ETHNIC MOVEMENTS AND CITIZENSHIP IN ECUADOR

Carlos de la Torre
FLACSO-Ecuador

COOPERACIÓN AL DESARROLLO Y DEMANDAS ÉTNICAS EN LOS ANDES ECUATORIANOS: ENSAYOS SOBRE INDIGENISMO, DESARROLLO RURAL Y NEOINDIGENISMO. By Víctor Bretón Solo de Zaldívar. (Quito and Lleida, Ecuador: FLACSO and the Universitat de Lleida, 2001. Pp. 278.)

ESTADO, ETNICIDAD Y MOVIMIENTOS SOCIALES EN AMÉRICA LATINA: ECUADOR EN CRISIS. Edited by Víctor Bretón and Francisco García. (Barcelona, Spain: Icaria, 2003.)

ANDEAN ENTREPRENEURS: OTAVALO MERCHANTS AND MUSICIANS IN THE GLOBAL ARENA. By Lynn A. Meisch. (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2002. Pp. 328. $50.00 cloth, $19.95 paper.)

LIBERALISMO Y TEMOR: IMAGINANDO A LOS SUJETOS INDÍGENAS EN EL ECUADOR POSTCOLONIAL, 1895–1950. By Mercedes Prieto. (Quito, Ecuador: FLACSO and Abya Yala, 2004. Pp. 283.)

CRUDE CHRONICLES: INDIGENOUS POLITICS, MULTINATIONAL OIL, AND NEOLIBERALISM IN ECUADOR. By Suzana Sawyer. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004. Pp. 312. $21.95 paper.)

MILLENNIAL ECUADOR. CRITICAL ESSAYS ON CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS. Edited by Norman Whitten (Iowa City: Iowa University Press, 2003. Pp. 438. $59.95 cloth, $27.95 paper.)

Perhaps the most significant event in Ecuador in the 1990s was the emergence of ethnic movements. In 1986, after a prolonged period of organization, indigenous nationalities of the three main regions (coast, sierra, and Amazonía) created the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE). This organization led several mobilizations and "uprisings" in July 1990, April 1992, June 1994, January and February 1997, January 2000, and January 2001. CONAIE, however, is not the only indigenous organization. Indigenous evangelicals have their own organization, the Federación de Indígenas Evangélicos del Ecuador (FEINE)

Latin American Research Review, Vol. 41, No. 2, June 2006

and their own political party Amauta Jatari (renamed as Amauta Yuyay) that has participated in elections since 1998. Even though FEINE and CONAIE tend to compete for state resources, they have joined forces a few times as they did in the 2001 indigenous uprising.

Indigenous uprisings are forms of collective action in which indigenous communities have blocked major roads and have marched to cities to present their demands. Indigenous organizations have been at the forefront of the opposition to structural adjustment policies. They have also incorporated ethnic claims such as bilingual education and changing national identity from mestizo to multicultural and multiethnic. Indigenous protests were prominent in the removal of two elected presidents from office, Abdalá Bucaram in February 1997 and Jamil Mahuad in January 2000.

Indigenous protests have met with little repression. State officials, including presidents of different ideological orientations, have entered into national dialogues and have accepted some of the groups' claims. The Constitution of 1998, for instance, incorporated collective rights and has changed the character of the nation to multicultural and multiethnic. CONAIE has directed bilingual education programs that target indigenous people and has participated with the government and the World Bank in PRODEPINE (Proyecto de Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas y Afroecuatorianos), the first major ethno-development project in the Americas. In addition, indigenous nationalities of the Oriente were granted more than a million hectares of land.

Even though Afro-Ecuadorians have not had the same visibility as indigenous people, the number of black and Afro organizations multiplied in the 1990s. The state and the World Bank have included them in ethno-development projects, and Afro-Ecuadorians are demanding the creation of *palenques* (named after runaway slave settlements) in their "ancestral" territories in the northern province of Esmeraldas. What explains the emergence of ethnic movements in Ecuador? How can we account for state responses? What are some of the transformations of ethnic relations? Is Ecuador experiencing a renewal of the meanings of citizenship? The books discussed in this review give important clues to answer these questions.

