



BLACKWELL
COMPANIONS TO
ANTHROPOLOGY

A Companion to
Latin American
Anthropology

Edited by Deborah Poole

A Companion
to Latin
American
Anthropology

Edited by
Deborah Poole

NB - 19048

© 2008 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd
except for editorial material and organization © 2008 by Deborah Poole

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK

The right of Deborah Poole to be identified as the author of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks, or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

First published 2008 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2008

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to Latin American anthropology / edited by Deborah Poole.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-631-23468-5 (hardcover: alk. paper) 1. Ethnology—Latin America. 2. Anthropology—Latin America. I. Poole, Deborah.

GN564.L29C64 2008
306.098—dc22

2007032294

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10/12.5pt Galliard
by SPi Publisher Services Pondicherry, India
Printed and bound in Singapore
by Markono Print Media Pte Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website at
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Notes on Contributors</i> | <i>vii</i> |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | <i>xiv</i> |
| Introduction <i>Deborah Poole</i> | 1 |
| Part I: Locations | 9 |
| 1 Argentina: Contagious Marginalities <i>Claudia Briones and Rosana Guber</i> | 11 |
| 2 Bolivia: Bridges and Chasms <i>Rossana Barragán</i> | 32 |
| 3 Brazil: Otherness in Context <i>Mariza Peirano</i> | 56 |
| 4 Colombia: Citizens and Anthropologists <i>Myriam Jimeno</i> | 72 |
| 5 Ecuador: Militants, Priests, Technocrats, and Scholars <i>Carmen Martínez Novo</i> | 90 |
| 6 Guatemala: Essentialisms and Cultural Politics <i>Brigittine M. French</i> | 109 |
| 7 Mexico: Anthropology and the Nation-State <i>Salomón Nahmad Sittón</i> | 128 |
| 8 Peru: From Otherness to a Shared Diversity <i>Carlos Iván Degregori and Pablo Sandoval</i> | 150 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Part II: Debates | 175 |
| 9 Race in Latin America <i>Peter Wade</i> | 177 |
| 10 Language States <i>Penelope Harvey</i> | 193 |
| 11 Legalities and Illegalities <i>Mark Goodale</i> | 214 |
| 12 Borders, Sovereignty, and Racialization <i>Ana M. Alonso</i> | 230 |
| 13 Writing the Aftermath: Anthropology and “Post-Conflict” <i>Isaias Rojas Pérez</i> | 254 |
| 14 Alterities: Kinship and Gender <i>Olivia Harris</i> | 276 |
| 15 <i>Vinculaciones</i> : Pharmaceutical Politics and Science <i>Cori Hayden</i> | 303 |
| 16 Agrarian Reform and Peasant Studies: The Peruvian Case <i>Linda J. Seligmann</i> | 325 |
| 17 Statistics and Anthropology: The Mexican Case <i>Casey Walsh</i> | 352 |
| Part III: Positions | 373 |
| 18 Indigenous Anthropologies beyond Barbados <i>Stefano Varese, Guillermo Delgado, and Rodolfo L. Meyer</i> | 375 |
| 19 Afro-Latin American Peoples <i>Jaime Arocha and Adriana Maya</i> | 399 |
| 20 Reconceptualizing Latin America <i>Lynn Stephen</i> | 426 |
| 21 Places and Academic Disputes: The Argentine Gran Chaco <i>Gastón Gordillo</i> | 447 |
| 22 Disengaging Anthropology <i>Alcida Rita Ramos</i> | 466 |
| 23 On the Frontlines: Forensic Anthropology <i>Victoria Sanford</i> | 485 |
| 24 Collaborative Anthropologies in Transition <i>Charles R. Hale</i> | 502 |
| <i>Index</i> | 519 |

CHAPTER 5

Ecuador: Militants, Priests, Technocrats, and Scholars

Carmen Martínez Novo

In *Ethnography in Unstable Places*, US anthropologist Carol Greenhouse (2002) makes the claim that research under conditions of dramatic change allows us to question reifications of state and society because structures cease to be a given.¹ Large-scale systems are revealed to be fragile amalgams of improvisatory arenas and expanded agency, and social projects and understandings that would otherwise be latent in society are able to surface. Thus, instability allows for more productive theorization, and expands opportunities for thinking reflexively about both ethics and ethnographic methods as ethnographers become implicated in the situations about which they write.

Greenhouse, however, looks at Third World instability from the standpoint of the relative stability of the researcher in the academia of the North – reducing the principle of “instability,” in addition to the opportunities described above, to the risk and danger that anthropologists experience under the conditions of ethnographic fieldwork. The fieldwork trip, however, implies a condition of relative impermanence: no matter how long she is in “the field,” the ethnographer is there as an outsider who will, eventually, leave and whose livelihood and permanent security does not depend on conditions in the field. Thus, what the book does not consider is how the related questions of “conjuncture” and “instability” shape research and writing done by academics located in the academies of “unstable places.” Ecuadorian social scientists, for example, often complain that “the conjuncture can eat you up.” Things change so rapidly that a study or interpretation may be obsolete in a couple of days. This vertiginous course of events may present problems as well as opportunities for academic reflection. Sometimes there is not enough time to reflect academically on the events. In addition, many scholars feel pressure to change topics of study according to the conjuncture, sacrificing long-term academic reflection. On the other hand, however, periods of intense change and the insertion of the scholar within the social fabric under analysis may allow for research agendas that are more socially and politically relevant. As Arturo Escobar has noted:

US based Latin Americanist academic fields have treated Latin America largely as an object of study, even if many of its practitioners have done so from a political perspective

and have built a practice of solidarity along the way. In contrast, critical perspectives arising from Latin America have been as a whole more prone to foreground radical political questions and positions. (2006:12)

This chapter takes this question of conjuncture – and timing – to reflect on the institutional, political-economic, and epistemic conditions that have shaped Ecuadorian anthropology since the early 1970s, when the first anthropology department was created in Quito at the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador (Catholic University of Ecuador), until the present. This period coincides with the two issues that have most occupied Ecuadorian anthropologists: the agrarian reform and the rise of one of Latin America's most powerful indigenous movements.

I define Ecuadorian anthropology as scholarship written from within Ecuadorian institutions by either Ecuadorian nationals or foreigners who reside and work in the Ecuadorian academy. For a number of reasons, silence often surrounds this production. Reviews of the literature on Ecuador written in the United States often do not take into account the work of Ecuadorian authors, leading many Ecuadorian scholars to complain that they are treated as mere native informants or field assistants by academics from the North who adopt their ideas, but who most of the time do not quote their works or add their name to publications. Similarly, in many respects, Ecuadorian anthropology tends to be more open toward the outside, to new things coming from abroad, than it is to the idea of recovering a national tradition. This tendency may be explained by a combination of factors, including the intellectual dependency that results from the colonial legacy, fear of conflict and its consequences for one's academic career, and the "politicization" of the universities in the 1970s and 1980s. During these decades, academics were not conceived of as intellectuals but as party members who were understood as either allies who should not be questioned, or opponents who needed to be ignored (Francisco Rhon, interview, August 14, 2006).²

Its emphasis on politically engaged and applied work adds interest to a revision of Ecuadorian anthropology because anthropological ideas have had important social consequences. Reviewing anthropology-making institutions and anthropologists in Ecuador, I found that the same two actors that interacted with indigenous peasants and contributed to their political organization were also the ones producing anthropological knowledge: namely, the Catholic Church and the political left. In addition, I found that the boundaries between these two institutional fields were often blurred by actors who worked together in the field and shared academic spaces. Thus, a review of anthropological literature in Ecuador provides important clues about debates on the Ecuadorian left, as well as the impact of religious ideas and practices at all levels of Ecuadorian society.

