

Dismantling Gaps and Myths: How Indigenous Political Actors Broke the Mold of Socioeconomic Development

SARAH A. RADCLIFFE
Reader in Latin American Geography
University of Cambridge

FOR OVER TWO DECADES IN Latin America, indigenous actors from diverse environments and political contexts have struggled for social, economic, and cultural rights and for control over the processes of social and economic development. The need to improve on existing socioeconomic development efforts for the greater benefit of indigenous groups is indisputable. Indigenous people are on average poorer and less well provisioned with basic services than other ethnocultural groups (the “development gap”), and development programs have historically aimed to assimilate Indians through the destruction of distinctive cultures and the pursuit of Western-style modernity (the “development myth”).¹ Additionally, policy makers and academics have paid little systematic attention to creating frameworks that permit indigenous populations to determine for themselves how to best guarantee their livelihood, security, and social welfare in a manner that preserves their distinctive ethnocultural identities and ways of life (the “development challenge”).

The core demands of diverse indigenous movements across the Andean region and beyond include self-determination, land rights, and cultural survival—each of which sets the parameters for the kinds of development sought.² While indigenous actors are certainly not against market economies, they are adamant

SARAH A. RADCLIFFE is Reader in Latin American Geography at the University of Cambridge and a fellow of Christ's College Cambridge. Her research focuses on contested dynamics around social difference and development policy under postcolonial nationalism, and global restructuring. She is presently writing a book on indigenous women's experiences of development in Ecuador.

Copyright © 2012 by the *Brown Journal of World Affairs*

that successful development provide them resources for secure and dignified livelihoods. Additionally, indigenous movements demand recognition of their distinctive sociocultural relations and identities and of how these distinctions lead them to “other” development practices and priorities. The political activism of indigenous social movements and parties that seek to deepen democracy and establish stronger foundations for political and civil rights are hence fundamental for the design and implementation of development programs for indigenous populations.³ The objective of this essay is to outline the main development difficulties faced by indigenous groups and analyze how their distinctive experiences have given rise to a highly creative rethinking and reworking of development models. Focusing mainly on Ecuador and its Andean neighbors, I then discuss the constraints on this agenda-setting political action before drawing some conclusions about the feasibility and long-term consequences of their actions.

INDIGENOUS DISSATISFACTION WITH STANDARD DEVELOPMENT

90 Indigenous groups remain highly dissatisfied with the extent and type of development to which they have been exposed, whether it has been the “mal-development” associated with oil extraction and colonialism, not-so-benign neglect, or programs that fail to take into account their distinctive situations.⁴ When governments pursue economic growth at all costs, indigenous groups have often been considered obstacles to modernization, resulting in poor social outcomes and economic insecurity.⁵ Of course indigenous populations vary in their access to economic resources (land, work, credit, and markets) and social development provisions (education, health, and public infrastructure). Yet, on average in Latin America, indigenous populations are significantly worse off than non-indigenous populations, including Afro-Latin Americans.⁶ Major differences exist in access to basic services such as sewage, electricity, safe water, and healthcare, especially for indigenous women and children. According to the World Bank, “Being indigenous increases the probability of being poor, even controlling for other common predictors of poverty.”⁷

Three key processes restrict indigenous peoples’ ability to achieve and maintain parity with other groups. First, since colonial times and through various epochs of market reconstruction, Indians have been displaced from their land and have lost control of the water and other resources upon which their livelihoods depend. Additionally, in recent years, the extraction of raw materials from indigenous territories has resulted in pollution, the disruption of ecosystems, and the despoiling of soil and water. Moreover, according to Donna Lee van

Cott, “States have been unable or unwilling to enforce land and resource rights where they are protected by law, or to protect Indians from violence suffered when they try to protect these rights themselves.”⁸ Indigenous groups have often been on the losing end of these conflicts over resources. Despite international measures to ensure that indigenous populations give informed consent prior to any resource extraction, sovereignty ultimately rests with the state, which is controlled by elite politicians and policy makers. Second, racial hierarchies that justify and perpetuate earnings differentials in labor markets reduce indigenous access to training, education, credit, and justice. Third, national discourses and citizenship regimes tend to deny indigenous peoples full citizenship status.⁹ Furthermore, indigenous groups are often on the receiving end of violence and civil conflict, making the provision of social welfare and development opportunities even more complicated.¹⁰ Development is also determined in neoliberal settings by urban, mestizo, and university-educated technocrats who are mostly remote from the vast majority of indigenous individuals.