LIBERALISM AND FEAR

Mercedes Prieto focuses on the political and academic debates of the elites about "Indians" between 1895 and 1950 to analyze the ambiguities of the liberal universalistic project in a postcolonial nation. This period has been characterized by Andrés Guerrero (2000) as a time in which ethnic administration was transferred from the state into the private hands of hacienda owners. Until 1857, the colonial and postcolonial

state had administered people labeled as "Indians" through a bureaucratic apparatus designed to collect Indian tribute, a form of taxation that accounted for about 30 percent of the state budget. Guerrero argues that the abolition of Indian tribute created citizens who were equal before the law, although only literates could vote. To belong to the nation and to have rights, indigenous people needed to be transformed into mestizos, and for Guerrero the category "Indian" marked the boundary between who was included and excluded.

Haciendas were systems of economic exploitation and of political and ethnic domination. In exchange for having access to a plot of land, indigenous peasants had to provide a series of services to the landlord, such as working in the fields and in his house. Haciendas monopolized the best land. The first agrarian census showed that in the 1950s in the highlands "large properties controlled more that three quarters of the total area" (Zamosc 1994, 43). Indigenous peasants could not vote because illiterate people were excluded from the franchise until the late 1970s.

Prieto studies the creation of academic discourses in particular institutions and disciplines such as archeology and sociology. Academics of the elites developed a racist discourse to argue that indigenous people belonged to the countryside, were fit for manual labor, and had a peculiar psychological make up. Given the fundamental differences between indigenous and white people, special institutions such as *cabildos* (community councils) and communities were designed to govern indigenous people. Not all academics and intellectuals, however, accepted such racist claims. Prieto analyzes how a minority developed anti-racist discourses.

Differently from other Latin American experiences and from the interpretation of scholars such as Clark (1998), Prieto argues that Ecuador experienced relatively weak policies of *mestizaje*. These policies did not uniformly aim to abolish Indian culture in order to integrate indigenous people. Moreover, different from the common view that in order to be a citizen one could not be indigenous, Prieto analyzes debates and literacy crusades whose goal was to create quichua-speaking citizens in the 1940s. Even though the first census, which took place in 1950, did not use the category "race," it did not hide indigenous people; on the contrary, it marked their languages and objects of material culture as indigenous. In sum, through scientific and political discourses, the elite constructed indigenous subjects that were understood as fundamentally different from the white norm. Because Indians were imagined as "essentially" rebellious people who wanted social revenge, politicians and intellectuals of the elite used racist discourses to reconcile equality and inequality.

Prieto centers her analysis on elite fears of indigenous people. However, by ignoring Afro-Ecuadorians, her analysis remains incomplete. Although Afro-Ecuadorians have not had the same importance as

indigenous Ecuadorians in the thinking of intellectuals, they have not remained completely absent. As Norman Whitten (1981, 17) wrote long ago, Afro-Ecuadorians have been seen as a "problem" when intellectuals of the elites argued about the difficulties of incorporating them into "civilization," and when they discussed the "negative" impact of "Black blood" in the rebellious spirit of popular classes of the coast. Afro-Ecuadorians have also occupied a prominent role in elite racist thinking about their innate "criminal tendencies" (de la Torre 2002, 19–22; Rahier 1998). If Prieto's main argument is about elite fears, the terror blacks inspired in them needs to be studied.

ETHNICITY AND CRISES IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

Two fine anthologies analyze the ambiguities between innovation and continuity brought about by ethnic mobilization. The first one, edited by Norman Whitten, brings together several anthropological studies. Its main interest lies, in my opinion, in the excellent articles on race and ethnicity. *Millennial Ecuador*, however, lacks a good political and economic analysis to contextualize the articles whose focus goes from indigenous (Corr; Uzendoski) and black religiosity (Quiroga) to ethnic mobilizations (Vickers; Whiten and Whiten; Macas, Belote and Belote), and from crafts and arts (Dorothea Whitten; Colloredo-Mansfeld) to representations of the nation (Rahier; Weismantel). While the main silence of *Millennial Ecuador* is on political economy, this is the main contribution of *Estado, etnicidad y movimientos sociales*. This volume, edited by Victor Bretón, an anthropologist, and Francisco García, a geographer, has provocative analyses of the regionalized political system (León), the 1990s economic crisis (Francisco García), and neoliberalism and ethnicity in the highlands (Bretón; Martínez; Fernando García). Its main silence, however, is the analysis of race.