Ecuadorian anthropology has had many influences from abroad, and the resulting cosmopolitan character is an interesting value in itself. Some Ecuadorian anthropologists studied in North America or have been influenced by anthropologists who work in the US and Canada. Other anthropologists working in the Ecuadorian academia have studied in Europe, particularly France and Germany, and more recently in Spain. Similarly, French, German, Spanish, and other European anthropologists have done research in Ecuador and influenced Ecuadorian researchers. Latin American scholars and currents have been even more influential. There is an old and strong relationship between Mexican and Ecuadorian anthropology, for example. Moisés Sáenz, one of

the fathers of Mexican indigenismo, came to Ecuador in the early 1930s to carry out a study of the situation of Andean Indians. Later, Mexican indigenismo influenced the work of *Misión Andina* (1950s–1970s), a development program sponsored by the United Nations and carried out by the International Labor Organization in collaboration with Ecuador and other Andean states (Bretón 2001). These influences and relationships have led a number of Ecuadorian anthropologists to study in Mexico. Other scholars, particularly those working for *Centro Andino de Acción Popular* (CAAP, see below) were influenced by Peruvian and Bolivian anthropology. Finally, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, there was an important presence of political exiles escaping military dictatorships in Argentina and Chile.

Rather than tracing these intellectual genealogies in terms of national – or international – traditions, in this chapter I instead frame the history of Ecuadorian anthropology in terms of the important “moments” or “conjunctures” that have shaped debates within the discipline. I begin by considering the institutional landscapes through which the political and philosophical agendas of the state, the Catholic Church, and more recently nongovernmental organizations have shaped anthropological production. I then consider the important influence of the Ecuadorian left on anthropological discussions of peasant economies, indigenous culture, and gender. I conclude by looking at anthropological responses to the rise of the indigenous movement, the restructuring of the Ecuadorian state, and the diffusion of neoliberal academic agendas in the 1990s.

INSTITUTIONAL MARKS

Ecuadorian anthropology has been shaped in important ways by the country’s regional fragmentation and political and economic centralism. Most Ecuadorian anthropologists have focused on the indigenous peasantries of the Andean highlands. This fact is not unrelated to the centralism of Ecuadorian academia and the heavy concentration of universities and NGOs in the highland capital city of Quito, as well as to the political agendas of the left. The educational institutions of coastal Guayaquil, on the other hand, have been more inclined to promote “practical” specializations such as economics, business management, engineering, and agriculture, although there has also been an important archaeological tradition in the Ecuadorian coast centered around the Center for Archaeological and Anthropological Studies of the *Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral* (Polytechnic School of the Coast) and the Central Bank of Ecuador (for a classic study see Estrada 1979; for a recent critical perspective see Benavides 2006). Despite this general tendency to focus on indigenous peasants of the highlands, there is a less developed tradition of work on the coast and populations of African descent. North American anthropologist Norman Whitten (1965, 1974), Afro-European anthropologist Jean Muteba Rahier (1998), and Spanish anthropologist Paloma Fernández Rasines (2001) have developed work on populations of African descent, as have Ecuadorian scholars such as Diego Quiroga (2003), Carlos de la Torre (2002), and Maria Eugenia Chaves (1998). A few anthropologists have worked with indigenous populations of the coast like the *tsáchilas* (Ventura i Oller 1999), and there is also some anthropological work on coastal cities by anthropologists Marcelo Naranjo (1980) and Xavier Andrade (2004). Finally, there is a tradition of work on

coastal plantations by Ecuadorian and foreign scholars such as Manuel Chiriboga (1980), Andrés Guerrero (1980), and more recently Steve Striffler (2002).

There has been historically less work by Ecuadorian anthropologists on the Amazonian region than on the highlands. Foreigners dominated Amazonian anthropology for a long time (Moreno 1992). Some of these foreign researchers were perhaps seeking culturally diverse, relatively isolated communities, whereas Ecuadorian social scientists preferred to focus on the inherently political dynamics of the agrarian reform. However, some foreign anthropologists such as Blanca Muratorio (1991) have been influential in placing Amazonian peoples in larger contexts and in modernity. Nevertheless, interest in the Amazonian region grew slowly within Ecuadorian academia in the 1970s. One trigger was the historical and cultural research stimulated by evangelization, especially, as we will see, by Salesian fathers working with the Shuar in southeastern Ecuador. On the other hand, the Ecuadorian state became increasingly invested in the Amazonian region or Oriente in the 1970s due to the colonization that accompanied agrarian reform and the first exploitation of oil resources. Today there are a number of Ecuadorian researchers focusing on the Amazon. Many of them, as well as foreign scholars, study conflicts between indigenous populations and oil companies in a context in which oil companies are among the most important sponsors of scholarship (Fontaine 2003; Sawyer 2004).

Following the creation in 1972 of the Catholic University's Anthropology Department, Quito has remained the institutional center for Ecuadorian sociocultural anthropology. According to Andrés Guerrero (interview, January 20, 2006) the impetus behind the new anthropology department originated in a meeting of progressive Jesuits whose concern for the plight of Ecuador's highland peasants was at least partly inspired by the Vatican II Catholic Church Council (in 1962–65) and the Conference of Latin American Bishops in Medellín (in 1968). Francisco Rhon (interview, August 14, 2006) adds that progressive groups supported the creation of an anthropology department because they felt the need to promote critical, empirically grounded scholarship that would transcend the rigid, theoretically oriented explanations of orthodox Marxism. Originally, the department had two research lines. One, inspired by leftist politics and the agrarian reform, focused on peasant issues and sociopolitical change and was represented by anthropologists like Diego Iturralde and Fernando García. Another, led by Jesuit father Marco Vinicio Rueda, who studied for his doctorate in France, responded to the religious character of the institution and studied popular manifestations of Catholicism.

By this time (1972), the debate on the agrarian reform process (which had begun in 1964) was at its peak. In this context the applied and politically engaged aspects of Ecuadorian anthropology were reinforced. Researchers in anthropology and other social sciences asked themselves what would happen to peasants after the reform. Would they become successful subsistence peasants and improve their standard of living? Would they become proletarians or semiproletarians, or small capitalists? What role could state-led development play in bettering the lives of Ecuador's peasant population? These questions were framed within a Latin American wide debate, the *campesinista–descampesinista* debate, which discussed how peasants were articulated to capitalist modes of production (Chiriboga 1988; see also Seligmann, this volume). The answers to these questions had consequences for the revolutionary strategies of

leftist parties; what was discussed was whether the left should focus their political strategies on urban proletarians or on the countryside and peasants. The research lines of the newly formed anthropology department of the Catholic University were connected to these debates (García 1980). Influenced by the work of Russian agrarian economist Chayanov (who had been translated into Spanish by the Argentine exile and then Ecuadorian resident Eduardo Archetti), anthropologists at the Catholic University studied how reciprocity, kinship, and communal labor had allowed for peasant survival during the colonial and hacienda periods and encouraged peasant resistance to capitalism. Others worried to what extent capitalism was in fact eroding these traditional cultural strategies.

Others at the Catholic University focused on popular religion through collective fieldwork on religious rituals, particularly in the highlands (Rueda 1982). Much of this work was inspired by liberation theology and the Catholic Church's unprecedented acceptance – following Vatican II – of popular religion as a legitimate religious form. Another important influence was the Barbados Conference of 1971, which emphasized the importance of non-Western cultural elements for evangelization (see Varese, Delgado and Meyer, this volume).