HOW INDIGENOUS POLITICAL ACTORS BROKE THE DEVELOPMENT MOLD

Political action at various levels, from villages to the global institutions of the United Nations and International Labor Organization (ILO), emerged throughout the 1980s and 1990s to leverage better forms of development.¹¹ The most important international instrument to support indigenous demands for development was encoded in ILO Convention 169 and further expanded in the 2007 United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Article 23 of the latter document stated:

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, indigenous peoples have the right to be actively involved in developing and determining health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions.¹²

In this section, I identify and discuss three key elements of indigenous actors’ vision for transformed development: First, a change in the relationship between development, dominant culture, and indigenous populations; second, indigenous women’s action to highlight the existence of male–female diversity within ethnocultural diversity; and third, a rethinking of the priorities and nature

of “development” as an agenda for change.¹³

PARTICIPATORY PRACTICE AND NEW VISIONS OF CULTURE

The first transformation brought about by indigenous political action was to completely break down the development myth and reconfigure the link between culture and development. The development myth in Andean countries

Indigenous groups repeatedly demonstrated their initiative, creativity, and resistance while maintaining subaltern languages and identities.

held that indigenous peoples were incapable of developing on their own and that the only route to de-

velopment was assimilation into the dominant culture. In place of this myth, activism demonstrated that indigenous participation in the design, implementation, and management of projects was desirable, feasible, and had positive outcomes. Surviving colonization and postcolonial neglect and dispossession, indigenous groups repeatedly demonstrated their initiative, creativity, and resistance while maintaining subaltern languages and identities. Indigenous people have generally not opposed development per se, but rather the forms development has taken. They often wish to engage in market-based economies, but demand better access to markets, technical assistance, and credit.

92

However, only rarely have conditions permitted the emergence of successful, autonomous market engagement.¹⁴ For example, the Zapotec weavers in the Mexican state of Oaxaca have managed to retain community institutions and control over production and distribution of locally produced wool textiles, supported by a significant land base.¹⁵ Outside of these areas, indigenous actors have identified the factors that would permit the replication of these successful examples, namely greater collective empowerment and participation in project formulation, implementation, and in wider decision-making spheres. Their creative visions of the market also include proposals for food sovereignty and the maintenance of locally distinctive food crops and tree resources.¹⁶ Indigenous political actors have also been at the forefront of national debates on the importance of establishing core social, cultural, political, and economic rights in order to address fundamental problems. They forcefully make the argument for rights, rather than a series of ad hoc individual projects. Such agendas represent profound challenges to nation-states.¹⁷ “The Indigenous Fund” (*Fondo Indígena*), a multilateral development fund, thus lobbies for a clearer legislative basis for rights while also dispersing project funds.¹⁸

Indian political movements also shake another pillar of the development myth: the idea that indigenous cultures represent an obstacle to development and must be removed in order for development to occur.¹⁹ Mainstream notions of modernity have been overturned. The past two decades saw a major turnaround in development discourse about indigenous people: they are now perceived as having “appropriate” culture for development success.²⁰ Indigenous culture has become an asset in a number of senses: cultural diversity adds to the energy of multicultural societies, social cohesion provides stability, underutilized human capital can be drawn on, and untapped entrepreneurial capacity can be fully employed.²¹

From this setting has emerged the model of ethnodevelopment, or “development with identity,” which arises from indigenous demands and establishes principles of participation, co-management, and sustainability.²² Ethnodevelopment ideally considers indigenous “wishes, needs and aspirations and [requires] that these plans are protected by existing legal frameworks.”²³ Associated with ethnodevelopment is a new cadre of indigenous professionals, trained in education programs designed to provide students with comparative knowledge of a range of political tactics and development transformations.²⁴ The existence of indigenous professionals and ethnodevelopment bodies within Latin American governments puts to rest the myth that mainstream development experts necessarily know best about options for indigenous populations. Bolivian president Evo Morales has gone further, dismantling the Ministry of Indigenous Affairs (the body responsible for ethnodevelopment) in order to distribute indigenous representatives throughout the state structure.²⁵

