Indigenous people and political transnationalism:
globalization from below meets globalization from above?[1]

WPTC-02-05

Sarah Radcliffe[2], Nina Laurie[3] and Robert Andolina[4]

[2] Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EN
[3] Department of Geography, University of Newcastle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU
[4] Department of Political Science, Bates College, Lewiston ME 04240, USA

The premise of our work is very simply stated: indigenous people are building political networks that assist their demands, while multilateral development agencies and international non-governmental organizations are creating specific pro-indigenous development projects that further the globalised agendas of modified neo-liberal policy. At one level then, globalisation from above meets globalization from below. As pointed out by John Stack (1985: 5), increasing global interdependence has given ethnic groups unprecedented opportunities, as he says, to "enter the political processes of states, regions and the global system" (Stack 1985). Additionally, says Elise Boulding, international non-governmental organizations with an ethnic basis saw a five-fold increase in numbers between 1970-1994 to some 550 in total[5] (Boulding 1997).

My focus today is not INGOs alone, but rather what Mimi Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (Keck and Sikkink 1998) call an *issue network*, that is an informal social network including clusters of activists, policy-makers, IGO officials, and state institutions, which pursue the goal of indigenous "development". We examine this indigenous development issue network in the Andean countries of Ecuador and Bolivia, both countries with sizable and historically marginalized indigenous populations. We focussed exclusively on the Andean highlands in the research, feeling the highland area is highly significant in current definitions of "indigenous development" (Healey 2000), and that more work had been done on the Amazon region (Coalition for Amazon Peoples and Their Environment 1999; Brysk 2000; Sawyer 1997).

Once we examined this "meeting of above and below" in detail[6], it became clear that the indigenous political movements' engagement with neo-liberal development agendas involves a number of counter-intuitive elements.

- First, it involves diverse levels simultaneously - it's not just at the supranational level. In our analysis, we consider the crossing of scales (body, local, national, regional, international) as constitutive of transnationalism. In political transnationalism of Andean indigenous groups, there are multiple scales of interaction, with no fixed location within which actors or practices are found. In other words, transnationalism is as much about discontinuous space as relational space. We can exemplify this here through the convergence around notions of indigenous cultural specificity that cross multiple scales and which, despite profound divergence (over politics, over racism, over political

---

[5] Count from the register of Union of International Associations.
[6] On the literature that uses an "above" or "below" perspective, see among others, Smith and Guarnizo (1998), Portes (1997), Brysk (1993), and Anderson (1995). For an overview of literature on transnationalism, and its understandings of social and political levels, see Vertovec (1999 and 2001).

economy) between above and below, nevertheless contributes to the transnational indigenous development issue network (section IIIa).

- Second, the state is not "hollowed out" in this process, with ethnic groups and neo-liberal agendas reducing the remit and significance of the state. The state provides a ground of meaning-creation, institutions and political cultures through which transnational relations are constituted. It contributes to the establishment/reproduction of transnational connections by facilitating flows of funds, ideas and the award of resources to indigenous actors (section IIIb).

- Third, political transnationalism represents the entanglements of diverse ethnic, class and geographically dispersed institutionalised and politicized social actors around the notion of indigenous needs, and the policy and political frameworks through which to address these needs. Transnational actors, whether they are "from above" or "below", comprise all dimensions of social difference. As a result, as well as "globalization from above" meets "globalization from above", we find entanglements around gender hierarchies, political affiliations, notions of professionalism, and cultural authenticity, making the clear distinction of actors "from above" and "from below" analytically problematic (section IIIc).

Therefore, I examine the social and spatial formations made and re-made in - and through - transnational connections, thereby highlighting the *processual* and *embedded* nature of political actors. In contrast to Manuel Castells' (Castells 1996) work on "spaces of flows" and the acceleration of international connections (Brysk 2000), we are interested in the grounded, embodied and embedded nature of multiply scaled transnational political practices and discourses. Neither is our focus on the establishment of international rights for indigenous peoples: as commented by one Ecuadorian indigenous leader Marco Murillo, "you can't live on rights alone" (Interview 2000), especially when many rights remain on paper.

First a definition of 'indigenous people'. Indigenous people are the "descendants of the original inhabitants of a geographical region prior to colonization who have maintained some or all of their linguistic, cultural and organizational characteristics. In addition, self-identification is a fundamental criterion to determine who is considered indigenous" (Deruyttere 1997: 2). This is the definition used broadly by indigenous political movements, as well as by international agreements, multilateral and bilateral policy-makers. Transnational can be defined not as a "level" of action or analysis, but as actors, actions, and interactions that *cross* over levels and/or boundaries, highlighting the transgressive nature of transnationalism (Mitchell 1998). Risse-

Kappen defines transnational relations as "regular interactions across national boundaries when at least one actor is a non-state agent or does not operate on behalf of a national government or intergovernmental organization" (Risse-Kappen 1995).

In the talk today, I first discuss about how Andean indigenous people have organized politically, in what we might call "globalization from below". The following section, "Globalization from above" introduces the international development agendas concerning indigenous people. I then discuss why we talk about entanglements instead of "above meets below", before drawing some conclusions.