The Salesian Order also played an important role in the development of Ecuadorian anthropology. Starting in the late 19th century, the Ecuadorian government has granted the Salesian Order the authority to “civilize and Christianize the Shuar” in Ecuador's southeastern lowlands and, in the process, to ensure Ecuadorian presence along the highly contested border with Peru (Botasso 1986; Rubenstein 2005; Audiovisuales Don Bosco, *Misiones en el Oriente*, n.d.). The original goal of the Salesians was to transform Shuar culture into a European or “Western” and Christian model. A first step was to compile information on Shuar language, myths and customs (Pelizzaro 1990). However, by the mid 20th century, the Salesians had begun to reflect on the importance of preserving an indigenous culture that was increasingly threatened by the colonization of Amazonian regions following the 1964 Agrarian Reform and Colonization Law. The Salesians led a process of organization that resulted in the formation in 1964 of one of the first indigenous organizations in Latin America: The Federación Interprovincial de Centros Shuar, or FISCH (Interprovincial Federation of Shuar Centers). According to the missionaries' own account, they were pioneers in promoting the Catholic Church's awareness of cultural and ethnic diversity in the first (1971) Barbados conference (Juan Botasso, at the 2005 FLACSO conference; J. Manangón, personal communication 2002).

In 1975, the Salesians started to publish their own research, along with work by Ecuadorian and indigenous intellectuals and translations of foreign works, in the collection *Mundo Shuar* (Shuar World). In 1980, stimulated by the growth of the indigenous movement and the implementation of bilingual-bicultural education, the order expanded the collection to a series entitled *Mundo Andino* (Andean World). In 1983, they unified both collections in a publishing house named *Abya Yala*, which has been the most important publisher of anthropological research in Ecuador until today. From its foundation, the main goal of *Abya Yala* was to promote respect for indigenous peoples and cultural diversity among non-Indians in Ecuador, while providing materials to indigenous communities for a better self-understanding and self-reflection on their own identity (Cucurella 2005; Audiovisuales Don Bosco, *Abya Yala*, n.d.).

In 1987 the Salesians, led again by Juan Botasso, founded the school of applied anthropology. Applied anthropology was used in the 19th and 20th centuries to improve the administration of colonized groups, particularly by the British (Kuper 1973). However, in the 1960s, critical anthropologists, among them liberation theology priests, proposed using anthropology to advocate on behalf of indigenous organizations and to help them in their development plans. Specifically, the School of Applied Anthropology was founded to encourage mission personnel to take cultural factors into account in their evangelization and human development work (Bartoli 2002). The Salesians have also been pioneers in allowing access to higher education to indigenous, Afro-Ecuadorian, and other disadvantaged students at the Universidad Politécnica Salesiana (Salesian Polytechnic University) founded in 1994.

The Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO, Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences) in Ecuador has also provided Ecuadorians and foreigners with graduate degrees in Andean History, Amazonian Studies, and Anthropology. It has been a meeting place for scholars coming from Latin America, Europe, and North America. FLACSO is an international system of research and graduate teaching in the social sciences created in 1957 with the aim of elaborating Latin American development theories and proposals for the region. As with the other institutions mentioned above, the idea of applied and politically engaged social science was present from its foundation. Although the international system of FLACSO was first created in Chile, that center had to close after the brutal 1973 coup d'état of General Augusto Pinochet. The centers in Mexico and Ecuador were founded in 1975 to give asylum to Chilean and later Argentinean academics escaping dictatorships. The anthropology department, which was opened in the early 1990s, had few permanent professors and was mainly based on the teaching of invited professors from North America, Europe, and other Latin American countries. Among them were Europeans like Penelope Harvey, Olivia Harris, Joan Pujadas, Philippe Descola, and Anne Christine Taylor, academics working in North America like Deborah Poole, Ruth Behar, Joanne Rappaport, William Roseberry, Blanca Muratorio, and James Fernández, and Latin Americans like Guillermo de la Peña. This was a list of cutting edge scholars most of whom were examples of critical thought and many of whom were women. According to the director of the program at the time, Xavier Izko (personal communication), receiving classes and conferences from women scholars was unusual at the time in Ecuador, and was only made possible by the fact that FLACSO's director, Amparo Menendez Carrión, was a woman. A few Ecuadorian scholars like Andrés Guerrero and Diego Quiroga were also hired to teach classes at FLACSO.

The history of FLACSO and the list of invited scholars attest to a characteristic of Ecuadorian academia that it still retains: its cosmopolitanism and its tendency to look abroad for inspiration, a tendency that could also be read as intellectual dependency. Preference for foreign over national scholarship was not only intellectually and politically questionable; it also brought institutional costs. Faced with a mounting financial crisis, FLACSO was forced to emphasize the sorts of applied research that could attract external funding. An interesting initiative in the anthropology department in the last years has been a graduate program in ethnic studies that has been attended by a number of indigenous leaders.

The role of the state has been weaker than the role of religious orders in the promotion of anthropological scholarship. However, in the 1970s, thanks to funds originating

in the oil boom and in the context of nationalist military dictatorships, there was considerable funding for cultural matters. According to Andrés Guerrero (interview, January 20, 2006), the Central Bank of Ecuador was a very important sponsor of archaeology and FODERUMA (Fondo de Desarrollo Rural Marginal, Development Fund for Rural and Marginal Areas) employed many anthropologists in development programs. In addition, the Central Bank created the Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología (IOA, Otavalo Institute of Anthropology), an institution that sponsored archaeological and anthropological research linked to museums. However, according to Francisco Rhon (interview, August 14, 2006), most anthropologists who worked for the state through FODERUMA carried out narrowly focused consulting jobs that did not have an important intellectual impact besides that of providing a living for researchers.

Nongovernmental organizations have been another important site for the production of anthropological knowledge. The older NGOs such as the Centro Andino de Acción Popular (CAAP, Andean Center for Popular Action) and the Centro de Planificación y Estudios Sociales (CEPLAES, Center for Planning and Social Studies), for example, started to function in the 1970s in the context of radical political struggles that required independent research. Many others appeared in the following decades, particularly in the 1990s, when neoliberal reforms to reduce the size of the state led to an NGO boom in Ecuador and in Latin America more generally. The lack of long-term positions for social scientists within state agencies and universities, together with the scarcity of research and development funding, has led scholars to create these nongovernmental centers to provide jobs for themselves. The pressure to seek private funds for research, however, has often resulted in the imposition of external theoretical agendas and the proliferation of short-term, narrowly focused, quickly written case studies.

However, some of the older centers like CAAP have resisted these trends, sponsoring independent academic research. CAAP has produced anthropological knowledge and development work for more than 30 years and publishes one of the most established journals in the social sciences in Ecuador: *Ecuador Debate*. This institution started in 1975 under the direction of Francisco Rhon. CAAP carried out organizational activities among peasants, development programs, and research simultaneously, providing an ideal environment for the kind of engaged, applied anthropology that developed in that period. CAAP promoted important *campesinista* (and some *descampesinista*) scholarship and brought to Ecuador debates on the Andean community and *lo Andino* (Andean identity) inspired in Peruvian and Bolivian scholarship.

ECUADORIAN ANTHROPOLOGY AND DEBATES WITHIN THE LEFT

Many agrarian scholars believed that the agrarian reforms of 1964 and 1973 would result in a transition toward capitalism and the formation of new peasant sectors. Marxist and other scholars had understood large properties in the highlands as feudal since they relied on servile labor until 1964. Similarly, relatively independent peasant communities were assumed to possess a different logic from capitalism, one that the agrarian reforms and the process of modernization were starting to break (Chiriboga 1988). Some researchers thought that contact with capitalism would cause the

disintegration and proletarianization of the peasant community (L. Martínez 1984), whereas others noticed complex processes of semiproletarianization and recampesinization taking place in the Ecuadorian countryside (Farga and Almeida 1981). Rural-urban migration was seen as the main mechanism of contact with capitalism and the main source of destruction of these rural/indigenous cultures of resistance (Sánchez Parga 2002). Thus, there is a tradition of stigmatization of migration in Ecuadorian social science that still permeates perceptions of international migration.

