarizations. "Radical changes" express the dissonant sounds played against currents of thought, some ahistoric, some post-historic. Postmodern, gender, ethnic voices and world views clash against dominant class paradigms. "Maybe"—as Carlos Fuentes puts it—"we are living a long process of mediation between two ideologies that appear to be aging, that are old. Neither can impose itself with its total dogmas. Both are undergoing a process of transformation. One appears dead, maybe mutating; the other one is alive but also changing" (Cordera 1992: 36, my translation)

The *Pachakuti* can also be seen as the space where different levels of problems, debates, and political stands over organizing are taking place, amidst the recent campaigns of Indigenous, Popular and Black Resistance. This space is known as the *Spanish American/Latino-Chicano/Brazilian* world, a new region indeed. It is the place where we run into harsh realities that have to do with the consequences of

the "discovery" 500 years ago. The distortions are visible images where we encounter the return of debt-peonage, a system the New York Times labeled "modern slavery." It can be found especially in Brazil (from 597 in 1989 to 16,442 in 1992), amidst the remnants of fazenda landowners, unscrupulous capitalists who have been turning the forest into pasture, cattle ranching, depleting the land without long-term concern. It is here that *Pachakuti* expresses Latin America's chaotic and subservient position regarding the powers that be, and the desperation of its disenfranchised people struggling and anguished by its history.

In these spaces of struggle, we find, however, a decentralized clash of political interests. Recent literature on "new social movements" sees political actors deconcentrating power. Within this process of constructing a new political morality, however, and in relation to Indigenous peoples, there are remnants of colonial practices that distort and impede new political developments--such as the attempts to organize "Indigenous, Black and Popular" alliances which ignore crucial historical divergences. However, as history and prophecy put together these "marginal peoples without history," Indian voices emerged, forcing the short-memory nation states and civil societies to remember the colonial past that is not so distant, and which still is, in a certain way, present. Or as the Aymara "*long-term*" memory puts it: "there is no future without looking at the past". Amidst these voices are those of the oldest inhabitants of the continent.

No other sector in the hemisphere has been consistently silenced and disavowed as Indigenous peoples. Throughout Latin America's history, the colonial legacy, and later the nation-state formation, have systematically undermined the historical presence of Indigenous peoples, eliminating them physically, betraying, ignoring, coopting, tricking, and forcing them into the most degrading levels of existence. This process started with a sudden and radical process of depopulation prompted by new diseases to which Indigenous peoples were not immune; only today, after five centuries of

martyrdom, are these populations reaching their original numbers.² And in places such as Brazil, Bolivia and Guatemala, Chile, Mexico, and North America, several indigenous peoples are still going through such a process. In this specific situation the reflection on existing violence among all cultures as a fact, highlights the particularly ethnocidal instinct of "Western culture's" violence against Indigenous peoples. With the acquiescence of local governments, it has been in the *old New World* that such violence of ethnocidal stature reached unimaginable levels.

If colonialism is the burden that Latin America must bear, it is obvious that, in order to contest colonialism embedded in such countries, there has to be a body and a voice that is anticolonialist. The *Creole* anticolonialism of the 1800s fell short, for it was against Spain, and with less intensity against Portugal (monarchies were twice advocated for by Maxiliano and Carlota in Mexico, and just recently in Brazil). That was a generational Oedipal fight, rather than truly a liberating one. Inheritors of the Conquerors became imitators of their ancestors, and the colonized *mestizo or ladino* updated remnants of the past, transformed themselves into the current managers of Latin America's debt. Not coincidentally it was during the 19th century that take-overs of indigenous lands reached the worst period of commodification. The anticolonialism of Indigenous peoples, however, needed (and needs) to be consistent against both Conquerors, Creoles, and the mestizo by-product of the Americas. "As scholars of colonialism and imperialism have argued recently, the avant garde taking up of the terms *colonization* and *decolonization* by "First World" theorists intent on dislodging the certitudes of the old subject of Western humanism does an injustice to, effectively occludes, very real colonial practices in specific geographical locations and historical periods" (Smith & Watson 1992: xv). The history of anticolonial behavior on the part of Indigenous peoples has been expressed through their distrust of

² I must acknowledge, however, that there are several indigenous cultures undergoing an alarming process of extinction.

colonial authority and neo-colonial nation-states. Only some coopted indigenous "leaders" survived, having lost historical perspectives of fundamental struggles over territory and dignity. Generations of Indigenous peoples, however, retrieve and decolonize their histories. They continue doing it, while their political expressions are classified and labeled by Western scholars studying: "revolts", "uprisings", "messianic movements, "nativistic movements" "jacqueries", "pre-political movements". It is not that Indigenous peoples withdraw from their historical responsibility. As these labels tell us, they were consistently resistant, and they remain so.