DIVERSITY WITHIN DIVERSITY: INDIGENOUS WOMEN’S DEVELOPMENT SITUATION

Very little has been written about indigenous women’s experiences with development, yet the existing documentation clearly demonstrates that they face compounded disadvantages due to interlocking marginalization caused by gender, race-ethnicity, location, and income.²⁶ Indigenous women have broken the mold of development by challenging policy makers’ tendency to deal with only a single dimension of social differences at a time. Indigenous women challenge the ingrained assumptions of development institutions that historically separated indigenous and women’s development issues into distinct offices. This separation inevitably limits dialogue and coordination between intersecting marginalized populations.²⁷ A series of policies exist for women’s development, arguing for women’s empowerment and systematic attention to male–female

dynamics. These policies have been highly successful in drawing attention to women's development disadvantages. Yet recent scholarship and activism in the Global South has highlighted how gender policies have only selective impacts because of the ways they reproduce class and racial privilege. Andean indigenous women are acutely aware of these limitations and criticize gender policies for their racial blindness and ingrained assumptions about gender dynamics. For instance, indigenous women in the Ecuadorian Andes cannot easily access special-

Indigenous women are increasingly visible political actors in a diverse range of organizations. ized anti-violence police stations that are prepared to deal with domestic violence, as the stations are located in urban areas and personnel are not trained to speak

indigenous languages. They call for alternative conceptualizations of gender relations and power. Yet indigenous women do not view ethnodevelopment models uncritically, pointing out how these policies sideline women in project design and decision making.²⁸ My field research among Kichwa women in the central Ecuadorian Andes demonstrates that local female leaders are acutely aware of the existence of male favoritism within ethnodevelopment programs and have, in response, mobilized to rework resource distribution. At the local scale for instance, Andean Kichwa women in one village bought a plot of land together to raise incomes. Moreover, Bolivian and Ecuadorian Indian women have begun to systematically document and publicize the types of development initiatives from which they would benefit.²⁹

94

By struggling to be recognized as legitimate interlocutors, indigenous women defy the longstanding tendency in development thinking to homogenize and simplify the category of *beneficiary*. They bring to the fore the existence of diversity within diversity: the inextricably entangled impacts of male–female differences on ethnicity and of ethnocultural differences on gender.³⁰ Indigenous women activists and their leaders speak passionately about the form of development they would like to achieve, namely a life without threat of violence, secure access to land, respect, and the right to a voice. In this way, these political actors dispute the way development policy has been conceived and implemented—a challenge only recently and partially taken up with respect to Andean women.

Most urgently in need of change are social programs targeted at the poorest of the poor, which too often rely upon over-simplified understandings of women and, as a result, fail to comprehend the difficulties caused by interlocking relations of race-ethnicity, gender, and location. One major difficulty for indigenous women is inadequate access to credit to support farming or craft activities. Gendered assumptions about women's dependence on husbands, combined with

the insecurity of indigenous livelihoods (often compounded in women's case by lack of legal title to land), and the dearth of rural financial services mean that Indian women cannot use "regular" credit sources. The continued activism of indigenous women's leaders and grassroots associations seeks to leverage change in governments, agencies, and non-governmental organizations.

Indigenous women are increasingly visible political actors in a highly diverse range of organizations, from local to international scales. The Continental Network of Indigenous Women (the *Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas América Latina*), for instance, works to develop strategies that enable its grassroots members from across the Americas to coordinate activities, to identify their priorities, realities, and struggles; to strengthen indigenous women's identity; and to create training opportunities that allow indigenous women greater participation at the local, national, and international levels.³¹ Through their words and actions, women-only and mixed-gender movements communicate the salience of diversity within diversity.³²