I Globalization from below

Ecuador and Bolivia's indigenous population makes up around 20 per cent of Latin America's indigenous population of around 40 million (Yashar 1999), forming a majority in Bolivia (between 60% and 71% of the total population) and a sizeable minority in Ecuador (between 20% and 40%) (Andolina 1999). While coming under the rubric of 'indigenous', ethnic groups – including predominantly Quechua, Aymara and Guarani in Bolivia, and Quichua and Shuar-Achuar in Ecuador - remain distinct in terms of language and livelihood, although they are generally characterized by relative poverty and social marginalization. In demanding rights to territory, language and politico-cultural autonomy, indigenous movements have engaged with the nation-states, seeing the possibility of institutional frameworks and resource distribution towards indigenous beneficiaries. Indigenous peoples currently have considerable political legitimacy in these Andean republics.

Andean indigenous peoples have organized politically over the past three decades from the grassroots up, building local associations, regional federations and, from the mid-1980s, national confederations. The indigenous social movements of Andean Latin America represent one of the most systematic and large-scale movements for rights in the region (Díaz Polanco 1997, Van Cott 1994, Yashar 1996, Escobar and Alvarez 1992). In Ecuador and Bolivia, indigenous demands broadly encompass issues of self-determination, which range from campaigns for title to land, elaboration of bilingual or intercultural education programmes, projects to create relative autonomy, and a broad recognition of a multicultural, pluri-national society (Selverston 1994; Van Cott 1994). The "500 years of resistance" campaign against easy nationalist celebration of Columbus' Quincentenary in 1992 provided a key moment at which these organizations created a supranational web (Andolina 1999). In the 1990s, the politics and

cultural politics of these Andean countries in effect engaged indigenous actors with a diversity of international agencies, quasi-governmental organizations and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as government ministries, churches and trades unions.

Indigenous representatives and ideas of constitutional multi-culturalism rapidly entered the reiterative process of state formation (Joseph and Nugent 1994; Blom Hanson & Stepputat 2002). Both Ecuador and Bolivia ratified the ILO Convention on Indigenous Rights (ILO Convention 169); by the mid-1990s both countries had Ethnic Secretariats, by 1997 upgraded to a Vice-Ministry in Bolivia and an Indigenous Development Council in Ecuador (Andolina 1999). The ILO Convention 169 was highly significant in that, for the first time, the collective rights of indigenous people was recognized by international law, thereby changing the status of customary law (*America Indigena* 1996)[7]. Indigenous representatives were placed on the agricultural development boards in both countries, while the general elections in both countries saw the selection of indigenous for Congress. In Bolivia, a former Katarista movement indigenous leader was appointed Vice-President.

Although varying from country to country, Andean indigenous social movements broadly have four aims, namely to strengthen their own cultures, to construct a plurinational state, to gain self-determination as a people with right to land and collective rights; and self-management of their own development (Selverston 1994; Collins 2001). Compared with transnational circuits' deracialized, apolitical discourses about indigenous people, which tend to emphasize *indigenous* people's lack (of wealth, contacts, resources), indigenous people reverse this discourse, displacing lack away from themselves and highlighting issues of racism and political economy (Radcliffe *et al*. 2001). In doing so, indigenous social movements argue that the state lacks a long term perspective for socially and ecologically sustainable development, and they consider the state as their primary interlocutor in demands for development. Within a profoundly cultural political movement, indigenous identity is associated with territorial, linguistic, cultural and traditional bases.

The Andean indigenous social movements work to contest the boundaries of social and spatial divisions (Radcliffe 1999). Land access questions are central to the movement. Indigenous representatives claim that their most important work – both development and political – takes place at the level of rural areas and indigenous territories. Indigenous territoriality also has its

---

[7] The ratification of the ILO169 Convention was itself bound up in transnational politics, as the UNDP funded a dialogue commission in Ecuador to discuss the ratification of the ILO Convention, involving indigenous leaders, state officials, the military, religious representatives and NGOs. The UNDP agenda of encouraging 'good governance' was responsible for such funding.

spiritual dimensions, which have come to the fore recently in the contests over neo-liberal government policies for water privatization. Furthermore, indigenous representations of rural development questions rest upon distinct premises to the multilateral literature. Indigenous peoples represent themselves as peasants certainly, but position their role as central in national and even global contexts, rather than closed communities. As producers for internal markets, they picture themselves as active contributors to the national economy. Rural development policy is criticized for its inadequate response to what indigenous people want, although there is acknowledgement that indigenous peoples are now beneficiaries of certain projects. Yet, rather than *passive* beneficiaries, documents and discourse represent indigenous as agents in agricultural development with analytical and management skills. Modernization of agriculture is pictured not as something that indigenous people are necessarily opposed to, but priority is placed on sustainability objectives (Pacari 1992). In this perspective, development means thinking about markets, but not just global markets which have profoundly negative impacts on indigenous livelihoods. Indigenous producers are starting from the needs of nationalities [communities], not market values. According to indigenous representatives, globalization needs to be re-thought in terms of "solidarity, cooperation, reciprocity, respect" and the extreme neo-liberal model is not acceptable (Interview with B. Chancoso, 2000), a position that has strong parallels with the anti-globalization discourse of numerous protestors worldwide (Klein 2000).