Both volumes focus on the impact of indigenous and to a lesser extent Afro-Ecuadorian mobilization on the nation state, neoliberal policies, and the meanings of citizenship. What accounts for indigenous and black mobilization, and for a pattern of state responses that has privileged dialogue over repression? Different from superficial assertions such as Lane's (in Whitten's volume) that agrarian reform did not "delegitimize the hacienda owner once and for all" (88), researchers have shown how agrarian reform in the 1960s and 1970s ended the hacienda system of domination and created a power vacuum in the countryside that was later filled by indigenous organizations (Zamosc 1994). By 1985, 36.2 percent of the land belonged to large farms, 30.3 percent to medium-sized units, and 33.5 percent to small units (Zamosc 1994, 43). The 1979 abolition of literacy requirements to vote allowed the political incorporation of peasants and indigenous people. Quintero and

Silva (1991, 265–266) show that the electorate increased by 45 percent in peasant and indigenous areas.

External actors such as the Catholic and Protestant Churches, leftwing political parties, nongovernmental organizations, and state programs for agrarian development tried to fill the power vacuum, and their work ended by reaffirming an ethnic revival. Researchers have shown how the Catholic Church organized indigenous people and Afro-Ecuadorians along ethnic lines (Martínez Novo 2004; de la Torre 2002; Rubenstein 2005), the impact of evangelicals on indigenous organization in Chimborazo (Andrade 2005), and the effect of missionaries from the Summer Institute of Linguistics on the politization and modernization of the Secoyas (Vickers in Whitten). Scholars have also demonstrated how traditional Catholic worldviews based on class and ethnic subordination were transformed by Protestantism in Chimborazo (Muratorio 1981) and in Napo (Uzendoski in Whitten's volume). The ambiguous role of NGOs that have privileged ethnic over class claims has been masterfully analyzed by Victor Bretón and is discussed below. What still needs to be researched are the roles of the left and of the social programs of the army in these processes of organization and ethnic revival.

Jorge León in "Un sistema político regionalizado" (in Bretón and García) provocatively argues that the lack of unity and cohesion of the country's regional elites, along with Ecuador's regionalized political system, explains why Ecuador's weak and fragmented state has used dialogue instead of repression. Suzana Sawyer's *Crude Chronicles* has rich ethnographic descriptions of the national dialogue between President Sixto Durán Ballén, landlord representatives, and CONAIE officials in June–July 1994 and between the ARCO oil company, state officials, and the leadership of the Organization of Indigenous People of Pastaza earlier that year. It is remarkable that despite clear prejudices, elites were forced or were willing to sit in negotiating tables with indigenous leaders and intellectuals. The emergence of an indigenous intelligentsia transformed the country's public sphere to such an extent that some researchers have argued that ventriloquist forms of representation have ended and that indigenous people were articulating their own voices and demands (Guerrero 2000).

Norman Whitten's introduction and conclusion to *Millennial Ecuador* nicely frame the ambiguities between innovation and continuity brought by ethnic movements. Some indigenous and nonindigenous actors explain their politics in millenarian terms. The 2000 coup d'état or popular rebellion (depending on your political perspective) has been considered a radical rupture with traditional politics (Dieterich 2000; Saltos 2000). Actors' self-interpretation of political mobilization as a new coming has been echoed by academic interpretations of the meanings of indigenous politics. Norman and Dorothea Whitten (in *Millennial Ecuador*), for

instance, have analyzed the 1992 indigenous March for Land and Life as a challenge to the nation state (186). Sawyer has forcefully argued that differently from previous social movements that have focused on economic and social distribution such as better wages and working conditions, "indigenous organizations demanded a new and different organization of the polity" (151). She concludes her book with the statement that "Indians consciously positioned themselves against the state" (221). Luis Macas, Linda Belote, and Jim Belote (in *Millennial Ecuador*) see indigenous and white-mestizo politics as fundamentally different. The principles of community, respect for others, transparency, consensus, equilibrium, and dialogue, they argue, characterize indigenous politics. "Participation of the community members in decision making takes place at community council (cabildo) meetings. This means that community actions are governed by consent and discussion is held until consensus is reached. . . . The best examples of the full expression of collective effort are the various uprisings and marches" (224).