A connected debate was that of the transition of large agrarian properties to modernization and capitalism. The large properties of the coast had been perceived as linked to capitalism since the late 19th century because they exported cocoa and later bananas and other products to the world market (Chiriboga 1980; Guerrero 1980; Striffler 2002), whereas highland haciendas produced for the national market using nonwage labor arrangements. Despite the fact that the highland hacienda has been described as feudal, Andrés Guerrero (1983) showed that landowners thought and acted as capitalists when they sold hacienda products on the national market and imported agrarian technologies from the world market. However, labor relationships within haciendas were not based on salaries, but on historically grounded customary rights and duties that subordinated workers to landowners while simultaneously preserving some prehispanic indigenous customs (Guerrero 1991).

While European and North American structuralists and cultural ecologists had described the Amazonian peoples as relatively isolated, Ecuadorian anthropologists scrutinized these same societies for evidence of historical colonization, state domination, and the penetration of oil and timber companies. Ernesto Salazar's (1986) *Pioneros de la selva. Los colonos del proyecto Upano-Palora* (Pioneers of the Rain Forest: The Settlers of the Upano-Palora Project), for example, examines rain forest colonization, state policies, and the environment in order to argue for new colonization policies. In this same vein, Teodoro Bustamante's (1988) *La larga lucha del kakaram contra el sucre* (The Long Struggle of Kakaram [shuar concept of strength or power] against the Sucre [earlier Ecuadorian currency]), analyzes Shuar violence not as an intrinsic feature of their "culture," but rather as a historical reaction to colonialism. Interpreting the creation of the Salesian backed Shuar Federation in 1964 as a reaction to the wave of colonization provoked by the agrarian reform, Bustamante frames the process of ethnogenesis underlying Shuar political organization as a process of modernization, rather than as a form of "preserving tradition."

THE DEBATE ON CULTURE, DISCRIMINATION, AND RESISTANCE

It has become common sense to argue that the 1970s Latin American left was characterized by a class based approach with little sensitivity for the political potential of culture and ethnicity. However, Ecuadorian debates on culture, and its role in the political organization of peasants, challenge these widely held assumptions. Some authors such as Hugo Burgos (1970) – a progressive indigenist who was not part of the militant left – Diego Iturralde (1980) and Gladys Villavicencio (1973), all of whom studied in Mexico, began to focus on ethnic differences as a legacy of colonialism, internal colonialism, elite and state domination. Burgos carries out an analysis of central aspects of what is understood as indigenous culture and demonstrates how they constitute

mechanisms of social subordination: One example is the *minga* (communal work), which was used by the Inkas, the Spaniards, hacendados and the state to extract free labor from peasants for public works. Syncretic religious festivities were also an important factor of exploitation, according to Burgos, when local elites and the traditional Church extracted economic profits from peasants through the rental of public spaces, customs, religious objects and other necessities, and the sale of food and alcohol. Peasants were so indebted after these celebrations that they were forced to mortgage or sell their land to local *chicheros* (sellers of *chicha*, a native beer) who were also moneylenders. This argument contrasts with the point of view of Rueda (1982), who understood peasant religious festivals as a factor of resistance to colonization and as peasant creativity.

Similarly, Iturralde (1980) argued that the 1937 communal law (passed as a means of controlling a unionized and increasingly radical peasantry), and its revamping with the 1964 agrarian reform, had resulted in increased state control over the community. Like Burgos, Iturralde believed that the ethnic label “indigenous,” and the sense of belonging to a community that accompanied it, actually facilitated peasant co-optation. Likewise, Gladys Villavicencio (1973) observed during her fieldwork in Otavalo that local mestizos encouraged Otavalo to keep their traditional indigenous dress and hairstyle, as well as to remain monolingual in Quichua, to produce a clearly distinguishable group that they could exploit and discriminate against. Those Otavaleños who were able to speak Spanish or who adopted mestizo appearance were perceived as uppity and unmanageable (*alzados*) and were not hired in mestizo businesses. However, Villavicencio also noticed that one group of upwardly mobile indigenous textile manufacturers were reinforcing their ethnic pride, and contributing to the formation of an indigenous nationality as a strategy to fight discrimination. More established indigenists like Gonzalo Rubio Orbe (1973), however, rejected this conclusion.

Although some earlier indigenista authors (e.g. Buitrón 1971) had indirectly addressed the topic, Burgos’s and Villavicencio’s vivid descriptions of discrimination in the markets, public spaces, and public and private institutions of mestizo cities were among the first detailed analyses of racism in Ecuador, a topic that has only begun to be taken up again recently (J. Almeida 1996; de la Torre 1996, 2002; Cervone and Rivera 1999; Rahier 1998).

Researchers at CAAP, meanwhile, set out to rescue cultural differences for leftist politics by emphasizing the historical traditions and strategies for resistance that characterized the Andean community. CAAP’s focus on the community had several sources of inspiration, including cultural anthropologists’ models of Andean reciprocity and solidarity, John Murra’s model of environmental micro-verticality, José Carlos Mariátegui’s and Chayanov’s notion of “the peasant commune... as the cell form of a future communist society” (Roseberry 1989:176), and the Catholic idea of religious base communities (Andrés Guerrero, interview, January 20, 2006).

The foundational book in this tradition was *Comunidad andina. Alternativas políticas de desarrollo* (The Andean Community: Political Alternatives for Development) (CAAP 1981). Although published only a year after Iturralde’s sweeping critique of the community, the authors of *Comunidad andina* do not engage either Iturralde’s argument or the Ecuadorian tradition of thought on the political importance of the indigenous community (e.g. Jaramillo 1922). On the contrary, the authors in

Comunidad andina and its continuation, *Estrategias de supervivencia en la comunidad andina* (Survival Strategies in the Andean Community) (CAAP 1984), draw on an eclectic mix of Russian, Mexican and Peruvian scholarship to argue that kinship and the Andean ayllu form the bases of peasant survival. Many of the authors in the volume were heavily influenced by both functionalist understandings of kinship and social cohesion, and by the seemingly contradictory tenets of Marxism. This harmonic view of the community was not only an interpretation of reality, but also an integral part of CAAP's political project and development work. For example, CAAP encouraged peasants to put into practice the very strategies of solidarity that had supposedly characterized them in the past.

Ethnolinguists were another left group whose ethnic and cultural agenda influenced the social movement. Linguists, for example, designed and helped to implement bilingual education, an institution that is key to understanding the political culture and organizational efficiency of the indigenous movement (Martínez Novo 2004). Ethnolinguists were based at the department of linguistics of the Catholic University, a program founded as a counterweight to the influence of the Protestant Summer Institute of Linguistics (Francisco Rhon, interview, August 14, 2006). Another ethnolinguist, José Yáñez (interview, May 5, 2006), argues that while the indigenous movement and some academics close to it like himself still sponsored class based politics, ethnolinguists like Consuelo Yáñez and Ruth Moya promoted an ethnicity centered agenda. The recent Secretary of Education in the government of Alfredo Palacio (2005 to 2006), Consuelo Yáñez Cossío, for example, designed the intercultural bilingual program and elaborated Kichwa grammars, textbooks, and other materials. Ruth Moya and her sister Alba also worked on written materials for bilingual education and implemented the first degree in Andean linguistics for indigenous students at the University of Cuenca. By providing indigenous intellectuals with access to higher education, they helped to form those cadres who would later implement intercultural bilingual education in different regions of the country. Ruth Moya, who graduated at the University of Ottawa in Canada, mixed Marxism and structuralism in her work *Simbolismo y ritual en el Ecuador andino* (Symbolism and Ritual in Andean Ecuador) (1981). Similarly to *campesinista* authors, Moya interprets the survival of Andean symbols, customs, and practices as cultural resistance to colonization, modernization, and capitalism. Another important ethnolinguist, Ileana Almeida (1996), who studied linguistics in the Soviet Union, imported the Stalinist concept of oppressed nationalities, a concept that under her influence and that of other ethnolinguists was adopted by the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE).