RETHINKING THE SCOPE AND NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT

Indigenous political actors have been at the forefront of contentious politics, challenging development's priorities so that it becomes more attuned to indigenous ways of life, commitment to living environments, and food sovereignty. Indian demands for new forms of development gained impetus for what the former UN Special Rapporteur for Indigenous Populations termed a "reversal of government *indigenista* [assimilation] policies."³³ At an early stage, the rethinking of development was fostered in synergy with global environmental and conservation movements. Diverse forms of ecocapitalism were imagined and, in some places, put into practice, giving rise to indigenously organized ecotourism ventures and the production of organic products.³⁴

Yet indigenous reconceptualizations of development have always had a wider remit, challenging the scope, context, and content of mainstream development. Development with identity is now generally agreed to require a firm legislative basis for rights, continuous consultation, recognition of territories to protect environments and resources, and local communities' approval of large infrastructure projects. Demands for self-determination have been transformed into demands for high levels of control over extractive or large-scale development in local territories.³⁵ Indigenous intellectuals have put considerable effort into thinking about how nation-state structures could be organized, leading to innovative municipal actions especially where governmental decentralization

of authority and budgets has coincided with multilateral assistance. Where indigenous local authorities work constructively alongside mobilized civil society, old models of top-down development have been replaced with consultative, participatory, and rural-oriented change.³⁶ The local authority in Guamote in Ecuador's central Andean region introduced innovative structures to involve poor, rural indigenous populations in participatory decision making. Whereas previously local elites had captured resources for urban vanity projects, indigenous councilors and regular public meetings began to put resources into agricultural development. In this sense, local development does not have to be radically "alternative" in form to regular projects. Indigenous initiatives stress community involvement and a more democratic allocation of resources.³⁷

Nevertheless, the impetus for transformed national-level policy remains crucial, given the need for systematic attention to the still-present development gap. Health policies, for instance, remain a point of contention: although indigenous movements have indicated their willingness to create medical practices fusing modern and traditional medicine (what they term "intercultural" practice), the political will to ensure these treatments are universally available or properly funded is lacking.³⁸ In Ecuador, the National Development Council for Indigenous Nationalities and Pueblos has recently pushed debates around intercultural public policies in a plurinational—as opposed to a monocultural—state.³⁹ The energy and imaginative leaps required by such recasting of development thinking often originate from indigenous intellectuals and their rearticulation of forms of knowledge associated with indigenous cosmologies or ways of life. With state investment in bilingual education programs, these "other" knowledges circulate more widely and gain greater legitimacy.⁴⁰ In several Andean countries, the notion of *buen vivir* (living well) originated with indigenous intellectuals who reimagined development in important new directions.⁴¹ By means of contentious politics through indigenous, urban, and women's movements, Ecuador sought to incorporate elements of *buen vivir* into the 2008 Constitution by establishing numerous social, environmental, cultural, political, and collective rights intended to provision a high quality of life.⁴² However, the promising directions embedded in the Constitution have yet to be put on the statute books, prompting skepticism about how real these rights are.⁴³

CONSTRAINTS ON TRANSFORMATION: LIMITS TO CHANGE

Despite indigenous mobilization to rethink the basis and scope of development, numerous constraints on innovative change persist. The first major hurdle to

re-envisioning development has been the particular limitations associated with multiculturalism, which does not cause racism to disappear, but changes its forms and consequences. In the words of sociologist Stuart Hall, multiculturalism represents “a diversity of strategies for dealing with the cultural diversity and social heterogeneity of modern societies.”⁴⁴ Almost all Latin American countries have now passed multicultural legislation, but have found it much harder to eliminate entrenched discrimination. Ten years of top-down ethnodevelopment in various countries of Latin America have resulted in only limited improvement and, in some cases, a worsening situation for indigenous populations.

The reasons for this situation remain contentious and undecided. On the one hand, cultural difference can be used to boost sales of crafts and services (such as ethnotourism), but the vast majority of Indians work in hard manual labor and low-paid jobs. Although policy was premised on optimism that wider society would be open to indigenous culture, ethnodevelopment has done little to shift prevalent quotidian racism.⁴⁵ In the Andes, these conditions have too often led to what my co-authors and I termed “developmentally appropriate culture” rather than “culturally appropriate development.”⁴⁶ Moreover, few anti-racism initiatives have been mainstream enough to make a sustained difference. For instance, anti-racism activists in Bolivia and Ecuador are located largely in civil society organizations called *observatorios* (observer groups) rather than in national programs.⁴⁷ In another aspect, territorial titles and legal provisions do not always provide sufficiently robust protection and self-determination for Indian groups. When indigenous professionals do gain a foothold in the state, they have to negotiate problematic relationships with civil servants from the dominant racial group, have limited scope for action, and deal with high expectations from indigenous civil society.⁴⁸