The anthropologist's efforts to capture the voice of the people, and to give proper evidence of their active roles, should not occlude critical analysis of the ambiguities of indigenous politics. The idealization of indigenous communities by Luis Macas and the Belotes, for example, as institutions free of conflict and domination obscures any analysis of power relations. Not all voices are equal in council and community meetings. Class and educational differences, and, above all, gender give authority to some voices. Consensus does not always mean the pacific resolution of problems. Entire families are coerced to act in a certain way even when they do not support the community's decision. For example, families faced threats of the termination of basic services such as drinking water if they refused to join in the agreed form of collective action.

It is revealing that the effort to focus solely on the newness of indigenous protest can lead to inconsistencies. For instance, Fernando García's (in Bretón and García) fine analysis of indigenous demands and state responses does not fit well with the new social movements paradigm that he uses. In addition to "seeking autonomy" and having a "new political style" the indigenous movement has been successfully integrated into the state apparatus. Among other achievements, Fernando García (212) mentions indigenous control of bilingual educational programs and the concession of three million hectares of land to indigenous communities from the Amazon and the coast. Also, CONAIE has directly named state functionaries such as the director of Health for Indigenous People and the representatives to PRODEPINE, a joint World Bank-Ecuadorian state initiative that had a budget of $50 million for ethno-development projects.

Yet, a few scholars have analyzed the continuities between past forms of protest and inclusion to the polity, and indigenous and Afro-

Ecuadorian claims and state responses. From the 1930s, the state has encouraged the corporatist organization of all sectors of society. Elites were organized into the chambers of agriculture, commerce, and industry. Nonelite groups such as public employees and organized industrial workers were incorporated through the recognition of their organizations and the granting of special privileges. Along with the transition to democracy in the late 1970s, indigenous people, women, and Afro-Ecuadorians have successfully demanded their corporatist inclusion (de la Torre 2002, 2003; León 1997; Santana 2004).

The paradox of corporatist claim-making lies in the fact that these forms of incorporation privilege the inclusion of the leadership and intellectuals of the excluded group into the state apparatus. These new appointed bureaucrats end with the double task of representing the state to the excluded groups and, at the same time, representing these groups to the state apparatus. A good example of these paradoxes is the demand of Afro-Ecuadorians to create palenques in their ancestral territories (Halpern and Twine 2000). As a response to institutional racism, some Afro-Ecuadorian organizations seek to control educational, health, and ethno-development projects in their communities. They also demand the implementation of their constitutional rights to self-government and the respect for their traditional practices recognized by the constitution. The project to create palenques could benefit these movements' leadership and could help to create a middle class of black professionals in charge of education, health, etc. But without a firm commitment of the state to transfer resources, these projects might end up with Afro-Ecuadorians administering their own poverty. Furthermore, the Afro-Ecuadorian organizational focus on palenques has not yet been translated into a proposal to end discriminatory practices in cities where most Afro-Ecuadorians live at the mercy of police brutality and other forms of brutal racism (de la Torre 2002; Rahier in Whitten).

Victor Bretón's *Cooperación al desarrollo y demandas étnicas* is a path-breaking analysis of the ambiguities of NGO development projects and state intervention for ethnic and peasant claims. Through quantitative and qualitative analyses of NGOs working in the Ecuadorian highlands in the mid and late 1990s, Bretón presents some challenging hypotheses and conclusions. He argues that the transformation of peasant demands into ethnic ones cannot be seen only as the natural evolution of changing forms of indigenous leadership or just as the work of an indigenous intelligentsia. He shows that the new claims go hand in hand with the neoliberal privatization of state development projects and the massive presence of NGOs. His quantitative analysis demonstrates that NGO intervention does not automatically lead to development or to the reduction of rural poverty. NGOs tend to act in rural areas with strong indigenous organizations, but their continuous presence through

several projects creates a cycle of intervention and failure, while at the same time mestizo poor rural areas are neglected. Perhaps the most controversial point is his conclusion that Indian-peasant demands have been tamed by NGO development work. A more politicized leadership formed around the struggles for land reform has been replaced by a new cadre of technocratic indigenous leaders who know how to present successful development projects. The creation of PRODEPINE through the cooperation between the World Bank and the state could lead to further demobilization because this program may favor indigenous organizations who could present NGO-type development projects. In a recent article published in his co-edited book with Francisco García, Bretón argues that the indigenous movement has being domesticated and neutralized. By accepting as their own the principles of "multiculturalism, multilingualism, and in the best case of the multinationality of the Latin American states," they have not necessarily challenged "the logic of neoliberal capitalist accumulation" (246).