Somewhat different is the focus of José Yáñez's *Yo declaro con franqueza. Cashnami causashcanchic* (I Sincerely Declare: We Have Lived in This Way) (1988). His book focuses on the oral history of a hacienda in Pesillo, Cayambe. Yáñez emphasizes the political significance of collaborative research for raising peasant consciousness and promoting organization, as well as for learning about peasant historical rebellions, unionization processes, and political resistance to the hacienda system. After many years of working closely with the indigenous movement and in bilingual intercultural education, today Yáñez's project focuses more on building interculturalism among mestizos in Ecuador through his classes in Kichwa language and anthropology. The idea is to make mestizos aware of their indigenous self so that they stop being secretly ashamed of themselves, become more indigenous, proud, and politically conscious.

Yáñez's political project would thus seem to resonate with the work of early 20th century Andean intellectuals, such as the Peruvian indigenista José Uriel García (1930) who rejected the idea of a "pure" Andean culture, and argued instead for a dynamic and flexible understanding of identity based on cultural *mestizaje* (see also Poole 1997).

GENDER AND ETHNICITY

Gender studies in Ecuador started to develop in the 1980s (Cuví 2006) and became incipiently institutionalized in academia in the 1990s (Herrera 2001). This scholarship was triggered in Ecuador by two concerns: the need for recognition of gender inequality and gender rights by a mostly urban, middle class feminist movement, and the agendas of international development organizations that in the 1980s start to require a gender component. Thus, the majority of work has been applied, and has been carried out from outside academia. Herrera (2001) argues that, for these reasons, a reflection on the articulations between gender and ethnicity has been scarce. Most work has centered on the oppression of women and the formation of their identity in private urban, middle class spaces, the inequality of women in public domains like the economy and politics, and the agendas of international organizations in topics such as gender and development. Paradoxically, according to Herrera, most foreign scholars working on gender in Ecuador have been anthropologists, and as such, they have privileged the study of indigenous and rural women (see, for example, Stolen 1987; Weismantel 1988; Crain 1991, 1996).

Studies of gender in indigenous contexts in Ecuador focused first on the role of female labor in peasant economies. These studies emphasize the flexibility of labor roles in indigenous peasant contexts, as well as the dignity of women's status within indigenous communities (Poeschel 1986; A. Martínez 1998). However, the seminal work of Stolen (1987) triggered reflection within Ecuador on the oppression and violence suffered by peasant women in the highlands, a violence that was characterized by Sánchez Parga (1990) as a way to restore Andean harmony, and as an Andean tradition of ritual fight linked to the Pan-Andean *tinkuy* (the violent union of opposites). Since then, the debate on gender and ethnicity has continued to focus on whether indigenous societies are egalitarian from a gender point of view, or unequal and characterized by discrimination and violence toward women. This debate is not, of course, restricted to Ecuador, but rather reaches across the Andean countries (see Harris, this volume). The discourse of gender complementarity, which is part of the official self-description of indigenous organizations, would seem to justify indigenous women's privileging of ethnic discrimination over gender oppression, as well as their lack of common agendas with the white-mestizo and urban-centered feminist movement (Prieto 1998; Prieto et al. 2005). On the other hand, it has been argued that indigenous societies are hierarchical from a gender point of view and that indigenous women would benefit from joining a feminist agenda and adding to it, while feminists would benefit from making their movement more inclusive (Prieto 1998; Prieto et al. 2005).

The differences between the highlands and the Amazonian region have also been pointed out (Cervone 1998). Whereas indigenous women in the highlands, despite

sometimes acknowledged inequalities, have benefited from the flexibility of gender roles and from expanded spaces for political action, gender in the Amazon has been characterized by separate spaces for men and women, and women seem to have lost power and independence with processes of modernization that have encroached on their traditional spaces (Cervone 1998). Often, the violence and oppression against Amazonian, and Andean, women is interpreted as a Western and capitalist influence that has disrupted traditional gender relations described as harmonious. This assumption is challenged by Blanca Muratorio (2001), who uses archival and oral sources to show that gender violence among the Napo-Kichwas of the Ecuadorian Amazon has roots both internal to the culture and colonial.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE INDIGENOUS MOVEMENT

Starting in the early 1980s, Ecuadorian Indians had begun to take the first steps toward the formation of a united indigenous movement that would transform national politics in Ecuador. Although many regional, or second tier, indigenous organizations and communal associations had been active for many years, it was not until 1986 that the largest organization of highland Indians, ECUARUNARI, joined with the lowland CONFENIAE (Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of the Ecuadorian Amazon) to form the united Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador, or CONAIE. Four years later, CONAIE organized its first nationwide indigenous uprising. The uprising paralyzed the country, creating awareness among mestizo Ecuadorians of the organizational strength that indigenous peasants had acquired. Since then, periodical national uprisings have succeeded in halting or slowing the implementation of neoliberal reforms in Ecuador. Indigenous revolts have focused on the resolution of land claims, opposition to the 1994 law that sought to put an end to the process of agrarian reform, the declaration of Ecuador as a pluricultural state, opposition to the elimination of subsidies for basic products including natural gas and gasoline, intercultural education, and the demarcation of indigenous territories. In 1995, the indigenous social movement was enriched with its own political party, Pachakutik. In 1998, the Ecuadorian constitution was reformed to include the multicultural character of the nation as well as an array of indigenous rights.

The indigenous movement has definitely changed a country that until the 1980s was still very much based on a past of haciendas, servitude, and lack of citizenship rights. However, as critics have pointed out (Bretón 2001; Santana 2004), despite the formation of an indigenous middle class, most indigenous communities still live in poverty. Moreover, although constitutional indigenous rights were achieved, the secondary laws necessary for their implementation have not been developed. In addition, the indigenous movement participated in a military coup d'état in the year 2000 and reached governmental power in 2002 with Colonel Lucio Gutierrez. Once in power, Pachakutik for a number of reasons, including growing differences with the military president, did little to transform the country. In the 2006 presidential elections, we find a fragmented and weakened movement that was only able to get little above 2 percent of the vote in support of Luis Macas, its presidential candidate, while retaining some of its strength in Congress and at the local level.

How has this process been interpreted by anthropologists in Ecuador? Beginning in the mid-1980s, Ecuadorian anthropologists – influenced by their own activism with indigenous people and by an international academic turn toward the study of resistance – had begun to study the history and forms of indigenous protest (Prieto 1980; Moreno 1985; Ramón 1987; Yáñez 1988; Bustamante 1988). The fact that many authors failed to fully comprehend the importance of the powerful organizational machinery that was in the making can be attributed, on the one hand, to the indigenous peasants' politically strategic (and historically justified) silence about their political activities, and on the other, to the role of the Catholic Church in the early indigenous organizations (Martínez Novo 2004; Rubenstein 2005). Many leftist scholars were anticlerical and dismissed the activities of the Church as reinforcing the status quo. For instance, Father Juan Botasso (1986) was well aware that strong political organizations based on indigenous identity are being built with the help of the missionary Catholic Church.