Another severe constraint on the realization of better lives is the position of women in society. Indian women experience the development gap, the development myth, and the development challenge in ways that place them at a disadvantage relative to male colleagues and non-indigenous policy makers. Despite women’s growing political activism, they have not gained sufficient political legitimacy to make their voices authoritative within anti-poverty agendas. As indigenous women were historically the least visible citizens in multicultural Andean societies, they now face the greatest hurdles to participation and decision making. Indigenous women are unlikely to be elected under pro-women quota laws, and they face resistance to equity measures in male-dominated ethnic organizations. Furthermore, indigenous women continue to be affected by a particular version of the development myth. Historically (and sometimes still

today) policy makers believed that indigenous women were either irredeemably anti-modern (and thus beyond the reach of development) or equitably treated in ethnic communities (and thus did not require specific programs or attention).⁴⁹ Despite rapid and significant progress in dismantling the development myth about indigenous people, women often face the additional task of overcoming these assumptions and combating their pernicious consequences. Indigenous women have to overturn stereotypes by highlighting their work in monetized economies and political activism and by promoting a comprehensive understanding of the uneven gendered and ethnoracial effects of globalization and uneven development.⁵⁰ At the international level, indigenous women continue to find it difficult to pressure aid donors to broaden gender policies to include dimensions of race and ethnicity, despite supportive networks of lobbying organizations and non-governmental development organizations.

Indigenous actors' efforts to shift the direction and content of development also face significant constraints. The ongoing predominance of neoliberal macroeconomic models in many countries produces limited options for national and regional governments, and continues to undercut livelihood security. Market-based models at one level seek to establish greater clarity about property ownership through formal regulation, but can also be associated with the extension of unfavorable capitalist relations. Moreover, the "resource grabs" now occurring to feed emergent global powers bring the harshest environmental and social consequences to communities that are least cushioned by social and legal protections. In areas populated by indigenous groups, extraction and economic activities are more likely to be unregulated, while prior or informed consent is not routinely sought or acted upon.⁵¹ Political will to consider the uneven and disproportionate effects of resource extraction on indigenous populations is frequently lacking, regardless of the stated allegiance of governments. For

98


Political will to consider the uneven and disproportionate effects of resource extraction on indigenous populations is frequently lacking.

example, Guaraní territorial claims in Bolivia's Chaco region are weighed against national demands for gas revenues, and found wanting. The sheer difficulty of finding another form of development within the timeframes

of government and multilateral development agencies represents another obstacle. A further issue is policy's slowness in taking into consideration the sheer diversity and internal differentiation within indigenous populations, resulting in diverse and often incompatible visions for the future.⁵² If an ethnodevelopment policy becomes a template transplanted unthinkingly onto different eth-

nocultural realities, it risks becoming itself the basis of contestation and losing sight of participatory goals. Separating ethnodevelopment policy from “regular” governmental policy also risks ghettoizing pro-Indian policies and undercutting the need to comprehensively address Latin America’s growing income and wealth disparities.

CONCLUSION

Indigenous populations have historically received a raw deal from development, considered by Latin American states and societies a hindrance to modernity and progress. Whether actively dispossessed or neglected during the pursuit of national development, indigenous people have now become the least able to earn a dignified wage, control a fair share of resources, and consider cultural differences an asset. The “indigenous development gap” is an indictment of development policy makers, states, and publics, and their racism and cultural snobbery. Development’s myth—prevalent until very recently—was that indigenous populations would disappear, seduced by progress. This myth has now been systematically dismantled by indigenous activists and intellectuals who resoundingly demonstrate how indigenous land and labor permitted dominant groups’ development while restricting ethnic social mobility through the reproduction of exclusionary hierarchies. As a result of the longstanding predominance of the development myth and a blindness to the development gap, policy makers and academics paid little systematic attention to indigenous groups as development beneficiaries. In this context, indigenous actors had to mobilize for their cause and produce an agenda for change. Their priority has been to identify and create frameworks that permit indigenous populations to determine and control a means of guaranteeing livelihood, security, and social welfare, and at the same time retain distinctive ethnocultural identities and ways of life. In actions undertaken to strengthen economic, social, and cultural rights, indigenous actors also undertook a mold-breaking reorientation of development practice and concept. 