It is too early to evaluate Bretón's pessimistic predictions about the de-radicalization of indigenous protest. Perhaps his argument needs to be supplemented with an analysis of the cycle of indigenous protest that might have ended recently with the corporatist inclusion of their leadership and intelligentsia to the state apparatus. In any case, CONAIE was absent from public demonstrations against Lucio Gutierrez's government in 2005. Journalists as well as rank-and-file members of CONAIE have argued that their brief participation in Gutierrez's administration and the government's use of patronage to divide the Indian movement were partially successful in demobilizing indigenous protest, at least in the short run.

Most researchers have rightly pointed to the democratizing effects of indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian movements. Leon Zamosc (1994, 64–65), for instance, saw indigenous politics as modern critiques of exclusionary and racist capitalist modernization processes. Others have pointed out the positive changes of representation in the public sphere, the changes in the meaning of the nation, and the possibility of creating alternative citizenships. However, after part of CONAIE's leadership formed an alliance with Lucio Gutiérrez in the coup d'état against President Mahuad in January 2000, and their brief participation in the Gutiérrez administration, researchers also need to focus on indigenous authoritarian or at least non-democratic practices. Instead of idealizing community and cabildo meetings as profoundly and radically democratic, researchers should study how these local forms of governance work, and explain who is included and excluded, and how. Moreover, the disdain of the leadership of the indigenous movement for liberal democratic institutions, a contempt shared with many nonindigenous Ecuadorians, needs to be analyzed.

ON NEOLIBERALISM

For Suzana Sawyer, neoliberalism, understood as "the cluster of government policies that aim to privatize, liberalize and deregulate the national economy so as to encourage foreign investment and intensify export production" (5) is the main variable that explains the emergence of "indigenous transgressive subjects." In addition to promoting a series of economic policies, she understands neoliberalism as a broader social and political phenomenon where the state surrenders protecting and governing the population and increasingly transfers these functions to multinational corporations, such as ARCO Oil Company, which increasingly assumed "pastoral" and governing roles.

Yet Sawyer's elegant argument, which might work for other historical contexts, does not help to analyze the changing roles of the state in Ecuador. It idealizes the extent to which social policies supposedly benefited the poor in the past. To imagine a strong state is inaccurate, especially in a context such as the Oriente, a region of very limited and scattered state presence. Multinational corporations assumed pastoral and governing functions long before the neoliberal era in Ecuador. Steve Striffler (2002, 40–61) has brilliantly analyzed how the United Fruit Company from the 1940s to the 1960s created a community where workers had family wages and the company intervened in their daily lives through social programs designed to domesticate them.

If neoliberalism is not going to appear as a single explanation, and as a sort of boogey man, more detailed analysis of its policies are needed. Francisco García's article (in Bretón and García) gives us a nice introduction to structural adjustment policies in Ecuador. He demonstrates their socially regressive impact. However, he does not analyze what Thuomi and Grindle (1992) characterized as the tortuous road of economic reform in Ecuador. Some basic policies such as the reduction of the size of the state and privatization have only been partially implemented due to elite and popular resistance. As Santana (2004) has provocatively argued, the military has been at the forefront of opposition to privatization of their enterprises and politicians have not reduced the size of the bureaucracy. On the contrary, Lucio Gutiérrez, for instance, increased it by 13,000 to distribute patronage. It is more constructive to analyze neoliberal policies in particular contexts. And this is the merit of the work on the impact of neoliberal policies in the agrarian sector by Victor Bretón and Luciano Martínez (in Bretón and García). These authors show how NGOs' development projects and excessive reliance on social capital have not lead to the reduction of rural poverty or to development.