Additionally, indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia are engaged in profound debates about difference *within* indigenous identity, in contrast to the generalizations recycled in transnational literature. Being indigenous mostly transcends linguistic, policy, or political difference, in name of a wider kinship. Even among originally militant class defined, confederations broadly reject a *purely* class identity (Andolina *et al.* forthcoming). Cultural differences between indigenous groups are now being explored in ways that contest previous homogenization, and multilaterals' overgeneralization. Indigenous discourse often couches this in the language of "unity within diversity". Despite declarations of human rights at national and international level (Stamatopoulou 1994; Tennant 1994), indigenous social movements view racism as very much alive, turning them into second-class citizens. In response, the anti-colonial discourse of regaining sovereignty and self-determination appear, linked to cultural and political de-colonization (not succession, but autonomy) (Stavenhagen 1996).

II Globalization from above

Development agencies increasingly take civil society into account -- paying attention to participation and accountability while incorporating gender, human rights, and environmental issues (Nederven Pieterse 2001). As suggested by the President of the World Bank, James D. Wolfensohn, culture and ethnicity are becoming key components of development frameworks (Wolfensohn 1999). All projects of the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank now require consultation with ethnic group representatives and mitigation of negative impacts of projects on those groups (OD 4.20, 1991) (Davis 2000). Current revisions of multilateral bank policy actively promote indigenous culture, and include development projects specifically for indigenous peoples. One example is the Fund for Development of Indigenous Peoples in Latin America and the Caribbean, which receives monies from the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, numerous bilateral aid agencies, Latin American governments, and indigenous organizations (*Fondo Indígena* 2000). The World Bank's Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian Peoples' Development Project in Ecuador is another example, with funds of US $50 million and a governing board comprised of Bank personnel, Ecuadorian government officials, and representatives of indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian organizations.

With the recent announcement of Inter-American Development Bank's creation of a fund of US $250 million for projects for indigenous and Afro-Latin American groups in the region, indigenous development – or ethno-development as it is called – has definitely arrived. The IDB aims to overcome racialized social exclusion, whose "high costs" impede economic growth in Ecuador, Bolivia, Brazil and Guatemala (*El Comercio*, 20 June 2001). Within the neo-liberal development paradigm, ethno-development holds out the promise of economic progress (where have we heard that one before?) on the basis of the unique social capital embedded in indigenous cultures and traditional networks[8].

So far, so good. However, there is serious mis-recognition of indigenous livelihoods and identity within neo-liberal policy frameworks. Elements of the mis-recognition arise from the problems of applying the economic idea of capital to society, but others arise from the nature of multilateral/bilateral representation of indigenous peoples and their failure to listen to indigenous representations of their own lives. Transnational agencies rarely refer to the rights of indigenous peoples as *citizens*, despite international law on collective rights (Stamatopoulou 1994). I don't have time to go into a lot of detail on this but a few examples might suffice (see a longer

---

[8]   On ethno-development, see Palenzuela (1999)and van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas (2000). For critiques of social capital approaches, see Radcliffe *et al*. (2001), Fine (1999 and 2001).

discussion in Radcliffe *et al.* 2001). Indigenous people are represented as a particularly homogeneous group of poor, spatially circumscribed and vulnerable people. Such homogeneity is reinforced by references to a limited number of studies linking poverty and ethnicity, and the community-based nature of indigenous life. Based in the past, 34 million indigenous people in Latin America and the Caribbean are said to be "the descendants of the great Aztec, Maya and Inca civilizations", still speaking native languages (cf. Starn 1991). Indigenous people are consistently associated with natural environments, defined by climatic and vegetation patterns. For example, in "areas considered to be the least hospitable of the continent; the arid mountainous regions of the Andes and Meso-America, and the remote tropical rainforest areas" (Deruyttere 1997:2). Indigenous people are imagined as two distinct groups, "the rural peasant and urban migrant population [in the Andes mountains]… and scores of relatively isolated tribal societies [in the Amazon Basin]" (Davis & Partridge 1994: 1). Often, indigenous people are pictured as having a distinctive relationship with nature, as in specific "indigenous logics of ecology" (COWI 1999)[9].

In policy documents, economic poverty is the one consistent feature whereby indigenous people are represented as poorer than non-indigenous populations. Parallels are drawn with African levels of poverty, with over 75% poverty rising to 95% in rural areas. In Ecuador, over 77% of indigenous people are in poverty, while 42.23% are very poor. Based on household survey data in four countries, the 1994 World Bank commissioned study is referred to again and again to note the high correlation between poverty and (indigenous) ethnicity (Pscharaopoulos and Patrinos 1994). Only rarely is reference made to the structural causes of indigenous poverty (Plant 1998; Enclada *et al.* 1999). Indigenous populations are characterized largely as rural-based farmers engaging in small-scale production for subsistence and the market. The picture of rural agrarian livelihoods is surprisingly persistent, with occasional mention of urban migration and non-farm sources of income, such as trade and production (cf. Plant, 1998; COWI 1999: 23). According to Inter-American Development Bank, "over 90% of indigenous are sedentary subsistence farmers… grouped together with [*mestizo*] *campesinos*" (Deruyttere 1997: 3). The inter-linkages of rural and urban labour markets are generally presented as extraneous to the basic livelihood of indigenous people (cf. Plant, 1998: 17). Despite increased awareness of rural and urban distribution of indigenous, in diverse economic sectors, policy persistently focuses on the agrarian rural sphere as the core development objective.

---

[9] Questions around the linkages between indigenous populations and environment go beyond the scope of this paper. For detailed discussion of this important theme, see (Brysk 1994), (Colchester 1994), and (Lloyd 1998).