The nationalistic and eventually populist discourse of the nation-state in Latin America, as well as the urban-intellectual Creole *indigenista* current of the early 1900s, gradually lost its credibility by 1950. *Indigenismo* and populist discourses that attempted, during a long time, to speak for Indigenous peoples—taking Indian voices away—had almost run into a crisis of representativity. In the late fifties indigenous leaders emerged with a broader goal. This was registered by historians who confirmed indigenous attempts to build an autonomous movement of hemispheric dimensions. By the 60s and 70s, the Indigenous population was comparable in numbers to the population Columbus had run into when he got lost and bumped into the Abya Yala, continent of life, that he thought was India. An "Indianist" current made its way into political life, showing several unsuccessful attempts at creating political parties. Several of these were quickly coopted by nationalist political parties, churches, or remnants of *neo-indigenista* followers who cheered the "glorious Indigenous past." Certainly, however, they who were not about to accept new leaders who pressed ethnic demands, or who called for the reconstruction of Indigenous nations against the assimilationist will nation-states imposed on Native populations.

If mercantilism approved and encouraged a de facto law of land occupation, capitalistic encroachment on Indigenous territories founded a strange legal mixture: Indigenous peoples were entitled to sell but not to buy lands. In fact, monolingual laws were used to

legalize land transference taking advantage of linguistic barriers that forbade comprehension of the impenetrable legal process. One thing was clear: lands were taken away from the original settlers at a fast pace. Although, haciendas, plantations, mines, and cattle ranching were installed as main mechanisms of land takeovers, capitalism was held back by traditional pockets of self-sufficient Indigenous peasantries. Capital, however, initiated staggered invasions of those isolated pockets of "pre-capitalistic formations" and suddenly several ended up as: mining camps, oil refineries, lumber companies, cattle ranches, cotton fields, sugar bateys, where Indigenous peoples were forced into the bitter cycles of labor force exploitation. These same processes originated landlessness, creating a type of uprooted sharecropper, psychologically and culturally alienated, and semiproletarianized—but with no qualitative changes in their world views which remain rooted to their traditions (Taussig 1979). If Indigenous communities survived in an autonomous manner, it was because their lands were not rich, or yet not important enough, to be taken away by the inevitable process of commodification.

In 1993, indigenous territories and immemorial rights over them are—as you guessed—scarce. Land belongs to few indigenous inhabitants where they make sure capitalism is either accepted, rejected, or reinvented on their terms. As in the case of the pristine forests of the Amazonian Basin we have reached, as a human society, at last a stage that could lead us towards entropy—if we do not implement a sustainability where healing of the Earth may be continued for another five centuries, reversing in this way the negative politics loaded and carried on Indigenous backs.

And so, at the end of the 20th century, Indigenous peoples continue their fight for territory and dignity, two leit motif removed from the understanding or goals of political parties, nation-states and "popular movements".

II

If political parties demanded from Indigenous peoples obedience to their rigid and patriarchal directions, nation-states, and the institution of the Church worked hard at issuing assimilationist policies to de-indianize the surviving Native Americans of the Continent. The leadership of the popular movements regarding Indigenous peoples' issues was not far from either nation-state and political party goals, since these movements have been fabricated under a class-nation-state historical process.

What is "popular" about a movement? Other than an element of class that brings together popular movements, there is no clear definition of what it is. García Canclini suggests that there are varieties of representatives, of definitions, and strategies which "do not help us to define what it is that we will understand for *popular*" (1992: 249). Historically in Latin America, popular movements formed during different processes, changing throughout time, and used as cannon fodder by political parties, nation-states, and populist discourses. In this history *popular* is whatever has been excluded (Ibid 191), and by default whoever struggled against that exclusion.