After the first indigenous uprising of 1990, and following the recurring mobilizations of the indigenous movement, a number of books and articles were published. These studies reflected an important characteristic of social sciences in Ecuador: many were studies of the conjuncture. One of the first books written by anthropologists after the 1990 indigenous uprising challenged traditional indigenista policies, while also criticizing the left for not having given importance to ethnic differences in the past (Moreno and Figueroa 1992). Two influential collective works written immediately after the indigenous uprising of 1990 are *Indios. Una reflexión sobre el levantamiento indígena de 1990* (Indians: A Reflection on the 1990 Indigenous Uprising) (Cornejo 1991) and *Sismo étnico en el Ecuador* (Ethnic Earthquake in Ecuador) (Almeida et al. 1993). *Indios* brought together scholars who worked on indigenous issues and social actors such as indigenous activists, landowners and the military, while *Sismo étnico* also featured academic analyses by both white/mestizo and indigenous intellectuals. A more recent book by Fernando Guerrero and Pablo Ospina (2003) focuses on the connections between indigenous mobilization and neoliberal structural adjustment. The authors, however, also note the collaboration of the indigenous movement with what they characterize as neoliberal governments since the movement's entrance into the political sphere in 1995. Other authors have focused on particular aspects of indigenous struggles, such as the search for legal pluralism (García 2002). While documenting a wide array of indigenous legal uses, some of these works also reflect a romantic view of the community and fail to be critical when indigenous legal practices collide with human rights.

Such complexities attest to the ambiguities and contradictions of the indigenous movement, and present a challenge to anthropologists in their attempts to describe and understand indigenous "resistance." Here it is important to note that much of the work done since 1990 on the indigenous movement has been done by anthropologists working as consultants for (or otherwise funded by) international agencies. The majority of this work has supported the movement even in moments of crisis or when it has made important mistakes (for example, during the 2000 coup d'état or the alliance with Lucio Gutiérrez). In fact, some of these scholars are themselves advisors to the movement or collaborate closely with it in consulting or development work. This close collaboration makes it difficult for authors to defend a critical position with respect to the indigenous movement, especially because scholars now often require the approval of indigenous organizations to get funds from international agencies.

Substantial critiques of the indigenous movement have been made by Roberto Santana and Víctor Bretón. Santana (2004), who teaches in France, draws on his long-term work on Ecuadorian indigenous politics to describe how the movement's organizational "fetishism" prevents it from developing a coherent political project. Bretón (2001, 2005) shows that development projects and particularly the World Bank's Development Program for Indigenous and Black Peoples (PRODEPINE, Programa de Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas y Negros) – which has been widely embraced by the indigenous movement – have failed to improve indigenous peoples' lives, and led to the political demobilization of a once radical movement. Bretón's work contributed to the indigenous movement's recent rejection of the second phase of PRODEPINE. Some critiques have also been presented by the Catholic Church. Father Miguel Angel Cabodevilla (2004) of the Aguarico Vicariate, has written a moving and passionate book about the genocide of what he calls the "hidden peoples," indigenous groups neighboring the more numerous Huaorani, and still living with little contact with Ecuadorian society. Cabodevilla argues that oil and timber companies are encouraging the Huaorani Indians who lead the Organización de la Nacionalidad Huaorani del Ecuador (a branch of CONFENIAE and CONAIE) to exterminate these other peoples. Father Cabodevilla is ethically involved in protecting the human rights of these peoples – who, paradoxically, are legally represented in relation to the Ecuadorian state by the very organization that is annihilating them.

INDIGENOUS SCHOLARS AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Although every Ecuadorian has enjoyed a constitutional right to elementary education since the 19th century (Ramón 1991), in practice most indigenous peoples were functionally illiterate and excluded from public education until the 1970s. The educational efforts of the Communist Party, which opened clandestine schools for indigenous peasants in the 1940s, the work of the progressive Catholic Church, and the struggles of the indigenous organizations themselves have allowed for the formation of a group of indigenous intellectuals. These intellectuals started to acquire literacy, high school diplomas, higher education, and more recently access to graduate education and international grants. Despite these achievements, their insertion in academia is not yet complete. Unlike what happened 20 years ago, indigenous peoples now participate in academic conferences as students, speakers and audience. However, most indigenous intellectuals find jobs in politics or intercultural bureaucracies, and remain underrepresented in academic institutions. As a result, indigenous intellectuals have, to date, not published as much as their nonindigenous counterparts, a problem that is often noted at meetings of the indigenous movement (Kar Atamaint, personal communication). With this history of difficulties and exclusion in mind, I will briefly comment on a few published works by indigenous authors.

In the 1970s, the Salesians started to publish the work of Shuar intellectuals in the collection *Mundo Shuar*. José Vicente Jintiach, a historic leader of the Shuar Federation and one of the first to get access to higher education, at the Catholic University, published his reflections on the difficult adjustments facing the Shuar youth who entered Salesian boarding schools. Jintiach's book (1976) portrays the Shuar as a people fully integrated into, and fond of, modernity, who enjoyed the few movies to which they

had access in Sucúa and the music of the Beatles. As is typical of the egalitarian Shuar culture, Jintiach is very critical of the Salesians' authority. According to Jintiach, Shuar adolescents find the lack of personal liberty and the sexual repression they encounter in the boarding schools particularly painful. However, Jintiach unambiguously recognizes the importance of the opportunity provided by the Salesian schools for education in the dominant culture. A much more recent work that also questions essentialism and presents indigenous peoples as fully integrated into modernity is Gina Maldonado's *Comerciantes y viajeros. De la imagen etnoarqueológica de lo indígena al imaginario del Kichwa Otavalo universal* (Merchants and Travelers: From the Ethnoarchaeological Image of Indigenous People to the Universal Quichua Otavalo Imaginary) (2004). Maldonado, who obtained her M.A. in anthropology at FLACSO-Ecuador, draws on interviews with young Otavaleños who are business people and who often travel to Europe, the United States, and other Latin American countries to question the anthropological image of Otavaleños as a people who are "frozen in the past." Instead, she argues that Otavaleños are themselves struggling to define what it means to be indigenous within modernity and globalization.

By contrast with Jintiach and Maldonado, another recent book by another anthropology M.A. from FLACSO, Raul Ilaquiche (2004), represents indigenous culture as fixed since prehispanic times, arguing that such a representation is necessary in order to legitimize the claims of the indigenous movement to legal pluralism (a right that was recognized for the first time in the 1998 constitution). Ilaquiche is also uncritical of the tensions between indigenous justice and human rights, which is one of the most important bottlenecks for the implementation of indigenous legal systems, as well as of the legacy of hacienda practices in indigenous customary legal practices. Thus, the work of indigenous scholars – although not abundant given their difficult access to the sorts of academic jobs where writing is encouraged and possible – do enrich Ecuadorian anthropology with a variety of different perspectives.

CONCLUSION: ACADEMICS OR CONSULTANTS?

How, then, does living in an economically and politically unstable environment affect the intellectual work of anthropologists residing in Ecuador? Instability does good and bad things to our ability to produce knowledge and to the kind of knowledge produced for those who not only study, but also live in unstable places (Greenhouse 2002). It is important to note that in Ecuador academic jobs are limited, institutions tend to be fragile, and the state does not now – and perhaps never did – provide anthropologists with a reliable framework within which to work. Since the mid-1980s, academics in Ecuador have relied more and more on consulting work for international agencies like the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the United Nations. Others have been forced, or have chosen, to work for private companies – including oil companies, which now finance some Amazonian anthropology. Others have had to work with the validation of the social actors they study. Of course, this has had important ethical implications for those whose desirable role might be to provide a perspective of critical distance. Even those who are lucky enough to work for more or less stable academic institutions, such as the universities, are required to bring in private funds that can sustain these institutions financially. While this process is certainly

linked to the neoliberalization of academia that is also taking place in the North, the stakes are much higher in an “unstable” and poorer country with virtually no safety net for those intellectuals who do not succeed in the entrepreneurial world of consultancies (Escobar 2006). On the other hand, rejecting external private funds and depending on state money makes institutions vulnerable to political influences and to uncontrollable factors like oil prices in an oil-fueled state.