THE GLOBAL, THE URBAN, AND THE RURAL

The leaders of the indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian movements continue to characterize their constituencies as rural and peasant. This identification of indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian is, however, inaccurate and misleading. Rudi Colloredo (in Whitten), Luciano Martínez (in Bretón and García), and Lynn Meisch in *Andean Entrepreneurs* have shown that peasant production is not the main economic activity of rural inhabitants. Meisch shows how for Otavalos the production of corn "seems to be taken on symbolic rather than subsistence importance" (45). Martínez demonstrates how rural inhabitants combine a series of economic strategies to survive where peasant production is not the most relevant. Given this context, why do the leaders of indigenous movements, NGOs, the World Bank, and the state continue to prioritize development projects solely based on agricultural and pastoral activities?

Nor should indigenous and black people be seen as predominantly rural. According to the 2001 Census, 40 percent of Afro-Ecuadorians live in cities (Secretaría Técnica 2004, 33), and 12 percent of the indigenous population live in Quito and Guayaquil (León Guzmán 2003, 120). However, the leadership of their movements continues to locate black and Indian bodies in the countryside. Rahier in "Racist Stereotypes and the Embodiment of Blackness" (in Whitten) illustrates the frustrations of Afro-Ecuadorians when they are not seen as proper and rightful inhabitants of Quito. Rudi Colloredo Mansfeld in his article on "Tigua Migrant Communities" (in Whitten) shows the links between rural and urban communities and emerging Indian urban identities.

The best example of the changing impacts of globalization on ethnic identities comes from the experiences of the Otavalos. In a masterful ethnography Lynn Meisch analyzes Otavaleño history, textile production, music, tourism, transnational migration, and sexuality. *Andean Entrepreneurs* is based on twenty years of ongoing ethnographic research. Meisch shows how by combining "traditional values and practices and modern technology in order to preserve and market their ethnic identity" (10), Otavalos are not only coping with but sometimes thriving on globalization. Their economic prosperity is leading to acute levels of social differentiation, but also allowing the "reconquest" of the city of Otavalo and the transformation of their identity. Many no longer see themselves as, and in fact no longer are, peasants (46), and transnational migration has transformed them into the most cosmopolitan Ecuadorians. Otavalo is the only place in Ecuador where mestizo males dress as Indians in order to improve their sales in the tourist market (204) and to have a better chance of seducing a "gringa" (214–220). The prosperity of Otavalos, however, might have started to decline because "the

earnings from music and the sales of artesanías have dropped" (197) in Europe and at home as well.

As Meisch's ethnography illustrates, any account of contemporary Ecuador has to analyze the impact of migration. She estimates that out of a population of 60,000 Otavalos in 2001, perhaps 4,000 have become "permanent transmigrants and that another 6,000 are abroad on a short-term basis" (164). Given its importance, it is a pity not to have an article on that topic in *Millennial Ecuador*, even though Mary Weismantel wrote a fine analysis of transnational Cuencano identities. However, Paloma Fernández's article in Bretón and García's volume gives a good account of migration to Spain and the patriarchal stereotypes of the media in obscuring the presences of women and distorting the class background of many migrants.

RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITIES

Lynn Meisch notes that the five ethnic categories—*blanco*, *mestizo*, *cholo*, *moreno*, and *runa* or *indígena*—commonly used in the 1970s were replaced by three terms—*blanco-mestizo*, *indígena*, and *Afro-Ecuatoriano* or *negro*—in the 1990s (205). These changes in ethnic and racial classification are explained, in part, by the disappearance of the "distinct clothing styles that distinguished cholos, mestizos and blancos" (203). The translation of the quichua term *mishu* as *white-mestizo*, and the influence of social scientists that wanted to correct the self-interpretation of elites as white and European and started to use the term *white-mestizo* in the 1980s, also account for these transformations. The discursive abolition of the category white from public and academic debates has had the effect of helping to erase whiteness as a system of power, prestige, and status. For example, María Cuvi's fine article (in Bretón and García) on how men and women of the elite differ in their visions of the indigenous movement by not taking race as a category of analysis ends up mystifying white elites as mestizo.