Although characterized by high levels of poverty, indigenous populations have increasingly been seen to have *high* levels of "social capital". Drawing on an extensive development and economics literature, the concept of social capital has become ubiquitous – if not always clearly defined – in recent years. In academic terms, social capital is defined as the social glue or "norms and social relations embedded in the social structures of society that enable people to coordinate action and achieve desired goals" (Narayan 1999). It is now agreed that social capital is one thing that Andean indigenous have plenty of.

> In general, indigenous peoples in Ecuador suffer from economic deprivation but are well-endowed with social capital (for example, organization, solidarity patterns, and shared social and cultural values. (van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas 2000)

In the words of an IDB report, "culture becomes an asset rather than an impediment" (Deruyttere 1997: 9). Non-monetary exchange and reciprocity between members of indigenous communities exemplify social capital according to transnational discourse, as do "ancestral and traditional knowledge" (Executive Summary, n.d.), identity, close attachment to ancestral lands, and a capacity to mobilize labour (COWI 1999: 18). The concept of social capital is central to the formulation of an "ethno-development policy" that builds on the social capital of indigenous populations. In the words of the World Bank, indigenous social capital provides a platform for ethno-development (van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas 2000). Development problems will be overcome, according to recent policy, if indigenous social capital is strengthened (Davis 2000). Social capital growth is linked to eventual <u>productive</u> capital growth, while retaining the cultural specificity of indigenous populations (van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas 2000). Combining social and other capitals is synergistic; "strengthening cultural identity and promoting sustainable socioeconomic development are mutually reinforcing" (Deruyttere 1997: 9). The development of indigenous and black human capital, says one report, "is no longer a moral preoccupation.. [but] an economic imperative" (Enclada *et al*. 1999).

This section has attempted to sketch out how adaptation of neo-liberal development policy (free markets but social nets and targeted anti-poverty programmes) has coincided with a growing awareness of indigenous peoples as specific, needy beneficiaries. Through pressure from INGOs (such as the Forest Peoples Programme, Bank Information Center, Centre for Economic and Social Rights) and indigenous groups, the policies of multilateral and bilateral agencies are now making specific provision for indigenous populations (Fox and Brown 1999). Indigenous peoples have become established in recent global development paradigms as worthy recipients of targeted aid programmes. However, when indigenous cultures are 'frozen' in particular policies,

and their grounded contextualization is lost, policy can be based on emblematic programmes that are applied outside of their original context. Pro-indigenous policy can thus become one which highlights social capital issues, at the cost of pressing indigenous concerns that fail to come under this rubric.

III Above meets below? Or entanglements?

At a recent conference in Princeton, the indigenous former Bolivian Vice-President, Victor Hugo Cárdenas, said the international climate is currently very favourable for indigenous movements. He was thinking of how the various initiatives at national and regional level in Latin America are compounding gains made in indigenous political representation, shifts in government and social attitudes, and multilateral policies. Over the past decade, Andean indigenous people have forged lasting networks with multilateral and bilateral agencies and non-governmental organizations, creating networks with a material and policy impact (Van de Fliert 1994; Brysk 1994), but often with unintended or unexpected implications for states, indigenous politics and civil society.

Our work demonstrates a number of significant points about political transnationalism that challenge the previous theorization of globalizing webs of political action, as we find three kinds of entanglements. First, convergence around issues of culture, or discursive entanglement. Second, the continued importance of the state in transnationalism, organizational entanglements. Third, the social heterogeneity of transnational webs, or social entanglements.

a)   Discursive entanglement: Convergence around culture
My discussion so far has highlighted the <u>divergence</u> between multilateral and social movement representation of "indigenous development issues". However, indigenous and policy discourses do <u>converge</u> around an idea of cultural specificity. The existence of indigenous cultural difference is the premise of multilateral development intervention, and indigenous social movement platforms. Notions of indigenous cultural specificity provide a powerful discourse around which indigenous development issue networks come together, and which crosses multiple scales from the local to the international. Looking at the ways in which indigenous, multilaterals, consultants and advocacy INGOs talk about indigenous culture reveals a construction of notions of culture as being discrete, transcendent and holistic (see Radcliffe 2001b). This construction process which operates from local communities through to international conferences and policy, can be termed cultural boundary making. Given recent changes in the development field (described above),

development actors – beneficiaries and practitioners – constitute culture as a discrete feature of Andean society. In these representations, culture is reduced to a super-organic holistic and transcendent entity, which doesn't get made or struggled over as much as it is smoothly reproduced in isolated rural communities (where could those be in the Andes?). From a very different starting point, and a highly transgressive, politicized agenda, indigenous movements have engaged in a politics of representation that highlights an anti-colonial ethnic identity, addressing indigenous commonalities rooted in specific local territorialities (Andolina 1999). A politics of cultural authenticity represents history, racism, political economy and livelihood in claims to political and social authority, while creating a politics of gender (Radcliffe & Laurie 2001). Indigenous politics effectively positions culture around a set of embodiments, practices and spaces by which cultural boundaries can be inscribed and reproduced.