In addition to the lack of diversity discussed earlier, another problem in Ecuadorian academia relates to the position of women. Although, as has been pointed out throughout the chapter, some of the most important contributions to Ecuadorian anthropology have been made by women, whose works often do not receive the attention they merit, they tend to be in academic positions that are more fragile than those of men; they are not invited to the conferences and debates that deal with public issues; and their contributions to research tend to remain unrecognized.

Another difficulty facing Ecuadorian anthropologists is that solid academic work is often restricted to theses and dissertations. Many academic contributions to Ecuadorian anthropology by authors such as Galo Ramón (1987), Mercedes Prieto (2004), Susana Andrade (2004), and Eduardo Kingman (2006) have been published theses. For instance, Prieto's *Liberalismo y temor. Imaginando los sujetos indígenas en el Ecuador postcolonial* (Liberalism and Fear: Imagining Indigenous Subjects in Postcolonial Ecuador) (2004) draws on a rigorously researched review of congressional and other political debates, as well as academic texts, to trace liberal debates about indigenous peoples in the first half of the 20th century. Prieto characterized these debates as being marked by a tension between fear of popular groups, ethnic subordination, and the longing for a certain degree of equality. Susana Andrade's *Protestantismo indígena* (2004) is based on long-term fieldwork and reflection among indigenous Protestants in Chimborazo. She looks at indigenous Protestantism in the context of processes of economic, social, and political change, and shows how a religious current of North American origin becomes inserted within, and transformed by, local and Kichwa logics. Kingman (2006) discusses how concepts of the urban and the modern which circulated in early 20th century Quito, rendered invisible the city's indigenous migrants and lower classes.

However, as Greenhouse (2002) and the authors of *Ethnography in Unstable Places* note, instability and fragility can often lead to insights and creative solutions. As I have discussed at length, Ecuadorian anthropologists in the last decades have overcome institutional obstacles to play major roles in public debates on important social and political transformations, and they have tended to avoid trivial discussions in an environment where the contribution of academia to the understanding and improvement of a fragile reality is deemed fundamental.

NOTES

- 1 I would like to thank Deborah Poole for her comments and thorough editorial work. Víctor Bretón, Francisco Rhon, José Yáñez, Andrés Guerrero, Carlos de la Torre, and the colleagues at FLACSO-Ecuador provided valuable insights as well.
- 2 Some of the same reasons have been used to explain the “conspiracy of silence” that surrounds Ecuadorian literary works from this time period (Arcos Cabrera 2005).

REFERENCES

- Almeida, Ileana (1996) *Temas y cultura quichua en el Ecuador*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Almeida, José (1996). Fundamentos del racismo ecuatoriano. *Ecuador Debate* 38:55–71.
- Almeida, José et al. (1993) *Sismo étnico en Ecuador*. Quito: CEDIME/Abya Yala.
- Andrade, Susana (2004) *Protestantismo indígena. Procesos de conversión religiosa en la provincia de Chimborazo, Ecuador*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Andrade, Xavier (2004) Burocracia. Museos, políticas culturales y flexibilización laboral en Guayaquil. *Iconos* 20:64–72.
- Arcos Cabrera, Carlos (2005) Los avatares de la literatura ecuatoriana. El caso Chiriboga. *Letras* (Chile), Sept.
- Audiovisuales Don Bosco (n.d.) *Abya Yala*. DVD. Quito.
- Audiovisuales Don Bosco (n.d.) *Misiones en el Oriente*. DVD. Quito.
- Bartoli, Laura (2002) *Antropología aplicada. Historia y perspectivas desde América Latina*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Benavides, Hugo (2006) La representación del pasado sexual de Guayaquil. Historizando a los encaquirados. *Iconos* 24:145–160.
- Botasso, Juan (1986) Las nacionalidades indígenas, el estado y las misiones en el Ecuador. *Ecuador Debate* 12:151–159.
- Bretón, Víctor (2001) *Cooperación al desarrollo y demandas étnicas en los Andes ecuatorianos*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Bretón, Víctor (2005) *Capital social y etnodesarrollo en los Andes*. Quito: CAAP.
- Burgos, Hugo (1970) *Relaciones interétnicas en Riobamba*. Mexico City: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano. Republished Quito: Corporación Editora Nacional, 1997.
- Buitrón, Aníbal (1971[1949]) *El valle del amanecer*. Otavalo: Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología.
- Bustamante, Teodoro (1988) *La larga lucha del kakaram contra el sucre*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- CAAP (Centro Andino de Acción Popular) (1981) *Comunidad andina. Alternativas políticas de desarrollo*. Quito: CAAP.
- CAAP (Centro Andino de Acción Popular) (1984). *Estrategias de supervivencia en la comunidad andina*. Quito: CAAP.
- Cabodevilla, Miguel Angel (2004) *El exterminio de los pueblos ocultos*. Quito: CICAME.
- Cervone, Emma (1998) *Mujeres contracorriente. Voces de líderes indígenas*. Quito: CEPLAES.
- Cervone, Emma and Rivera, Freddy (1999) *Ecuador racista. Imágenes e identidades*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Chaves, María Eugenia (1998) *María Chiquinquirá Días. Una esclava del siglo XVIII. Acerca de las identidades de amo y esclavo en el Puerto colonial de Guayaquil*. Guayaquil: Archivo Histórico del Guayas-Banco Central de Ecuador.
- Chiriboga, Manuel (1980) *Jornaleros y gran propietarios en 135 años de explotación cacaotera*. Quito: CIESE.
- Chiriboga, Manuel (1988) *El problema agrario en el Ecuador*. Quito: ILDIS.
- Cornejo, Diego (ed.) (1991) *Indios. Una reflexión sobre el levantamiento indígena de 1990*. Quito: ILDIS/Duende/Abya Yala.
- Crain, Mary (1991) Poetics and Politics in the Ecuadorian Andes: Women's Narratives of Death and Devil Possession. *American Ethnologist* 18(1).
- Crain, Mary (1996) The Gendering of Ethnicity in the Ecuadorian Andes. In A. Stolen and M. Melhus (eds), *Machos, Mistresses and Madonnas*. New York: Verso.
- Cucurella, Leonella (2005) *Abya Yala. Tierra en plena madurez*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Cuvi, María (2006) *Pensamiento feminista y escritos de mujeres en el Ecuador. 1980–1990*. Quito: UNIFEM–UNICEF.
- de la Torre, Carlos (1996) *El racismo en el Ecuador. Experiencias de los indios de clase media*. Quito: CAAP (2nd edn 2002 with Abya Yala).
- de la Torre, Carlos (2002) *Afroquiteños. Ciudadanía y racismo*. Quito: CAAP.