Norman Whitten (1981), among others, rightly pointed out that mestizaje was part of a strategy designed to progressively whiten the population. The pervasive influence of whiteness is illustrated in Mary Weismantel's article (in Whitten) when she analyzes how light-skinned children are privileged over their dark-skinned siblings, and how Cuenca's elite designed the Chola Cuencana as the whitest possible symbol of their identity.

Different from studies that have frozen white and mestizo identities by not analyzing historical shifts and changes, scholars have demonstrated how indigenous and black or Afro-Ecuadorian identities are in constant flux. Colloredo-Mansfeld (in Whitten) analyzes the creation of urban indigenous identities by Tigua-quiteños, Rahier (in Whitten)

shows how black females from Quito are reconstructing urban black identities in a dialogue with racist stereotypes. Perhaps the main accomplishment of ethnic mobilization has been to de-center fixed views of the nation, and to open more democratic possibilities. The challenge is to create institutional spaces where common Ecuadorians, especially those whose race and ethnicity has been stigmatized, can democratically reinvent the nation and themselves.

REFERENCES

Andrade, Susana
2005 "El despertar político de los indígenas evangélicos en Ecuador." *Íconos* 22 (May): 49–60.
Clark, Kim
1998 "Race, 'Culture,' and Mestizaje: The Statistical Construction of the Ecuadorian Nation, 1930–1950." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 11 (2): 185–211.
De la Torre, Carlos
2002 *Afroquiteños: Ciudadanía y racismo*. Quito: CAAP.
2003 "Movimientos étnicos y cultura política en Ecuador." *Íconos* 15 (January): 62–75.
Dieterich, Heinz
2000 *La cuarta vía al poder*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
Guerrero, Andrés
2000 "El proceso de identificación: Sentido común ciudadano, ventriloquía y transescritura." In *Étnicidades*, edited by Andrés Guerrero, 9–61. Quito: FLACSO.
Halpern, Adam, and France Winddance Twine
2000 "Antiracist Activism in Ecuador: Black-Indian Community Alliances." *Race & Class* 42 (2): 19–33.
León, Jorge
1997 "Entre la protesta y el corporatismo." *Íconos* 2 (May-July): 29–40.
León Guzmán, Mauricio
2003 "Etnicidad y exclusión: Una mirada a partir del censo de población de 2001." *Íconos* 17 (September): 116–132.
Martínez Novo, Carmen
2004 "Los misioneros salesianos y el movimiento indígena de Cotopaxi, 1970–2004." *Ecuador Debate* 63: 235–268.
Muratorio, Blanca
1981 *Etnicidad, evangelización y protesta en el Ecuador. Una perspectiva antropológica*. Quito: CIESE.
Quintero, Rafael, and Erika Silva
1991 *Ecuador una nación en ciernes*. Vol. 3. Quito: FLACSO and Abya-Yala.
Rahier, Jean Muteba
1998 "Blackness, the 'Racial' Spatial Order, Migrations, and Miss Ecuador 1995–1996." *American Anthropologist* 100 (2): 421–430.
Rubenstein, Steve
2005 "La conversión de los Shuar." *Íconos* 22 (May): 27–48.
Saltos, Napoleón
2000 *La rebelión del arco iris: testimonios y análisis*. Quito: Fundación José Peralta.
Santana, Roberto
2004 "Cuando las élites giran en redondo: El caso de los liderazgos indígenas en Ecuador." *Ecuador Debate* 61 (April): 235–258.
Secretaría Técnica del Frente Social
2002 *In The Shadows of State and Capital. The United Fruit Company, Popular Struggle, and Agrarian Restructuring in Ecuador, 1900–1995*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

2004 *Los Afroecuatorianos en cifras*. Quito: Secretaría Técnica del Frente Social.

Striffler, Steve

1992 *In the Shadows of State and Capital: The United Fruit Company, Popular Struggle, and Agrarian Restructuring in Ecuador, 1900–1995*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Thoumi, Francisco, and Merilee Grindle

1992 *La política de la economía del ajuste: la actual experiencia ecuatoriana*. Quito: FLACSO.

Whitten, Norman

1981 "Introduction." In *Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador*. Edited by Norman Whitten, 1–41. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Zamosc, Leon

1994 "Agrarian Protest and the Indian Movement in the Ecuadorian Highlands." *Latin American Research Review* 29 (3): 37–69.