From an indigenous point of reference, indigenous peoples' histories remain colonial when reduced to class. But, class is not everything. The relation Indian-Black-Popular is permeated by class. Indigenous and Black political thought cannot exist without their colonial history, for ignoring it would be to accept assimilation, de-indianization, monoculture, homogeneity. Indigenous histories are not just about exclusion, above all they are about land. It is here that the concept of ethnicity enters Latin America's social discourse. It is a long unaccepted category, as gender is, although existing de facto as part of a new epistemological outlook, whose conceptual depth can no longer be refused as explanatory of social reality. Gender and ethnicity have become part of the socio-conceptual and epistemological apparatus. The formations of these ideas and explanations have taken into consideration the response to

official history, and along with it, to nation-states monolithic nationalisms and oppressive class patriarchies and hierarchies.

In Latin America ethnic demands, and gender oriented movements such as the frontal feminist attacks against authoritarianism and patriarchies of male dominated hierarchies have little to share with "popular movements" that are far removed from these new variables of struggle. Entrenched popular movement leaderships are not devoid of patriarchy, nationalism, paternalisms, and "indigenismos", they are not necessarily feminist. In fact, history as only class struggle has run out of steam. It must yield to emerging forces that dynamize resistance, taking it to other levels, aiming at rejecting established regulatory mechanisms of power distribution. The problem emerges clearly from the view of one Mexican scholar: "The extreme left, devastated by the socialist crisis and the Cuban tribulations, can hardly aspire to be a majority; without doubt, not one fraction of the left can do it alone. But if one is well placed to be able to do so, *it is the new (current inheritors of old populism), and the old Latin American social democracy*". (Castañeda 1992: 55, 59, my underlining)

In the three major attempts at mixing class/popular oriented movements in Latin America, with ethnic/gendered ones (or engendered), there have been more failures than successes. Since the Quito Declaration in 1990³, the Indigenous movement has consistently rejected the overwhelmingly male oriented and patronizing attitude of popular/populist leaders of the popular

³ The Continental Gathering "500 Years of Indian Resistance," with representatives from 120 Indian Nations, met in Quito, Ecuador on July 17-20, 1990. The gathering was organized by the Confederation of Indian People of Ecuador (CONAIE), the Organization of Indian Nations of Colombia (ONIC), and SAIIC, The South&Mesoamerican Indian Information Center (Oakland, CA). The "Declaration of Quito" contains eight main demands. Number 4 reads: "We reject the manipulation of organizations which are linked to the dominant sectors of society and have no Indigenous representation, who usurp our name for (their own) imperialist interests... We affirm our choice to strengthen our own organizations, without excluding or isolating ourselves from other popular struggles." (SAIIC. "Declaration of Quito". SAIIC Newsletter, Vol 5 (3-4), 1990: 21) 1990

movement. Although there have been several instances where these politics were openly discussed, some Indigenous confederations (sixteen in total) walked out of the II Encounter of *Indigenous, Popular and Black Resistance* Movement held in Xelajú, and also the III one held at Managua where the organizers attempted to control the Indian voice. Speaking of dissident Indians, an official bulletin of this Encounter reads "how long are we going to pay attention to them?" (Boletín Continental 1992: 10). This was in reference to CONIC, an organizing autonomous continental Indigenous body that met and signed the *Declaration of Temoaya* at the Second Encounter of Indigenous Peoples in Temoaya, Mexico, October of 1993 to follow up the Quito Declaration. The results of the Campaigns of Indigenous, Black and Popular Resistance have only been Declarations, with no other value than documenting the worsening situation of the Latin American dispossessed, and the bitter sentiment held by "populares" against those who claim either gender or ethnicity, autonomy and self-determination, as the basis for launching their respective demands. Reflecting on this scene, Charles R. Hale later wrote: "All that remains are two options that the Conference actually produced: outright division, allowing *indígenas* to hear their own voices while making it less likely that others will listen or change; or alternatively, a "unified" campaign, where unity is little more than an empty slogan, shouted in unison by some, while those at the cultural margins look silently on." (1991:40 ms).