In policy documents too, indigenous society has elements of an organism, where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts and the parts cannot be understood apart from the whole. In this reification of indigenous culture, policy formulations address indigenous society as having a discrete bundle of activities, rituals and relations to traditional leadership and gender relations, that produce a culture, somehow removed from a changing political economy (cf. Starn 1991). NGOs subscribing to an 'Andeanist' interpretation of rural indigenous settlements as well as Washington-based multilaterals can be equally likely to subscribe to this version of a bounded, 'Andean' culture. A culture is on the move in the Andes, but you would never guess from policy documents that imagine a rural, community-based entity with traditional authority structures called Andean indigenous culture. Cultural boundary making in development policy compounds holistic and super-organic metaphors of culture by inscribing culture onto indigenous groups in fixed and reified ways.

It is here we see a <u>convergence</u> between indigenous political agendas and development interventions. Under social capital models culture is an asset, while for indigenous movements, culture represents a successful politics of anti-colonialism. Cultural boundary making thus comprises one key practice which makes and maintains political transnationalism around indigenous development. The issue network around indigenous development operates on the basis of discrete, identifiable indigenous cultures which, however much they are countered by evidence, form the "principled goal" (Keck & Sikkink 1998) around which mobilization takes place. The ethno-development issue network is premised on ideas of bounded ethnic cultures. This is not a Huntingdon-esque clash of cultures, but rather a community-based, timeless notion of rural Andean ethnic lifeways. What becomes defined as the Andean/*lo Andino* rests upon webs of meaning that involve transnational actors, indigenous peoples, and nation-states, In contrast to

assumptions in political transnational theory, the principled goals of the indigenous development issue network has *not* been constructed merely at the international level. Rather, it has been constructed from levels that go from rural settlements through national bureaucracies to multilateral and bilateral agencies, cultural boundary making has been taking place at the crossing of levels, and at different scales simultaneously. Just as bodies are constitutive of cultural uniqueness at one level, so too are internationally circulating notions of Andean indigenous social capital: *together* they make the transnational political sphere in which indigenous development issues get defined and contested.

b)   Organizational entanglements: Hybrid institutions and the state

The second dimension that questions the idea of globalization "from above meets below" is the role of the state in ethno-development transnationalism. Contrary to expectations of some globalization writing[10], our evidence challenges the widespread view that neo-liberal transnational connections entail inherently negative consequences for Andean nation states. Rather, the institutionalisation of development practice and the operation of both indigenous and agencies have worked through the re-formation of the nation-state (Radcliffe 2001a). If the nation-state is taken to be constantly in *formation* (Joseph and Nugent 1994), then ethno-development goals have formed the state using indigenous actors, new institutional forms, and the guidelines offered by international conventions. An emerging pattern of development administration in Latin America is one where actors who historically would have operated in distinct spheres – the state, grassroots organizations, non-governmental organizations – are now coming together in new quasi-state institutions. These 'hybrid institutions of development' comprise organizations working with development agencies and quasi-governmental departments and can work closely with private sector companies and NGOs (Radcliffe 2001a). Hybrid institutions of development arise out of the neo-liberal reforms of state formation, the privatization of service provision combined with a new willingness of NGOs to work with (certain elements of) the state (Bebbington 1997; Vellinga 1998). The lines between government and non-government organizations become blurred, as the World Bank and other funding agencies of development require states to work with NGOs and civil society organizations (Clark 1995).

---

[10]   Here the contrast can be made between work such as Anderson (1995), and that which locates a role for the state precisely in the interconnectivity created by transnational diasporas e.g. Basch *et al*. (1994).

Our detailed work on the *ayllu* movement in Bolivia, where indigenous organizations galvanize international support through NGOs, bilateral agencies and support networks to further their goals of establishing territorial autonomy, is a case in point (see Andolina *et al.* forthcoming). The *ayllu* movement was constituted not just at the level of local grievances, and identity formation, but also through the working of transnational processes *through* the Bolivian state. In making reforms on indigenous rights, decentralization, participation, and education, Bolivian governments responded to indigenous movement mobilizations and recognized their legitimacy without derailing the market-oriented regime underway since 1985. They were also able to bring the *ayllu* movement into a more pluralistic state-society relation centered on "dialogue", moving away from the protest-based repertoire of the peasant confederation. In conjunction with other actors, the Bolivian State accomplished this recognition by redefining subjects in categorical and territorial ways, in turn reconfiguring the identity and territoriality of the state through apprehending multiculturalism and neo-liberalism. Unpacking notions of national politics is key to understanding these dynamics and consequences, as is linking national political structures to processes that are not always strictly "national" (Andolina *et al.* forthcoming).

c) Social entanglements: heterogeneity in transnational networks

In the third dimension of our work that challenges "above meets below" models of political transnationalism, we have to consider the social distinctions that operate "below" and "above", and question the extent to which there are demarcated groups that only connect through their shared political agenda (cf. Brysk, 1993). Diaspora studies generally presume social homogeneity stretched across space, while Keck & Sikkink (1998) show that global advocacy networks rest upon notions of vulnerable groups. The vulnerability of indigenous populations – whether to ecological destruction, nationalist assimilation or harsh economic reforms – certainly contributes to mobilization on behalf of indigenous populations (Brysk 2000; Ramos, 1998), although the divides between advocates and indigenous beneficiaries are presumed to be clear-cut, if contested. Although indigenous peoples tend to see themselves unproblematically as political agents rather then vulnerable beneficiaries, they are often pictured as such by INGOs such as Survival International, environmentalists, and other transnational representations (Mato 1998). By contrast, a sense of a shared ethnic history of colonialism is seen to legitimate and unite indigenous movements across national borders (e.g. Díaz Polanco 1997).