- Escobar, Arturo (2006) Revisioning Latin American and Caribbean Studies: A Geopolitics of Knowledge Approach. *Latin American Studies Association Forum* 37(2):11–14.
- Estrada, Víctor Emilio (1979) *Últimas civilizaciones prehistóricas de la cuenca del río Guayas*. Guayaquil: Publicaciones del Archivo Histórico del Guayas.
- Farga, Cristina and Almeida, José (1981) *Campesinos y haciendas de la sierra norte*. Otavalo-Ecuador: Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología.
- Fernández Rasines, Paloma (2001) *Afrodescendencia en el Ecuador. Raza y género desde los tiempos de la colonia*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Fontaine, Guillaume (2003) *El precio del petróleo. Conflictos socio-ambientales y gobernabilidad en la región amazónica*. Quito: FLACSO.
- García, Fernando (1980) Introducción. *Revista de la Universidad Católica* 8(26):7–14.
- García, Fernando (2002) *Formas indígenas de administrar justicia*. Quito: FLACSO.
- García, José Uriel (1930) *El nuevo indio*. Lima: Colección de autores peruanos.
- Greenhouse, Carol (2002) Introduction. In C. Greenhouse, E. Mertz, and K. Warren (eds), *Ethnography in Unstable Places: Everyday Lives in Contexts of Dramatic Political Change* (pp. 1–34). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Guerrero, Andrés (1980) *Los oligarcas del cacao*. Quito: El Conejo.
- Guerrero, Andrés (1983) *Haciendas, capital y lucha de clases andina*. Quito: El Conejo.
- Guerrero, Andrés (1991) *La semántica de la dominación. El concertaje de indios*. Quito: Libri Mundi.
- Guerrero, Fernando and Ospina, Pablo (2003) *El poder de la comunidad. Ajuste estructural y movimiento indígena en los Andes Ecuatorianos*. Quito: CLACSO.
- Herrera, Gioconda (2001) Los estudios de género en el Ecuador. Entre el conocimiento y el reconocimiento. In G. Herrera (ed.), *Antología de estudios de género*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Ilaquiche, Raul (2004) *Pluralismo jurídico y administración de justicia indígena en Ecuador*. Quito: Hans Seidel.
- Iturralde, Diego (1980) *Guamote. Campesinos y comunas*. Otavalo-Ecuador: Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología.
- Jaramillo, Pío (1922) *El indio ecuatoriano*. Quito: Corporación Editora Nacional.
- Jintiaich, José Vicente (1976). *La integración del estudiante Shuar en su grupo social*. Quito: Mundo Shuar.
- Kingman, Eduardo (2006) *La ciudad y los otros. Quito 1860–1940*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Kuper, Adam (1973) *Antropología y antropólogos. La escuela británica*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Maldonado, Gina (2004) *Comerciantes y viajeros. De la imagen etnoarqueológica de lo indígena al imaginario del Kichwa otavalo universal*. Quito: FLACSO/Abya Yala.
- Martínez, Alexandra (1998) La producción de esteras en Yahuarcocha y la construcción del significado de ser mujer y ser hombre. In C. Landázuri (ed.), *Memorias del primer congreso ecuatoriano de antropología*. Quito: PUCE-Marka.
- Martínez, Luciano (1984) *De campesinos a proletarios*. Quito: el Conejo.
- Martínez Novo, Carmen (2004) Los misioneros salesianos y el movimiento indígena de Cotopaxi 1970–2004. *Ecuador Debate* 63:235–268.
- Moreno Yáñez, Segundo (1985) *Sublevaciones indígenas en la Audiencia de Quito desde comienzos del S. XVIII hasta finales de la colonia*. Quito: PUCE.
- Moreno Yáñez, Segundo (1992) *Antropología ecuatoriana. Pasado y presente*. Quito: Ediguías.
- Moreno Yáñez, Segundo and Figueroa, José (1992) *El levantamiento indígena del Inti Raymi*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Moya, Ruth (1981) *Simbolismo y ritual en el Ecuador Andino*. Otavalo-Ecuador: Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología.
- Muratorio, Blanca (1991) *The Life and Times of Grandfather Alonso: Culture and History in the Upper Amazon*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Muratorio, Blanca (2001) History and Cultural Memory of Violence against Indigenous Women in the Ecuadorian Upper Amazon. MS.

- Naranjo, Marcelo (1980) *Etnicidad, estructura social y poder en Manta*. Otavalo: Pendoneros.
- Pelizzaro, Siro (1990) *Arutam. Mitología Shuar*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Poeschel, Ursula (1986) *La mujer salasaca*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Poole, Deborah (1997) *Vision, Race and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Prieto, Mercedes (1980) Haciendas estatales. Un caso de ofensiva campesina. In O. Barsky et al. (eds), *Ecuador: cambios en el agro serrano*. Quito: FLACSO/CEPLAES.
- Prieto, Mercedes (1998) El liderazgo en las mujeres indígenas. Tendiendo puentes entre género y étnia. In E. Cervone (ed.), *Mujeres contracorriente*. Quito: CEPLAES.
- Prieto, Mercedes (2004) *Liberalismo y temor. Imaginando los sujetos indígenas en el Ecuador postcolonial*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Prieto, Mercedes, Cuminao, Clorinda, Flores, Alejandra, Maldonado, Gina, and Pequeño, Andrea (2005) Las mujeres indígenas y la búsqueda del respeto. In *Mujeres ecuatorianas. Entre la crisis y las oportunidades*. Quito: FLACSO.
- Quiroga, Diego (2003) The Devil and Development in Esmeraldas: Cosmology as a System of Critical Thought. In N. Whitten (ed.), *Millennial Ecuador* (pp. 154–183). Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Rahier, Jean Muteba (1998) Blackness, the Racial Spatial Order, Migrations and Miss Ecuador 1995–1996. *American Anthropologist* 100(2):421–430.
- Ramón, Galo (1987) *La resistencia andina. Cayambe 1500–1800*. Quito: CAAP.
- Ramón, Galo (1991) Ese secreto poder de la escritura. In D. Cornejo (ed.), *Indios*. Quito: ILDIS/Duende/Abya Yala.
- Roseberry, William (1989) *Anthropologies and Histories*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Rubenstein, Steven (2005) La conversión de los Shuar. *Iconos* 22, special issue on politics and religion: 27–48.
- Rubio Orbe, Gonzalo (1973) Prólogo. In G. Villavicencio, *Relaciones interétnicas en Otavalo*. Mexico City: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano.
- Rueda, Marco Vinicio (1982) *La fiesta religiosa campesina*. Quito: Ediciones de la Universidad Católica.
- Salazar, Ernesto (1986) *Pioneros de la selva*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Sánchez Parga, José (1990) *¿Por qué golpearla? Ética, estética y ritual en los Andes*. Quito: CAAP.
- Sánchez Parga, José (2002) *Crisis en torno al Quilotoa. Mujer, cultura y comunidad*. Quito: CAAP.
- Santana, Roberto (2004) Cuando las élites indígenas giran en redondo. El caso de los liderazgos indígenas en Ecuador. *Ecuador Debate* 61:235–258.
- Sawyer, Suzana (2004) *Crude Chronicles: Indigenous Politics, Multinational Oil, and Neoliberalism in Ecuador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stolen, Kristi Anne (1987) *A media voz. Relaciones de género en la sierra ecuatoriana*. Quito: CEPLAES.
- Striffler, Steve (2002) *In the Shadows of State and Capital: The United Fruit Company, Popular Struggle and Agrarian Restructuring in Ecuador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ventura i Oller, Montserrat (1999) Ser Tsáchila en el Ecuador contemporáneo. *Ecuador Debate* 48:95–118.
- Villavicencio, Gladys (1973) *Relaciones interétnicas en Otavalo. ¿Una nacionalidad india en formación?* Mexico City: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano.
- Weismantel, Mary (1988) *Food, Gender, and Poverty in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Whitten, Norman (1965) *Class, Kinship, and Power in an Ecuadorian Town: The Negroes of San Lorenzo*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Whitten, Norman (1974) *Black Frontiersmen: Afro-Hispanic Culture of Ecuador and Colombia*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Yáñez, José (1988) *Yo declaro con franqueza. Cashmami causashcanchic*. Quito: Abya Yala.