This confrontation of Indigenous representatives and "populares" in Latin America documents several levels lack of communication: from the contradiction of landless peasantries that encroach on Indigenous territories (e.g. throughout the Amazonian Basin), to the right to exercise native religions freedoms against the raised eyebrows of Catholic or Protestant churches in their endless varieties. Although seemingly intimidating, the popular movement rejects the autonomous and ethnic movements as separatist, only because these have chosen to press for demands that are not completely coincidental with those popular movements have (national liberation, social justice and democracy, economic and

political liberation, socialism). It must be acknowledged however, that indigenous peoples are not one entity. In my effort to understand the Indigenous movement, I identify at least three major trends: "bureaucratized Indians" (e.g. the UN crowd, self-elected representatives, coopted leaders, top-down selected ones), "nation-state, political parties, or church-sponsored Indians" (those still colonized that accept paternalisms), and "self-determinative and autonomous Indians" (those demanding a total process of decolonization).

By contrast, between 1990 and 1993, large "self-determination and autonomous" Indigenous mobilizations of men and women, demanding that territories be returned to them have been organized at Cotopaxi, Tungurahua and Chimborazo by Quichua Peoples, and the Indigenous Peoples of Pastaza (Conaie, Ecuador), the Mapuche "Aukin Wallmapu Ngulam" (Chile), the Indigenous March for "Land and Dignity" of the Bolivian Amazon (CIDOB), the *Xi N'ich* Zoque, Tzoltzil, Chol, Tojolabal and Tzeltal Indigenous March of Mexico. The Kuna of Nusagandi, Madugandi, Kuna Yala and the Guaymi Ng be-Bug l'e (Panama) organized armed defense of their territory against landless peasants and nation-state. This same self-determinative and pro-autonomy branch has been extremely successful at reorganizing a Continent wide decentralized pan-Indigenous organization.

But with few exceptions (such as Ecuador), an "alliance" between Indigenous peoples and popular movements does not seem to have worked. There have been cases, instead, when, Indigenous marchers begged "popular class organizations" to "please", not help, not join, but allow them to achieve demands on their own, saying: "This is our problem, it is not yours". The popular organizations inquired "what can we do to help you?" Indigenous communities answered "nothing, you have already done a lot". Thus, *Xi N'ich* arrived alone to Mexico City, unfortunately protected by priests who cannot let go of their Las Casas paternalism. Before *Xi N'ich* got to El Zócalo, their leaders negotiated with the Mexican government. As is known, Mexico is the cradle of *indigenismo*, and *neo-indigenismo* its offspring, a hundred

years old tradition that is well and alive. *Xi N'ich* did not need a negotiation but more autonomy and territory. The question is: did they understand it?

As for the Quichua, Achuar, Shuar Peoples of Ecuador, the neoliberal state returns territories, withdraws, and invites faceless multinational oil corporations against which Indigenous peoples must fight. The Mapuche struggle to be recognized as a people, with another history that is not Chilean history, but history more ancient than Chile's.⁴ The Bolivian Amazonians obtained almost a million hectares of territory, but laws move slowly while lumber companies keep depleting the forests despite laws that forbid them to do so. Laws have the double face of Janus when applied to Indigenous peoples. In fact, the Bolivian Amazon, not long ago, considered Indigenous peoples slaves. And in Brazil, Indigenous peoples are legally children. (Eliane Potiguara personal communication, Geneva 1992).

III

Within the wings of resistance movements, class oriented ones have definitively lost their capacity to unite. It is not a surprise, for example to see in Bolivia a former guerrilla running for office as mate of his past military torturers (you may ask about the depth of class struggles). This is roughly an example of how people change. One cannot talk about "a popular movement", because it is a monolithic lingering corpse that, in the best of circumstances, is able to negotiate the cost and price of strikes. In the past as is known, a worker's strike could become a strategic tool that prompted "the seizure of power". And so, the "force of the masses", at its best moment, sponsored several attempts at triggering radical social change.

⁴ "Their efforts to establish a separate Mapuche nation, including their own flag, is an act that is in direct contradiction to Chilean national unity" [said] Enrique Krauss, Chilean Minister of the Interior. See: "Mapuches Convicted for Occupying Land." *Abya Yala News*. Vol 7 (1-2) 1993:22

Today, however, several of these popular movements have gone askew as they fight over wages, or democracy, anything but socialism, with the exception of the Movimento dos Trabalhadores sem Terra (MST), landless peasants that openly call for socialism. Yet, the MST is led by Euro-Brazilian men, and few (if any) women are in positions of power. Or, in its worst circumstance as Daniel Ortega put it softly at the end of the Foro de Sao Paulo-92 in Managua: "The Foro belongs to our people, the campesinos, the workers, the poor of Latin America—that is what we aspire to be" (García 1992: 9). Dulce María Pereira, a PT leader attending the Foro later said: "Nothing should be conceived without including half of society, which is the mother of the other half" (García Op cit:8). The Foro invited only fifteen women and no Indigenous leaders were reported attending the Foro, which gathered more than sixty Latin American leftist political organizations.