99

NOTES

1. A few definitions are in order here. I use the term *indigenous* (as well as *Indian* and *indígena*) throughout the article to refer to ethnoculturally distinctive populations that claim descent from pre-Colombian populations. By *development*, I refer to stable and distributed improvements in livelihood, security, health, and education that increase peoples’ options and opportunities.

2. Alison Brysk, *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2000); Karen Engle, *The Elusive Promise of Indigenous*

Development (London: Duke University Press, 2010).

3. Deborah Yashar, "Democracy, Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America," *World Politics*, 52, no. 1 (1999): 76–104; Deborah Yashar, *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Donna Lee Van Cott, "Indigenous Peoples and Democracy: Issues for Policymakers," in *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, ed. Donna L. Van Cott (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 1–27.

4. Eduardo Encalada, Fernando García, and Kristine Ivarsdottir, *La participación de los pueblos indígenas y negros en el desarrollo del Ecuador* (Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 1999); CEPAL-BID, *Atlas socio-demográfico de la población indígena y afro-ecuatoriana del Ecuador* (Santiago, CEPAL, 2005); Shelton Davis, "Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Participatory Development: The Experience of the World Bank in Latin America," in *Multiculturalism in Latin America*, ed. Rachel Sieder (London: Palgrave, 2002), 227–51; Gillette Hall and Harry Patrinos, *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America, 1994–2004* (Washington DC: World Bank, 2004).

5. UN Declaration, *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (New York: United Nations General Assembly, 2007).

6. Hall and Patrinos, *Indigenous Peoples*; Carlos Larrea et al., *Pueblos Indígenas, desarrollo humano y discriminación en el Ecuador* (Quito: Abya Yala-Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, 2007); Eduardo Telles, "Race and Ethnicity and Latin America's United Nations Millennium Development Goals," *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 2, no. 2 (2007): 185–200.

7. Hall and Patrinos, *Indigenous Peoples*, 5.

8. Van Cott, "Indigenous Peoples," 17; Jean Jackson and Kay Warren, "Indigenous Movements in Latin America, 1992–2004: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005): 549–73.

9. Engle, *Elusive Promise*.

10. Jackson and Warren, "Indigenous Movements"; Sarah A. Radcliffe, "Latin American Indigenous Geographies of Fear: Living in the Shadow of Racism, Lack of Development and Anti-Terror Measures," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97, no. 2 (2007): 385–97.

11. Brysk, *From Tribal Village*; Nancy Grey Postero and León Zamosc, eds., *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America* (Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Publishers, 2004); see also the articles in this section.

12. UN Declaration, *United Nations Declaration*.

13. I use the term *male–female diversity* here, in place of *gender* as indigenous women and men themselves find the concept of gender too Western, too bound up with specific policy measures, and too homogeneous.

14. Lynn Stephen, "Culture As A Resource: Four Cases Of Self-Managed Indian Craft Production In Latin America," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 40, no. 1 (1991): 101–30; Anthony Bebbington, "Movements and Modernizations, Markets and Municipalities: Indigenous Federations in Rural Ecuador," in *Liberation Ecologies*, eds. Michael Watts and Richard Peet (London: Routledge, 2004), 394–421; Pablo Laguna, "Mallas y Flujos: Acción Colectiva, Cambio Social, Quinoa y Desarrollo Regional Indígena en Los Andes Bolivianos" (Phd Diss., University Of Wageningen, 2011).

15. Stephen, "Culture as a Resource."

16. Roger Plant, "Latin America's Multiculturalism: Economic and Agrarian Dimensions," in *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy*, ed. Rachel Sieder (London, Palgrave, 2002), 208–26.

17. Willem Assies, Gemma Van der Haar, and André Hoekema, ed., *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of The State In Latin America* (Amsterdam: Thela, 2001).