In the case of Andean indigenous development transnationalism, what we find is that there is a radical social heterogeneity complicating the notion of discrete groups of "advocates

from above" versus "beneficiaries from below", or indeed homogeneous groups of "indigenous people" versus "the global North". In other words, the notion of a transnational community (of indigenous, policy-makers and advocates) presumes the coming-together of two, perhaps three, discrete groups, each with their own sets of interests, agendas and practices. In practice, the work on Andean indigenous transnational issue networks demonstrates that the interests, agendas and practices constitutive of transnational indigenous development are radically heterogeneous. The multiple axes of class, gender, race, location and institutional position, and political affiliation generate entangled relations between actors and their position within transnational indigenous development networks. For example, criteria of cultural authenticity do not fall neatly onto one side of the indigenous/non-indigenous divide or the other, but are constituted variously in diverse institutional and geographical settings, being cross cut by gender, class, and profession (Fieldnotes, 1999-2001; see also Lloyd, 1998).

I examine this point briefly through reference to gender in ethno-development transnationalism. Ethno-development policy aims to address the poverty experienced by most of Latin America's indigenous peoples, and presumes a discrete group of indigenous beneficiaries. Yet institutionalized gender hierarchies, especially around masculinities, crosscut the "above and below" divide, making the transnational development network more entangled than a policy-and-beneficiary analysis would suggest. This entanglement works both through femininities and gender policy, and racialized masculinities. First, a gender mainstreaming ethos and gender monitoring entangles indigenous (female and male) subjects and development practitioners in a multiscalar politics of gender. Gender mainstreaming and monitoring involves the use of gender components in funding applications, at the same time as they can be used in contests over the gender politics of indigenous organizations and development agencies. Ethno-development's recent forced inclusion of a gender perspective reflects the outcome of diverse, yet entangled (inter-related), challenges to the implicit masculinization of indigenous development at all scales from Andean settlements through to bilateral offices in Europe.

This takes us to the second aspect of the gender entanglements within which indigenous development issue networks are embedded. Despite the selective and hence limited visibility of "men" as a development category, masculine values are embedded in institutions and policy assumptions in the transnational development field and are largely invisible (Radcliffe & Laurie 2001). Moreover, such invisible masculinities crosscut the racial-ethnic divide between policy makers and indigenous groups. Indigenous men are often 'feminized' vis-à-vis *mestizo*-white men, due to racial hierarchies that inflect diverse masculinities (Larrea, 1999). As indigenous men negotiate with masculinized development agencies, the invisibility of masculinities combined

with their feminization makes indigenous men's role in reproducing indigenous gender hierarchies invisible, especially to white-mestizo donors (whether in North or South).

In summary to this section, I have suggested that transnational political analyses have previously assumed a relatively discrete social divide between groups "from below" and "from above". By examining the gender hierarchies in transnational development issues, I have suggested that this notion has to be replaced with an analysis of the social heterogeneity which cross-cuts such "divides" and makes them analytically redundant. In its place, we propose a notion of social entanglements around class, race, gender, profession, political affiliation, cultural authenticity and so on, which position actors not on a fixed "side" of a hypothetical "above and below" divide but which recognizes their complex, and unfixed, position vis-à-vis a number of social differences. Our work thus differs from James Clifford who suggests that there are "different degrees of entanglement in national/transnational orders" (1998: 365). In contrast, we argue that relations are always national *and* transnational, as well as bodily and local, and that what matters most is not the degree of entanglement but entangled social difference.

IV Conclusions

Our work demonstrates a number of significant points about political transnationalism that challenge previous theorization of globalizing webs of political action. Political transnationalism has, broadly, emphasized the international level, the evacuation of state sovereignty, and two discrete groups coming together in a transnational arena. In contrast, we advocate a concept of entanglements across levels and scales. First, we have argued for a multiscalar understanding of the transnational field. In the case of Andean indigenous development transnationalism, these multiple intersecting, but not uncontested, relationships and connections are made through the notion of indigenous cultural specificity. Despite divergences in opinions between members of the issue network about priorities, racism, political economy and other issues, cultural boundary making is constituted at multiple scales (from the body to the international scale), and provides a point of contact/shared beliefs for diverse actors.

Second, the state's groundwork of meaning-creation, institutions and political cultures provide the context and platform through which a transnational public sphere is elaborated. Unpacking notions of national politics is key to understanding the dynamics and consequences of transnational development issue networks, as is linking national political structures to processes that are not always strictly "national" (Andolina *et al*. forthcoming). Hence, we disagree with

Beck's view (quoted in Vertovec 1999) on transnational politics as being a "dialectic of global and local questions that do not fit into national politics". The state – as a set of institutions, actors, and discourses – precisely *contributes* to the establishment/reproduction of transnational connections by facilitating flows of funds, ideas and the award of resources to indigenous actors.

Third, political transnationalism in the context of Andean indigenous development represents the social entanglements of ethnic, class, gender and geographically dispersed institutionalised and politicized actors, around the notion of indigenous needs, and the policy and political frameworks through which to address these needs. Andean indigenous development transnationalism can be called an "ethno-development issue network", a fractured and far from coherent group and set of practices which is multiethnic, multiply located geographically and institutionally, and constantly negotiated. Social heterogeneity is found in this political transnationalism, such that entanglements of "indigenous" groups with "non-indigenous" groups are crosscut by political affiliations, ideas of cultural authenticity, gender hierarchies, and notions of professionalism.