What amazed me was the Foro's passivity and its rather declarative medical prescription: "The search for popular and revolutionary alternatives takes place in the course of resistance to the neo-liberal agenda. It requires the creation of spaces for popular power, the re-composition of the people's capacity to struggle ...bla, bla, bla". (Declaration of Managua 1992). Far from Managua, in Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Panamá, Colombia, Indigenous peoples show their "capacity for struggle" against transnational corporations. The state has been reduced to a mere intermediary (capital's bidding) of international investments. The popular movement remains observant, unable to understand the fight for land and territory, anguished by its "divisionismo", still a believer in the nation-state (Zavaleta Mercado called it a "noumena"), still a cheerleader of past heroes, at a time when there are no spaces for heroes. Indigenous peoples see the world going through a debacle, but believe in the concrete conservationist practices of Indigenous communities. Indigenous peoples can offer positive contributions to self-sufficiency, self-determination, ecological/human sustainability and dignity. The urbanized popular movement cannot relate to these "rural" positions and if it does, "rurals" must follow them.

Indigenous peoples of Ecuador via CONAIE are struggling to halt a recent government's agrarian law (1993) that endorses transnational land takeover. In June of 1993, Moxeño Indians of the Amazonian Basin are fighting mahogany poachers on their territory the size of Delaware. One may ask, in what ways would the "popular movements" assume these demands? Concrete situations should force them to make workable alliances; however until now "socialism" and "the seizure of power" have been their main concerns. Generalized skepticism towards the established political parties will continue to erode these movements, unless they urgently become critical of their past. Although, intellectuals are still thinking about "a Latin American socialism", the trend among indigenous, women and popular forces, is to look at concrete visible communal decentralized solutions, flexibly and transnationally coordinated rather than expecting "national" changes. The steadily-eroding legitimacy of the state, and thus a TNC open influence over the state's structural residue, will inspire other forms of social demands, different from traditional socialism.

IV

What are the lessons for current resistance politics? Demands must be reached at a decentralized level, forging where it is possible, flexible and temporary alliances to effectively enforce pressures on the system rather than allowing individual dictates of top-down power seekers. As ethnic and gender demands come into Latin America's social "consciousness", positive outcomes can fortify the future of tridimensional alliances (ethnic, gender, class) of equality. It is necessary, however, to work on decolonization first, as autonomy reinforces the subjectivity of movements that, once decolonized, will be able to dialogue under conditions of equality--subverting rather than accepting, history's monolithic and reified structure. Only then can an ethnic, gender and class movement move toward administering political power. This political power is the total dominion over one's communal space founded within a relation of equality. From this communal point of reference, and in

association with a set of political commonalities, one can become transnational indeed.

It is here that there are clear bases for creating trans-communal cadres as answers to transnational attacks. "To not develop such trans-communal cadres for the 21st century is to risk a weakened, divided, and conflicted marginalized general population confronted by a well-united ruling social bloc that is actually quite demographically diverse but which is separated by class and privilege from the rest of the America[s]". (Brown-Childs 1993: 7). The answer lies in a dialogue among equals (trans-ethnic, trans-gender, trans-nation, trans-language), decentralized but flexibly coordinated.

This has been the successful movements of Indigenous peoples that, motivated by the same pro-autonomy ethos, are able to dialogue and rebuild their sense of being as a *toto* despite language barriers. As a final conclusion, and self-criticism, I quote the words of Jim O'Connor asking me: "How do you get self-sufficiency, self-determination, in a world that global capital is making—without delinking Indigenous material life, ecologies, and cultures from world capitalism?"