18. See: www.fondoindigena.org.

19. This myth is not explicit but underlies many popular understandings of indigenous culture as 'traditional' versus development as modernity. See: Susanne Schech and Jane Haggis, *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000); Sarah A. Radcliffe and Nina Laurie, "Culture and Development: Taking Indigenous Culture Seriously in the Andes," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24 (2006): 231–48.

20. Robert Andolina, Nina Laurie, and Sarah A. Radcliffe, *Indigenous Development in the Andes: Culture,*

Power and Transnationalism (London: Duke University Press, 2009), chapter 2.

21. Sarah A. Radcliffe, "Tejiendo redes: Organizaciones y capital social en los pueblos indígenas," in *Pueblos Indígenas y Política en América Latina*, ed. Salvador Martín i Puig (Barcelona: CIDOB, 2007), 31–56.

22. For example, see: Victor Bretón, *Cooperación al desarrollo y demandas étnicas en los Andes ecuatorianos: ensayos sobre indigenismo, desarrollo rural y neoindigenismo* (Quito: FLACSO and Universitat de Lleida-GIEDEM, 2001); Martín van Nieuwkoop and Jorge Uquillas, *Defining Ethno-development in Operational Terms: Lessons from the Ecuador Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian Peoples Development Project* (Washington D.C.: World Bank, 2000).

23. Andy Atkins and Elena Rey-Maquiera, *Ethno-development: A Proposal to Save Colombia's Pacific Coast* (London: Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1996), 14.

24. Nina Laurie, Robert Andolina, and Sarah A. Radcliffe, "Indigenous Professionalization: Transnational Social Reproduction in the Andes," *Antipode: Journal of Radical Geography* 35 (2003): 463–91; Nina Laurie, Robert Andolina, and Sarah A. Radcliffe, "Ethnodevelopment: Social Movements, Creating Experts and Professionalising Indigenous Knowledge In Ecuador," *Antipode: Journal of Radical Geography* 39 (2005): 470–96.

25. Fondo Indígena, *Tendencias de la institucionalidad estatal y las políticas públicas respecto al desarrollo indígena en América Latina y el Caribe* (La Paz, Bolivia: Fondo para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas de América Latina y el Caribe, 2007), 23.

26. Diane Vinding, *Indigenous Women: The Right to a Voice* (Copenhagen: International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs, 1998); Ricardo Calla, *La mujer indígena en Bolivia, Brasil, Ecuador, Guatemala y Panamá: Un panorama de base a partir de la ronda de censos 2000* (Santiago: CEPAL, 2006); Sarah A. Radcliffe with Andrea Pequeño, "Ethnicity, Development and Gender: Tsáchila Indigenous Women in Ecuador," *Development and Change* 41 (2010): 983–1016.

27. Susan Paulson and Pamela Calla, "Gender and Ethnicity in Bolivian Politics: Transformation or Paternalism?" *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 5 (2000): 112–49.

28. Sarah A. Radcliffe, Nina Laurie, and Robert Andolina, "The Transnationalization of Gender and Re-Imagining Andean Indigenous Development," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 29 (2004): 387–416.

29. Declaration, Mandato de la I Cumbre Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de Abya Yala <<http://pensardenuuevo.com/mandato-de-la-i-cumbre-continental-de-mujeres-indigenas-de-abya-yala/>>, last accessed 26 April 2012 (2009); CONAIE Women's Office, *Agenda Política y Estratégica de las Mujeres de los Pueblos y Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador* (Quito: CONAIE Dirigencia de la Mujer y la Familia, 2010); WIDE, *Economic Alternatives for Gender and Social Justice: Voices and Visions from Latin America* (London: WIDE, 2011).

30. Carmen Tene, "Ruptura de la exclusión de mujeres indígenas," *Mujer: Participación y desarrollo. Seminario Internacional CORDES-CEDIME* (Quito: CORDES, 2000), 199–224; Paulina Palacios, "Construyendo la diferencia en la diferencia: Mujeres indígenas y democracia plurinacional," in *Pueblos Indígenas, estado y democracia*, comp. Pablo Dávalos (Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2005), 311–39.