Political transnationalism, in Andean indigenous development issue networks, is thus characterized by the production at multiple scales of a principle (indigenous development specificity) around which diverse actors converge and through which a pro-indigenous development policy is made. In this multiply leveled process, the state organizes legitimacy, institutional frameworks, languages and opportunities that contribute to the making of a transnational indigenous development network, despite its neoliberal-driven cutbacks. Finally, ethno-development issue networks in the Andes are constituted from the start as entangled relationships around social difference expressed in gender, ethnic, cultural, professional, locational and institutional terms. Although ethnic specificity is crucial to the network's principle for convergence, ethnicity is not the only axes of social difference around which politics and policy get made, and its meanings are always over-written by other salient divisions within the issue network.

Bibliography

Anderson, J. (1995) "The exaggerated death of the nation state." *A global world? Re-ordering political space*, J. Anderson, C. Brooke and A. Cochrane (eds), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 65-112.

Andolina, R. J. (1999) "Colonial legacies and plurinational imaginaries: indigenous movement politics in Ecuador and Bolivia," PhD, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Andolina, R., Radcliffe, S. & Laurie, N. (forthcoming) 'Development and Culture: Transnational Identity Making in Latin America', *World Politics*

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., and Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: transnational projects and deterritorialized nation-states*, Gordon and Breach, New York.

Bebbington, A. (1997) "New states, new NGOs? Crises and transitions among rural development NGOs in the Andean region." *World Development*, 25(11), 1755-65.

Boulding, E. (1997) "Foreword." *Transnational social movements and global politics: solidarity beyond the state*, J. Smith, Chatfield, C. & Pagnineco, R., (eds.), Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, ix-xi.

Blom Hanson, T. & Stepputat, F. 2001 States of imagination: ethnographic explorations of the postcolonial state. Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Brysk, A. (1993) "From above and below: social movements, the international system and human rights in Argentina." *Comparative Political Studies*, 26(3), 259-285.

Brysk, A. (1994) "Acting globally: indian rights and international politics in Latin America." *Indigenous peoples and democracy in Latin America*, D. Van Cott, (ed.), Inter-American Dialogue/St. Martin's Press, New York, 29-51.

Brysk, A. (2000) *From tribal village to global village: indian rights and international relations in Latin America*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Cal.

Castells, M. (1996) *The network society*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Clark, A. M. (1995) "NGOs and their influence on international society." *Journal of International Affairs*, 48(2), 507-525.

Clifford, J. 1998 "Mixed feelings", *Cosmopolitics*, P.Cheah and B.Robbins (eds), University of Minnesota Press, London, 362-371.

Coalition for Amazon Peoples and their Environment (1999) "Amazon Forum IV Report.", Coalition for Amazonian Peoples and their Environment, Washington DC.

Colchester, M. (1994) *Salvaging nature: indigenous peoples, protected areas and biodiversity conservation*, UNRISD, Geneva.

Collins, J. (2001) "A sense of possibility: Ecuador's indigenous movement takes centre stage." *NACLA*, 33(5).

COWI (1999) "Diagnóstico de las oportunidades económicas de los pueblos indígenas de Bolivia para acceder a mercados, tecnologías y recursos nuevos. Informe Ejecutivo." *Proyecto COWI 42354*, World Bank, Washington DC.

Davis, S. H. (2000) "Indigenous Peoples and Economic Development in Latin America: the experience of the World Bank." Paper presented at the conference *Pluri-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic: evaluating the implications for state and society in MesoAmerica and the Andes*, University of London, London.

Davies, S. & Partridge, W. 1994 'Promoting the development of indigenous peoples in Latin America', World Bank Social Development Unit, on www.worldbank.org/socialdevelopment/indigenouspeoples, accessed 13 Sept 2000

Deruyttere, A. (1997) "Indigenous peoples and sustainable development: the role of the Inter-American Development Bank." *IND97-101*, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC.

Díaz Polanco, H. (1997) *Indigenous peoples in Latin America: the quest for self-determination*, Westview Press, Boulder.

Enclada, E., García, F., and Ivarsdotter, K. (1999) "La participación de los pueblos indígenas y negros en el desarrollo del Ecuador", manuscript, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC.

Escobar, A., and Alvarez, S. (eds.) (1992) *The making of social movements in Latin America: Identity, strategy and democracy*, Westview, Boulder, Colo.

Fine, B. (1999) "The developmental state is dead - Long Live Social Capital?" *Development and Change*, 30, 1-19.

Fine, B. (2001) Social capital and social theory. Routledge, London

Fox, J., and Brown, D. (eds.) (1999) *The struggle for accountability: the World Bank, NGOs and grassroots movements*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Healey, K. (2000) *Llamas, weavings and organic chocolate: multicultural grassroots development experience from the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia*, University of Notre Dame Press, South Bend, IN.

Joseph, G. M., and Nugent, D. (eds.) (1994) *Everyday forms of state formation: revolution and negotiation of rule in Modern Mexico*, Duke University Press, Durham/London.

Keck, M., and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in International politics*, University of Cornell Press, Ithaca

Klein, N. (2000) *No Logo*, Flamingo, London.

Larrea, F. (1999) "Frontera étnica y masculinidades en el ejercicio del gobierno local" *Iconos* 8 (junio-augosto), 87-102.