Santa Cruz, California
Summer 1993

Note:

This is an abridged version of a longer paper written in Spanish with the title of "Lo Etnico y lo Popular", [Revista UNITAS, (La Paz, Bolivia) Número 11:90-105, 1993]. This English version was presented at a heated Hemispheric Studies Faculty Research Group discussion at the University of California, Davis on June 1993. I would like to thank the comments of Stéfano Varese, Carol A. Smith, Charles R. Hale, Rafael Varón and the faculty and graduate students of anthropology and Native American Studies at UCD. I discussed some of these ideas with James O'Connor, Philip D. Young and Winona La Duke of The International Studies Program, University of Oregon, and gained from their comments. I extend my appreciation for their support to my friends and colleagues Norma Klahn, and Angela Warsitz of Berlin. Norma Klahn and Susanne Jonas, in particular, provided sharp commentaries and editorial suggestions and I here thank them. The Chicano-Latino Research Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, provided me with support and a space to share these ideas to which I remain responsible.

Bibliography

Boletín Continental

1992 "Cuánto caso se hará a los Indígenas?". Secretaría Operativa Continental. Boletín # 6. (Nicaragua): 10.

Brown-Childs, John

1993 "Preliminary Notes for the Utilization of Gramsci in strategizing Race/Ethnicity/and Political Progress in the Late 20th Century United States". Santa Cruz, UCSC: The Chican/Latin Research Center. Working paper (unp. ms.)

Castañeda, Jorge G.

1992 "América Latina y la socialdemocracia". Nexos (México), Mayo: 55-60

Cordera, Rolando

1992 "La Pasión del futuro: una entrevista con Carlos Fuentes". Nexos (México), Julio: 29-39

Churchill, Ward & Winona La Duke

1992 "Native North America: The Political Economy of Radioactive Colonialism". IN: M.A. Jaimes (ed) The State of Native America. Genocide, Colonization and Resistance. Boston: South End Press: 241-266

de Certau, Michel

1989 Heterologies. Discourse of the Other. Tr. de Brian Massumi. MPLS, MN: University of Minnesota Press: 225-233

Hale, Charles R.

1991 "Between Ché Guevara and the Pachamama: Mestizos, Indians and Identity Politics in the Quincentenary Campaign. ms

Harrison, Faye V.

1991 Decolonizing Anthropology. Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Hobsbawm, Eric J.

1992 "Crisis de las ideologías: liberalismo y socialismo". In: Cemos-Memoria 41 (México): 36-41

García, Arnolando

1992 "A Glimpse of Bolivar's Dream". IN: Crossroads. (Berkeley) October: 6-15

García Canclini, Néstor

1989 Culturas Híbridas. Estrategias para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad. Mexico: Grijalvo

- Gonzalez, Nancie L.
1986 "Indigenismo and Ethnicity as Modernizing Forces"
IN: Jack R. Roliwagen (ed). Directions in the
Anthropological Study of Latin America.
Washington, DC.: Society for Latin American
Anthropology. Monograph 8: 61-78
- Lumbreras, Luís Guillermo
1992 "Raíz de la Utopía Colonial" En Chirapaq.
Contrarequirimiento. Lima: spi
- Montecino, Sonia
1992 "El mundo indígena en el Chile de hoy: temor y
tensión de una presencia". Hispamerica. Año XXI (6):
87-93
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia
1988 "El potencial epistemológico y teórico de la
Historia Oral: de la lógica instrumental a la
descolonización de la historia". Temas Sociales 11
(La Paz): Universidad Mayor de San Andrés: 49-64
- Rutjizol (collective)
1992 "Entrevista a Demetrio Cojtí". In: Rutjizol
(Guatemala-México): Enero-Marzo: 9
- Schaedel, Richard P.
1992 "The archaeology of the Spanish Colonial experience
in South America. Antiquity 66: 217-242)
- Smith, Sodonie and Julia Watson (eds)
1992 "Introduction" IN: De/Colonizing the Subject. MPLS:
University of Minnesota Press.
- Taussig, Michael
1979 The Devil & Commodity Fethishism in Latin
America. Chapel Hill: UNC Press
-
- 1992 The Nervous System. New York: Routledge. See:
"Violence & Resistance in the Americas: The Legacy
of Conquest": 37-52
- Varese, Stefano
1982 "Restoring Multiplicity: Indianities and the
Civilizing Project in Latin America". Latin
American Perspectives. Issue 33, Vol IX (2), Spring:
29-41
- Zavaleta Mercado, René
1987 Lo Nacional-Popular en Bolivia. México: Siglo XXI