31. Enlace Continental, http://www.enlacecontinentalmujeresindigenas.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=102&Itemid=8.

32. Shannon Speed, Aída Hernández, and Lynn Stephen, eds., *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2006); Aída Hernández, "The Emergence of Indigenous Feminism in Latin America," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 35 (2010): 539–45; Stephanie Rousseau, "Disputando la indigenidad: Las organizaciones de mujeres indígenas-campesinas bolivianas en el escenario post-constituyente," (Manuscript, 2011).

33. Rodolfo Stavenhagen, quoted in: Engle, *Elusive Promise*, 183.

34. The term *eco-capitalism* is from Brysk, *From Tribal Village*. On the consequences of such initiatives, see: Kevin Healy, *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate: Multicultural Grassroots Development in the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2000); Laguna, "Mallas y flujos."

35. Miguel González, Araceli Burguete Cal y Mayor, and Pablo Ortiz, eds., *La autonomía a debate: Autogobierno indígena y estado plurinacional en América Latina* (Quito: FLACSO-GTZ-IWGIA-CIESAS-UNICH, 2010).

36. Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe, *Indigenous Development*.
37. Bebbington, "Movements and Modernizations."
38. Raul Montenegro and Carolyn Stephens, "Indigenous Health in Latin America and the Caribbean," *Lancet* 367, no. 9525 (2006): 1859–69.
39. CODENPE, *Nueva institucionalidad del estado plurinacional* (Quito, CODENPE, 2009); CODENPE, *Políticas públicas para la Igualdad en la Diversidad*, Colección Construyendo el estado plurinacional publicación no. 2 (Quito: CODENPE, 2010); CODENPE, *Construyendo el estado plurinacional. Libro primero sobre el estado plurinacional* (Quito: CODENPE, 2011); CODENPE, *Avances, estancamientos y retrocesos en el ejercicio de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas, (1990–2010)* (Quito: CODENPE, 2011).
40. Bret Gustafson, *New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia* (London: Duke University Press, 2009).
41. Alberto Acosta and Esperanza Martínez, eds., *El Buen Vivir: Una vía para el desarrollo* (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2009).
42. Ecuador, *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2009–2013 Versión Resumida* (Quito: SENPLADES, 2009).
43. Sarah A. Radcliffe, "Development for a Postneoliberal era"; Sumak Kawsay, "Living Well and the Limits to Decolonization in Ecuador," *Geoforum* (2012) DOI:10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.09.003.
44. Stuart Hall, "Conclusion: the Multicultural Question," in *Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*, ed. B. Hesse (Zed Books: London, 2000), 4, 16.
45. Victor Bretón, *Capital social y etnodesarrollo en los Andes: La experiencia de PRODEPINE* (Quito: CAAP, 2005).
46. Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe, *Indigenous Development*.
47. Nina Laurie and Alistair Bonnett, "Adjusting to Equity: the Contradictions of Neoliberalism and the Search for Racial Equity in Peru," *Antipode* 34 (2002): 28–53.
48. Yun-Joo Park and Patricia Richards, "Negotiating Neoliberal Multiculturalism: Mapuche Workers in the Chilean State," *Social Forces* 85 (2007): 1319–39; Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe, *Indigenous Development*.
49. Maruja Barrig, "What is Justice? Indigenous Women in Andean Development Projects," in *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice*, ed. Jane Jaquette and Gale Summerfield (London: Duke University Press, 2006), 107–33.
50. Palacios, "Construyendo la diferencia."
51. Engle, *Evasive Promise*, 199–210. A vivid example of this is provided by the TIPNIS case in Bolivia where indigenous populations are contesting national plans to build a road through their territory. For a preliminary discussion, see: Catherine Walsh, "Afro- and Indigenous Life Visions in/and Politics," *Bolivian Studies Journal* 18 (2011), 49–69.
52. Plant, "Latin America's Multiculturalism"; David Gow, *Countering Development: Indigenous Modernity and the Moral Imagination* (London: Duke University Press, 2008).

Acknowledgements: This paper is dedicated to the memory of Guillermo O'Donnell and Carlos Iván Degregori, both of whom were giants in the study of political cultures.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.