Lloyd, J. (1998) "The politics of indigenous identity in Ecuador and the emergence of transnational discourses of power and subversion," unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, Liverpool.

Mato, D. (1998) "The transnational making of representations of gender, ethnicity and culture: indigenous peoples' organizations at the Smithsonian Institution's Festival." *Cultural Studies*, 12(2), 193-209.

Mitchell, K. 1997 [note date change] 'Transnational discourse: bringing geography back in' Antipode 29(2): 101- 114.

Narayan, D. (1999) "Bonds and Bridges: social capital and poverty.", World Bank, Poverty Group PREM, Washington DC.

Nederven Pieterse, J. (2001) *Development theory*, Sage, London.

Palenzuela, P. 1999 'Etnicidad y modelos de organizacion economica en el occidente de Guatemala', in K.Koonings & P. Silva (eds) Construccion ethnica y dinamica sociocultural en America Latina. Abya-Yala, Quito.

Pacari, N. 1996 [note date change] 'Taking on the neoliberal agenda' NACLA Report on the Americas XXIX (5): 23-32.

Plant, R. (1998) "Issues in Indigenous Poverty and Development." *IND-105*, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC.

Portes, A. (1997) "*Globalization from below: the rise of transnational communities*", Transnational Communities Programme Working paper series, WPTC-98-01.

Pscharaopoulos, G., and Patrinos, H. A. (1994) "Indigenous peoples and poverty in Latin America: an empirical analysis", World Bank, Washington DC.

Radcliffe, S. A. (1999) "Popular and state discourses of power." *Human Geography Today*, D.Massey , J. Allen, & P. Sarre (eds.), Polity, Cambridge, 219-242.

Radcliffe, S. A. (2001a) "Development, the state and transnational political connections: state and subject formations in Latin America." *Global Networks*, 1(1) 19-36

Radcliffe, S. A. (2001b) 'Gender, development and the problematic concept of culture', Seminar presented to the Gender Theory Seminar, University of Cambridge, October.

Radcliffe, S. & Laurie, N. (2001) 'The transnationalization of gender and re-imagining Andean indigenous development', paper presented at Latin American Studies Association

Congress 2001, in panel 'Re-imagining Gender and Development in the Americas', Washington DC, September.

Radcliffe, S., Laurie, N. & Andolina, R. (2001) 'Indigenous movement representations in transnational circuits: tales of social capital and poverty', paper presented at American Association of Geographers Annual Conference, New York, in panel 'Spaces of power: Social Movements and the politics of identity in Latin America'.

Ramos, A. (1998) *Indigenism: ethnic politics in Brazil*. University of Wisconsin, London.

Risse-Kappen, T. (ed.) (1995) *Bringing transnational relations back in*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sawyer, S. (1997) "The 1992 Indian mobilization in Lowland Ecuador." *Latin American Perspectives*, issue 94, vol. 24(3 (May), 65-82.

Selverston, M. (1994) "The politics of culture: indigenous peoples and the state in Ecuador" *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, D. L. Van Cott, ed., Inter-American Dialogue/St. Martin's Press, New York, 131-154.

Smith, M. P., and Guarnizo, L. E. (eds.) (1998). *Transnationalism from below*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.

Stack, J. J. (ed.) (1985). *Ethnic identities in a transnational world*, Greenwood Press, Westwood, Conn.

Stamatopoulou, E. (1994). 'Indigenous peoples and the United Nations: Human rights as a developing dynamic'. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 16(1), 58-81.

Starn, O. (1991) "Missing the revolution: anthropologists and the war in Peru." *Cultural Anthropology*, 6(1), 63-91.

Stavenhagen, R. (1996) "Indigenous rights: some conceptual problems" *Constructing Democracy*, E. Jelin and Hershberg, (eds), Westview Press, Boulder, 141-160.

Tennant, C. (1994) "Indigenous peoples, international institutions and the international legal literature from 1945-1993". *Human Rights Quarterly*, 16, 1-57.

Van Cott, D. L. (ed.) (1994) *Indigenous peoples and democracy in Latin America*, InterAmerican Dialogue/St. Martin's Press, New York.

Van de Fliert, L. (ed). (1994) *Indigenous peoples and international organizations*, Spokesman Books, Nottingham.

van Nieuwkoop, M., and Uquillas, J. E. (2000) "Defining Ethno-Development in operational terms: lessons from the Ecuador Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadoran Peoples Development Project." *Working Paper no.6*, World Bank, Latin American and Caribbean Regional Office, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development SMU., Washington DC.

Vellinga, M. (ed.) (1998) *The changing role of the state in Latin America*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Vertovec, S. (1999) "'Conceiving and researching transnationalism'." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 447-462.

Vertovec, S. (2001) "Transnational Social Formations: towards a conceptual cross-fertilization.", Transnational Communities Programme, Working Paper series WPTC-01-16, Oxford.

Wolfensohn, J.D. (1999) *A Proposal for a Comprehensive Development Framework (A Discussion Draft)*, available on http://www.worldbank.org/cdf/cdf-text.htm

Yashar, D. (1996) "Indigenous protest and democracy in Latin America." *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s: Themes and Issues*, J. Domínguez and A. Lowenthal, (eds.), The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Yashar, D. (1999) "Democracy, indigenous movements and the post-liberal challenge in Latin America." *World Politics*, 52.